Church Against State: How Industry Groups Lead the Religious Liberty Assault on Civil Rights, Healthcare Policy, and the Administrative State

Joanna Wuest[1] *and Briana S. Last*[2]

1 DEPARTMENT OF POLITICS, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE, SOUTH HADLEY, MA; 2 DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY, STONY BROOK, NEW YORK

Keywords: Healthcare Policy, First Amendment, Religious Liberty, Administrative Law, Gender And Sexuality, Civil Rights

Abstract: Industry-funded religious liberty legal groups have sought to undermine healthcare policy and law while simultaneously attacking the rights of sexual and gender minorities. Whereas past scholarship has tracked religiously-affiliated healthcare providers' growing political power and attendant transformations to legal doctrine, our account emphasizes the political donors and visionaries who have leveraged religious providers and the U.S. healthcare system's delegated structure to transform social policy and bureaucratic agencies more generally.

A 2022 investigative report revealed that DonorsTrust — a fundraising operation known as the "dark money ATM" of contemporary conservative politics — had funneled millions of dollars into religious liberty legal organizations.[1] Among the recipients was the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty, an organization renowned for its litigation against LGBTQ+ rights and the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) contraceptive mandate as well as its legal support for overturning the constitutional right to an abortion.[2] In a seemingly disparate realm, the donors and political leaders that covertly dole out funding to conservative causes have sought to curtail bureaucratic regulations which constrain the healthcare industry (as well as the finance and fossil fuel industries).[3] They too have worked to limit the capacities and inclusiveness of public programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and child welfare services.[4]

A growing movement of religious liberty legal organizations has assisted religiously-affiliated healthcare providers in their efforts to reduce or withhold care from sexual and gender minorities. Increasingly, these refusals of care have been taken to the Supreme Court.[5] Whereas past scholarship has tracked religiously-affiliated healthcare providers' growing political power and their transformations to legal doctrine, our account emphasizes the political donors and legal visionaries who have leveraged religious providers in their attempts to transform government institutions more generally.[6] Accordingly, we demonstrate that the ongoing erosion of reproductive healthcare access, antidiscrimination policies in healthcare provision, and public healthcare programs themselves is attributable to the entwining of the public-private administration and provision of healthcare in the U.S. with a long sighted corporate-religious coalition that exploits its fissures.

First, the delegated nature of the U.S. healthcare system has left it vulnerable to those seeking to further privatize and fragment the provision and administration of care. Since the early-twentieth century, a variety of forces — industrialist and religious but also labor movement ones — have consistently ensured that healthcare in the U.S. has been largely adminis-

Joanna Wuest, Ph.D., *is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Politics at Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, MA.* **Briana S. Last, Ph.D.**, *is an Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, & Access Fellow at Stony Brook University in Stony Brook, New York with their primary appointment in the clinical psychology department.*

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.
DOI: 10.1017/jme.2024.65

tered and provided by private, often religiously-affiliated actors and organizations.[7] This public-private structure has enabled insurance companies, employers, physician groups, and hospitals to exercise much authority over what care is provided and to whom. While far from determinative themselves, these path dependent conditions create the possibilities for political groups which seek to further insulate private sphere healthcare providers from government oversight.[8]

Second, the political entrepreneurs most responsible for these efforts at insulation and avoidance are a group of industrialists, the most active and visionary of which include the Koch, Olin, Scaife, Bradley, and DeVos families as well as deregulatory lobbying groups like the American Legislative Exchange Council.[9] These business leaders span industries but share a common goal of deregulation and limiting public oversight. For example, leaders in the Koch network like Americans for Prosperity (AFP) and the Center to Protect Patient Rights (now American Encore), the American Future Fund, the Club for Growth, and FreedomWorks have worked for over a decade to undermine and repeal the ACA as well as to prevent federal drug price regulation.[10]

Far from unique to the present moment, similarly situated industrial groups in the 1930s laid the foundation for today's conflicts by ensuring that the U.S. administrative, welfare, and healthcare landscape was delegated to private parties.[11] In recent years, these groups have funded attacks on federal government agencies such as the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as well as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) by highly constricting how bureaucrats implement policies. Notably, these "free market," "libertarian" interest groups often "capture" agencies to govern on their behalf as well as direct public funding toward private aims in a similar manner to how former President Donald Trump's administration repurposed rather than "deconstructed" the federal bureaucracy.[12]

To accomplish their ultimate aims, industry coalitions have historically courted and funded groups of social conservatives and Christian traditionalists.[13] In the mid-twentieth century, this involved enlisting Christian organizations into the Cold War fight against "godless communism."[14] Today, the Koch network and the Bradley Foundation fund religious legal organizations like the Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) and the Becket Fund, the two of which now appear almost annually before the Supreme Court.[15]

In all, our schema accounts for the iterative cycle of corporate-religious coalition-building and governance. In doing so, it reveals how these path dependent policy feedbacks have contributed to the erosion of government's regulatory capacity, the growth of the healthcare industry's power, and the curbing of the rights of gender and sexual minorities. Drawing from studies of the U.S. healthcare system's fragmented, public-private nature and the political interests of well-funded conservative organizations that exploit it, this study offers a holistic picture of what we call a politics of "church against state."

Importantly, these legal organizations *use* extant religious social service & healthcare providers (which may or may not have sincere religious beliefs against LGBTQ+ rights and reproductive health practices) to advance a broader deregulatory agenda. Other industry-backed groups like the Federalist Society and the Judicial Crisis Network have worked with leaders in the Republican Party to shift the judiciary rightward.[16] Scholars of the "judicialization" of politics and the rise of a "juristocracy" at home and abroad have demonstrated how conflicts over policy have increasingly played out in the courts.[17] In an era of unprecedented congressional gridlock, court capture has been crucial for governing.[18] While the conservative legal movement forms a composite of disparate rights issues, its effect has been to undo the regulatory state *and* civil rights protections simultaneously.[19]

In all, our schema accounts for the iterative cycle of corporate-religious coalition-building and governance. In doing so, it reveals how these path dependent policy feedbacks have contributed to the erosion of government's regulatory capacity, the growth of the healthcare industry's power, and the curbing of

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

the rights of gender and sexual minorities.[20] Drawing from studies of the U.S. healthcare system's fragmented, public-private nature and the political interests of well-funded conservative organizations that exploit it, this study offers a holistic picture of what we call a politics of "church against state."

The paper proceeds with a section on the history and institutional vulnerabilities of the public-private American healthcare system. We turn then to a description of the industry-funded religious liberty coalition and then introduce four case studies which flesh out these organizations' political interests, legal approaches, and impacts. These case studies include legal challenges to: 1) the ACA's implementation; 2) HHS and other agencies' authority to govern; 3) the nonpartisan civil service; and 4) state and federal COVID-19 public health policies. Throughout, we demonstrate how religious liberty legal organizations pursue legal cases that simultaneously erode civil rights and the administrative state. We focus especially on how these groups have adopted a politics of *anti-administrativism*, a term legal scholar Gillian Metzger coined to describe attacks on the bureaucracy which extend back to the New Deal era.[21] We expound our own term, *religious anti-administrativism*, to describe religious liberty-themed litigation that serves similarly deregulatory ends. Notably, we understand religious anti-administrativism to be a tactic, one which religious liberty legal organizations and conservative judges are apt to use as long as the approach engenders deregulatory outcomes or otherwise reorients the bureaucracy to serve private interests. The conclusion underscores that this politics of church against state is fundamentally driven by political visionaries who exploit both religious dissent and the public-private contours of the U.S. healthcare system in pursuit of profiteering.

The Public-Private U.S. Healthcare System and Its Vulnerabilities

The patchwork public-private nature of the American healthcare system not only creates openings for further privatization and fragmentation but it is itself an outcome of political contestation. The U.S. has consistently delegated responsibility of social provisions like healthcare to non-state actors — often employers, third-party insurers, and charitable organizations (funded through tax-deductible donations, wealthy donors, and public dollars).[22] Throughout the twentieth century when peer countries were constructing universal health insurance programs, the U.S. context was shaped by coalitions of pharmaceutical companies, health insurers, hospital networks, and organizations of medical professionals (namely, the American Medical Association) which defeated national health insurance proposals.[23]

As such, private institutions like hospitals and employer-sponsored health insurance plans–many of which have religious affiliations–have increasingly dominated the provision of care. In the Gilded Age, the Supreme Court allowed D.C. to fund the construction of new Catholic charity-owned hospital buildings; the Court surmised that there was no risk of indoctrination and that the interest in serving the poor excused this church-state intermingling.[24] This pattern persisted despite attempts by New Deal politicians to make the payment and provision of healthcare more public and centralized.[25] The Hill-Burton Construction Act of 1946, for instance, allowed federal funds to be channeled to religious-affiliated hospitals.[26]

Corporate interests later shaped Medicare and Medicaid by ensuring that private third-party organizations would administer public funds and provide expanded (often means-tested) care.[27] The 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act which established Medicare and Medicaid not only expanded the federal government's role in healthcare, but also enforced anti-discriminatory principles in service provision.[28] Nevertheless, these programs entrenched the role of private actors in healthcare, dashing the hopes of many of Medicare's architects who saw the program as a path to universal health insurance.[29] In subsequent decades, the pharmaceutical and managed care industries leveraged the delegated nature of the U.S.'s public health insurance programs to further privatize and subject them to market forces.[30]

As the government increasingly relied on private contractors to administer and provide public services, the New Deal era's (uneven) commitment to the public welfare state waned in favor of a "third way" embrace of both religious and market-based alternatives. As one part of the Clinton administration's 1996 welfare reform law, the federal government embraced the concept of "charitable choice," which allowed "pervasively sectarian" institutions including houses of worship themselves to distribute social services.[31] These programs range from child welfare to health support to substance use services.[32] Charitable choice was part of a broader package of reforms pushed by Clinton and the pro-business Democratic Leadership Council faction of the party, which combined its historic cuts in federal welfare spending with tax policies that further incentivized private philanthropy.[33] Importantly, churches and charities were still forbidden from discriminating in their distribution of social services, though the George W. Bush administration

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168. © The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics.

did enable faith-based providers to hire exclusively their own co-religious members.[34] Later, the Donald Trump administration reversed an older rule that required private providers to help locate a secular or alternative faith-based provider if they could not provide a service for religious reasons.[35] While Republican presidential administrations have been responsible for undercutting such antidiscrimination principles, Presidents Barack Obama and Joseph Biden adopted public-private charitable choice programs in their own administrations.[36]

The highly delegated nature of the ACA has also contributed to the religious provision (and withholding) of care. Despite charges from ACA opponents that it imposed a centrally-planned system, the law was actually based upon–and thus perpetuated–the overwhelmingly privatized American healthcare system, which has made it vulnerable to contestation by the employers, providers, and healthcare institutions that find certain mandated care protections and antidiscrimination provisions anathema.[37] In part spurred by the ACA, health systems have consolidated in recent decades, which in turn has led to religious hospitals imposing care restrictions on a greater share of providers.[38] As Elizabeth Sepper has noted, facilities that briefly pass into a Catholic network's ownership can actually bind those hospitals from providing care opposed to Catholic social teachings in perpetuity.[39] Today, one in six beds are in Catholic hospital networks that routinely refuse to perform certain reproductive and gender-affirming care procedures.[40] While states like Washington have sought to protect abortion rights by blocking hospital mergers that would restrict care, many states operate hospitals that enforce religious doctrine to the detriment of minority rights and the separation of church and state alike.[41]

Industry-Funded Religious Liberty Legal Organizations in Healthcare Law and Policy

Industry-funded religious liberty legal organizations have worked alongside individual religious employers, physician associations, and Republican Party lawmakers to undermine the ACA protections for gender and sexual minorities, to constrict the authority of the HHS, and to restrict COVID-19 public health measures. Among the organizations which pursue these challenges most frequently is the Becket Fund, which was founded in 1994 by Kevin Hasson, an attorney who had previously worked in the Reagan administration's Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice (under then-Deputy Assistant Attorney General Samuel Alito).[42] Becket ostensibly litigates on behalf of *all* religious believers. It has represented Seventh Day Adventist members who have been denied time off from work for their sabbath as well as Muslim and Sikh prison inmates who have been denied requests to grow beards.[43]

Becket's most significant litigation, however, has enabled socially conservative Christian businesses, schools, and social service providers to discriminate against minority groups (sometimes even religious minorities) while avoiding government oversight. Its victories have made it easier for religiously-affiliated schools to fire sick or disabled schoolteachers who would have otherwise been protected by the Americans with Disabilities Act or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.[44] Under the "ministerial exception," lay teachers in religious schools are denied antidiscrimination protections (an exemption formerly reserved for a house of worship's discretion in hiring and firing clergy). Becket has also defended publicly-funded, private faith-based social service contractors — which make up a large share of the child welfare system — seeking a religious right to discriminate against serving LGBTQ+ clients.[45] Regarding oversight, Becket and many other industry-backed religious groups like the ADF and the American Center for Law and Justice have worked to keep church-affiliated hospitals exempt from federal pension plan regulations.[46] Lastly, Becket has expanded "pervasively sectarian" institutions' access to public funding. This includes churches that are already less constrained by antidiscrimination policies (even more so than faith-based nonprofits) and which tend to spend fewer resources on "eligible services" than traditional social service providers.[47]

What is lost in debates over whether Becket promotes "Christian theocracy" is the more consequential question of *who benefits* most from its work. A look at Becket's donors and political ties reveals that, no matter its claims to religious ecumenism, Becket most faithfully serves corporate interests. For one, Becket is a registered member of the State Policy Network, an association of dozens of right-wing policy groups.[48] Becket is so entwined with anti-administrative forces that it recently hired an accountant to share with the author of *Is Administrative Law Unlawful?,* Philip Hamburger's New Civil Liberties Alliance.[49] While this is only suggestive of some degree of entanglement between religious liberty and anti-administrativist attorneys and intellectual leaders, the groups' shared donor circle is even more indicative of a shared mission. Becket has received millions of dollars from donors including the Bradley Foundation, the Koch Family Foundation, DonorsTrust, the Donor Capital Fund (a sister organization of DonorsTrust for groups

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

managing over $1 million), and the Atlas Network (an oil-backed consortium of policy groups that promote neoliberal economic policies in Latin America and an anti-climate change agenda at home).[50]

Religious Anti-Administrativism and the ACA Contraceptive Mandate Cases

Since its beginnings, the ACA has been challenged by conservative donors and Republican Party politicians, religious liberty legal organizations, and religious healthcare providers. The interests here are myriad: donors like the Kochs and GOP leaders seek to replace the law with less generous market-based alternatives such as individual healthcare savings accounts.[51] Others like the individual business owners and physicians who refuse to provide care such as abortions or hysterectomies for trans men are at least sometimes motivated by sincerely held religious beliefs. Nevertheless, the following cases discussed here are advanced primarily by donors and their litigation groups which use religious liberty claims to limit the government's power to determine what care providers must make available.[52]

Becket has been at the helm of several high-profile cases, which have pitted opponents of abortion, sexual and gender minorities' rights, and gender-affirming healthcare against various ACA provisions. Accordingly, the legal cases explored in this section — some of which are ongoing — have been pursued by Becket and similar groups which have either taken donations from corporate funders or have been trained by and clerked for judges in the Federalist Society network.[53] Many of the ACA legal challenges ought to be read in the context of the U.S. healthcare system's path dependent features and the contemporary religious-corporate coalition that aims to exploit them. Though Becket's immediate concerns have been to restrict certain controversial healthcare regimens, it has taken aim at the administrative state more broadly.

Becket's litigation on behalf of Hobby Lobby against the ACA is best known for expanding the scope of the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), a law which requires the federal government to meet an even higher standard of religious free exercise protections than the First Amendment affords.[54] In *Burwell v Hobby Lobby*, Hobby Lobby Stores sued HHS over the ACA's contraceptive mandate. While churches and faith-based non-profits were already exempt from the ACA's provisions, Hobby Lobby claimed that because they were a "closely held" for-profit corporation (one Christian family is its majority stakeholder), RFRA protected them from providing services they opposed on religious grounds. The Supreme Court agreed that HHS had "substantially burdened" Hobby Lobby's religious liberty rights. *Hobby Lobby* is just one example of how the Court has refashioned civil liberties in a neo-*Lochnerian* mode, one which privileges corporate rights over individual or minoritarian ones while inscribing a deregulatory, pro-market orientation back into legal doctrine.[55]

An underemphasized nature of Becket's ACA litigation has been its direct engagement with the sorts of administrative law arguments that are typically employed by those like coal companies protesting the EPA.[56] That is, religious liberty groups adopt doctrines of anti-administrativism, an approach to administrative law with roots in anti-New Deal industrial leaders' constitutional opposition to the emergent bureaucratic state as well as the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) of 1946.[57] The APA was the product of a longstanding fight between New Deal advocates of federal executive power and conservative opponents, among whom were industry coalitions like the National Manufacturers Association (NAM).[58] While less conservative than rival bills like the failed Walter-Logan bill which President Roosevelt vetoed in 1940, the APA augmented the judiciary's role in determining the lawfulness of agency regulations. Section 706 in particular reads that "court[s] shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action."[59]

Today, corporate-funded litigation organizations and their allies on the federal bench have attempted to further enhance judicial power over the bureaucracy, often by arguing for increasingly conservative interpretations of the APA.[60] In *Hobby Lobby*, Becket posited that HHS had violated the APA in requiring employers to include certain Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved contraceptive pharmaceuticals in their health insurance plans per the ACA's provisions regarding preventive services.[61] Two of the four APA-themed arguments took issue with HHS's "decision not to exempt Plaintiffs and similar religious individuals from the Mandate [which] runs counter to the evidence submitted by religious individuals during the comment period."[62] Pitting the FDA and HHS regulations against their own religiously-inspired, fringe medical beliefs that contraceptives like Plan B and intrauterine devices induce an abortion, Becket characterized HHS's dismissal as "arbitrary and capricious."[63] Based on its own understanding of these so-called abortifacients, Becket argued that the regulation violated RFRA as well as the Weldon Amendment's and ACA's restrictions on federal funds for abortion care.[64]

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168. © The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics.

Following the district court's initial ruling, Becket discarded its administrative arguments in favor of religious liberty ones. While RFRA took the centerstage before the Supreme Court, the Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund — an organization that emerged from Phyllis Schlafly's 1970s campaign against the Equal Rights Amendment and which has recently received funding from the Bradley and Olin foundations — encouraged the justices to resuscitate the nondelegation doctrine.[65] The nondelegation doctrine was a novel interpretation of the separation of powers crafted by critics of the New Deal. Nondelegation holds that the modern federal bureaucracy is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority to the executive branch. Notably, the doctrine does not describe a consensus opinion among the Framers nor does it describe a pattern of decision-making ever sustained by the Supreme Court.[66] The banking and manufacturing industry-led American Liberty League briefly adopted the nondelegation theory to thwart New Deal regulations and social welfare programs. Though the Court only seriously entertained nondelegation in one 1935 case, the doctrine has been recently refashioned by Republican Party elected officials and jurists.[67] In an unrelated 2019 case, Becket would endorse this notion that "Strict nondelegation is needed to protect free exercise rights."[68]

Since *Hobby Lobby v. Burwell*, challenges to the ACA's constitutionality have consistently featured a blend of religious liberty appeals and anti-administrativism. To appease religious concerns, the Obama administration had allowed nonprofits (and, after *Hobby Lobby*, many for-profits) an accommodation from the contraceptive requirements; dissenting employers needed only to file an exemption form, which would prompt the federal government to provide contraceptive care to the organizations' employees. In *Zubik v. Burwell* (2016), Becket joined arms with religious colleges, charity organizations, and other nonprofits seeking to further undermine HHS's preventive care regulations.[69] On behalf of Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the Aged (a multi-state operation with hundreds of lay employees), Becket argued that the mere act of filing for an exemption from the contraceptive mandate made religious dissenters complicit in the very care that they morally opposed.[70] Little Sisters of the Poor argued that, because the exemption form led the federal government to provide the services which they found objectionable, even this compromise was a violation of religious liberty.

Whereas Becket's appeal was designed to build on its previous RFRA victory in *Hobby Lobby*, groups like the Eagle Forum challenged the exemption workaround as just another violation of the nondelegation doctrine.[71] In its own brief, the Cato Institute took things much further, positing both that HHS lacked the authority to "regulate religion" and that the department had violated another tenet of anti-administrativism — the major questions doctrine.[72] Attorneys for Cato argued that the federal bureaucracy had promulgated an "expansive construction" of the ACA, and that it lacked the relevant "expertise" to make such healthcare policy decisions in the first instance.[73] The major questions doctrine has quickly become one of –if not *the*–most effective doctrinal tools to dismantle agency regulations.[74] It holds that an agency action is unlawful if it touches on matters of "vast economic and political significance" unless Congress has explicitly empowered the bureaucracy to do so. Today's major questions doctrine has its roots in the case *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp* (2000), in which the Court struck down the FDA's regulations concerning cigarettes and smokeless tobacco per the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act's language on "drugs" and "devices."[75]

The major questions doctrine was given new life in 2015 when the Court held that, because an Internal Revenue Service tax credit program for ACA healthcare exchanges touched on major questions, the Court could not defer to the agency's interpretation of the ACA.[76] The effect of the major questions doctrine is to hamstring government regulation over important political economic matters. Soon Cato was not alone in applying the major questions doctrine to such cases. Three years later, Becket found that the major questions doctrine encourages a "strict construction of laws potentially infringing core private rights in the context of nondelegation concerns."[77] Ergo, a broadly anti-administrativist approach best safeguards religious liberty.

President Donald Trump's 2016 election and subsequent revision of the contraceptive rule prompted a reversal in those championing and challenging agency action. Shortly after HHS rescinded the contraceptive mandate, Pennsylvania and New Jersey sued the administration for sidestepping the APA's required notice-and-comment period.[78] Once again, Becket represented the Little Sisters of the Poor before the Supreme Court in a challenge to both the Obama administration's accommodation regulation (Justice Scalia's untimely death prolonged judicial deliberation over the Obama administration rule contested in *Zubik*) and the state-led efforts to undo Trump's much broader exemption scheme which had accommodated the group.[79] Becket argued that RFRA and the First Amendment were bulwarks against a "sprawling

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

administrative state," and that the Trump administration's reforms were premised on its own duty to alleviate preexisting undue burdens on free exercise.[80] In a joint *amici* brief in *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania* (2020), Cato and the newly-formed socially conservative Jewish Coalition for Religious Liberty added that the Obama administration's original accommodations were themselves unlawful, noting that any scheme of exempting some entities and not others was a violation of the major questions doctrine.[81]

In a win for Becket and its allies, Justice Clarence Thomas observed that the ACA authorizes HHS to make exemptions to the contraceptive mandate, and that it was appropriate for HHS to consider RFRA in doing so.[82] The result is that the federal bureaucracy now has considerable latitude to act on *behalf* of religious rights claims, and that the right-leaning Supreme Court can step in to limit administrative authority whenever it threatens the interests of the corporate-religious coalition.

In litigation against both HHS and Department of Education (ED) antidiscrimination policies, religious liberty legal organizations have spearheaded attacks on longstanding doctrines which direct courts to afford agencies some discretion in governance. By targeting judicial deference doctrines, these organizations have aligned their litigation with hospital trade associations (as well as the fossil fuel industry and other large industries) which seek to limit agency oversight.

Additional Religious Attacks on Judicial Deference to Agencies

In litigation against both HHS and Department of Education (ED) antidiscrimination policies, religious liberty legal organizations have spearheaded attacks on longstanding doctrines which direct courts to afford agencies some discretion in governance. By targeting judicial deference doctrines, these organizations have aligned their litigation with hospital trade associations (as well as the fossil fuel industry and other large industries) which seek to limit agency oversight. For instance, in 2022 the American Hospital Association, with help from business advocacy groups, asked the Court to limit Medicare's power to adjust drug reimbursement rates by way of overturning one of its landmark deference doctrines.[83] This section examines how religious groups and industry associations have jointly pursued a strategy to do away with judicial deference doctrines that have historically allowed agencies to use policy expertise to implement and update necessarily vague congressional statutes. Such attacks on deference have been to the detriment of both antidiscrimination policies for sexual and gender minorities as well as patient care.

The historical route toward this weaponization of deference has been circuitous but instructive to map. By the 1970s, the federal judiciary was populated by a number of liberal judges and justices who used Section 706 of the APA to compel agencies to regulate *even more*; the judiciary often cited its own commitments to the rights of relatively powerless minority groups as justification for pollution regulations in blighted neighborhoods, for example.[84] Ironically, when the Supreme Court first articulated its modern standards of deference to agencies, the increasingly conservative Court actually did so to permit the Reagan administration to *undermine* agencies' own regulatory power.[85] Jurists like Justice Scalia once defended judicial deference. Things changed once the Obama administration was forced to navigate congressional gridlock by governing through the federal bureaucracy. Conservatives thus developed a distaste for judicial deference standards like *Chevron* (deference to agency interpretations of ambiguous federal statutes that pertain to their authority and prerogatives) and *Auer* (deference to agency interpretations of their own rules).[86]

As for *Chevron*, Becket joined a coalition targeting HHS's implementation of the ACA's Section 1557 that requires federally-funded healthcare programs to adhere to certain antidiscrimination principles. In the 2016 case *Franciscan Alliance v. Burwell*, a Texas-led coalition of various Republican state attorneys general along with religiously-affiliated hospitals and Christian medical professional associations charged the Obama administration with violating both RFRA and the APA.[87] Becket joined this effort on behalf of the Christian Medical & Dental Associations, Fran-

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168. © The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics.

ciscan Alliance, and Specialty Physicians of Illinois.[88] Together, they challenged HHS's interpretation of the ACA's language regarding "on the basis of sex" to encompass both "gender identity" and "termination of pregnancy," which would require providers to offer gender-affirming care and reproductive healthcare; the challengers posited that this reinterpretation was a breach of *Chevron* deference on the grounds that "sex" unambiguously refers to a biological binary (i.e., male and female). The healthcare providers' demands were met when the Trump administration rescinded the antidiscrimination rule in 2020 while simultaneously importing an even higher standard of RFRA protections.[89]

Also in 2016, this same group of corporate-religious organizations used another case on the meaning of sex and transgender rights to erode both judicial deference and civil rights.[90] *Gloucester v. Gavin Grimm* concerned ED's interpretation of existing agency regulations relating to Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972.[91] The central question was whether the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy in the Department's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) overstepped in interpreting "sex" as "gender identity." In opposing that policy's implication for expansive trans bathroom rights in public schools, Gloucester County School Board sued, challenging ED's authority to interpret the meaning of "sex" so capaciously. This triggered a debate over the legitimacy of the *Auer* deference standard, thereby threatening to permanently limit the authority of federal agencies to interpret their own rules.[92]

Gloucester attracted the attention of nearly every top litigator and legal organization in the conservative legal movement. Writing in the *National Review*, Justice Scalia's former clerk and then-president of the "Judeo-Christian" Ethics and Public Policy Center Edward Whelan summed up the movement's mood: "Seldom has a more brazen and aggressive bureaucratic misreading of federal law encountered a more craven and confused judicial reception."[93] In 2016, Gloucester County School Board's case was appealed to the Supreme Court by four prominent conservative attorneys who had recently fought marriage equality (and a few who have since 2020 been on the frontier of right-wing electoral reforms).[94] Among those counsel on the brief were S. Kyle Duncan, who had just opposed marriage equality in *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015) and Jonathan Mitchell, who has since become infamous for architecting Texas's SB8 anti-abortion law and sits on the New Civil Liberties Alliance's board of advisors.[95] Others included D. John Sauer, a former Justice Scalia law clerk and protégé of then-Attorney General of Missouri Josh Hawley, and Gene Schaerr, who had previously defended Utah's ban on marriage equality.[96] This team of superstar conservative attorneys put their position pithily: "This Case Is An Excellent Vehicle For Resolving Both The Divisions Over *Auer* And The Proper Interpretation Of Title IX And Its Regulation."[97]

The school board was joined by supportive industry-funded groups who filed *amicus* briefs calling for an overhaul of *Auer* while simultaneously condemning ED's threat to withhold education dollars from noncompliant school districts. The Cato Institute filed a brief authored by critics of the administrative state including Jonathan H. Adler, Richard A. Epstein, and Michael W. McConnell, which called for the complete overhaul of *Auer* deference.[98] Cato's brief charged *Auer* with incentivizing agencies to promulgate purposefully vague regulations so that they might "change their interpretations on a dime" whenever it behooved them.[99] Likewise, the Pacific Legal Foundation–a firm founded in the 1970s to oppose environmental policies–argued that limiting *Auer* in this case would be a stepping stone toward reining it in entirely.[100]

In its brief, the Wisconsin Institute for Law & Liberty (WILL) similarly condemned *Auer* while also deeming ED's regulation as an instance of coercive federalism akin to the Medicaid expansion program which the Supreme Court had partially struck down four years prior.[101] Like Cato, WILL and its counsel of record Mario Loyola had no policy position on trans bathroom reforms.[102] Instead, they sought to hinder the federal bureaucracy's ability to regulate, especially climate policy. Loyola, for instance, was an early critic of the Obama administration EPA's Clean Power Plan, which had become their quintessential example of bureaucracy-run-amok.[103]

Just as striking as those industry-funded briefs opposing ED's gender identity policy were the religious groups which filed briefs condemning *Auer* deference. Again, the Becket Fund's ability to thread anti-administrativism with religious liberty stands out. In a joint *amicus* brief with the General Conference of the Seventh-Day Adventists, Becket attorneys framed the regulation as just one instance of federal bureaucrats "skirting" and subverting the legislative process.[104] In various media statements, the ADF's Matthew Sharp asserted that the "Obama administration cannot unilaterally disregard and redefine federal law to accomplish its political agenda of forcing girls to share locker rooms and showers with boys," especially given the failure to engage in a proper public notice and comment process.[105] Still others ranging from televangelist Pat Robertson's National Legal Foundation, the Eagle

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

Forum, and the Family Research Council accused ED of undermining federalism and the legislative process while propping up its own authority.[106]

Serving as counsel for Robert P. George's National Organization for Marriage & his own Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence (CCJ), John Eastman asserted that "It is time for *Auer* to be overruled."[107] Eastman's and George's collaboration here represents in miniature the corporate-religious convergence. Most famous for organizing over one-hundred national Christian leaders under the banner of the 2009 Manhattan Declaration, George has long been an intellectual architect of a Christian traditionalist movement against marriage equality, abortion, and trans rights.[108] Eastman is a former clerk of Justice Clarence Thomas and has since directed the CCJ in matters concerning the nondelegation doctrine.[109] Eastman most infamously intervened in the 2020 presidential election, aiming to initiate a constitutional coup on behalf of President Trump and the anti-administrativism which his Supreme Court appointees have nurtured.[110]

Though the push to overturn *Auer* was ironically doomed by Trump's election and Education Secretary Betsy DeVos's rescinding of the gender identity regulation, anti-administrativist positions have become more widespread since. While the Court failed in *Kisor v. Wilkie* (2019) to overturn *Auer*, it did begin to place some additional limits on such deference; similarly, the Court balked on striking down *Chevron* in 2022, though it did limit Medicare's power to adjust drug reimbursement rates on behalf of the American Hospital Association.[111] Instead of overturning *Chevron* outright (which it may still do on Becket's and others' request in 2024), the Court may instead let deference simply atrophy until it is effectively dead.[112]

The Future of Healthcare Regulation and the Civil Service

In ongoing litigation against the ACA's implementation, a team including anti-abortion and anti-labor union legal strategist Jonathan Mitchell, former Trump White House staffer Stephen Miller, and a Republican-aligned business management firm have put both religious liberty and anti-administrativist arguments to work.[113] Specifically, they take odds with HHS's interpretation of the ACA's preventive-care coverage provision to include contraceptive pharmaceuticals, STD screenings, and pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) drugs that prevent the contraction of HIV, a provision which covers more than 150 million privately insured Americans.[114] As for the religious liberty challenge, Mitchell has contended that two religious for-profit business owners — Kelley Orthodontics and Braidwood Management — have sincere religious objections to "abortifacient" contraception drugs and those like PrEP, which might "encourage or facilitate homosexual behavior."[115] The business owners claim that the HHS regulation would substantially burden their First Amendment rights and RFRA by "subsidizing lifestyles that violate their religious beliefs."[116]

On the anti-administrativist front, Mitchell relies on now standard-fare arguments. Invoking the nondelegation doctrine, Mitchell contends that HHS supplied no "intelligible principle" that would guide its discretion in making its regulations.[117] This is despite the fact that HHS's Preventive Services Task Force (PSTF) has been statutorily empowered to create regulations based on "the scientific evidence related to the effectiveness, appropriateness, and cost-effectiveness of clinical preventive services."[118]

From there, the suit turns to two of the most radically anti-administrative arguments levied against the ACA yet.[119] First, Mitchell cites the Court's recent reinterpretations of Article II's Appointments Clause, which have been championed by Cato and the Chamber of Commerce, and which were endorsed in September 2022 and March 2023 rulings by Judge Reed O'Connor of the District Court for the Northern District of Texas (Judge O'Connor also endorsed the RFRA claim in this case).[120] Citing *Lucia v. Securities and Exchange Commission* (2018), which declared that SEC administrative law judges are no mere employees but instead officers who must be appointed, Mitchell cast those members of PSTF, the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, and the Health Resources and Services Administration as similarly unconstitutionally situated.[121] That is, Mitchell contends that the HHS professional civil service could not "unilaterally determine the preventive care that private insurers must cover" precisely because such decisions must be made by presidentially-appointed officers.[122]

This highly technical debate over the meaning of "officers" shrouds the broader aim here: to shift the job categories of potentially *thousands* of civil servants into the category of (partisan) appointed officers. The Court in *Lucia* and Mitchell in his litigation both cite Jennifer Mascott, a former Department of Justice attorney in the Trump administration, who has argued that the "historical meaning of 'officer' likely would extend to thousands of officials not currently appointed as Article II 'officers,' such as tax collectors, disaster relief officials, federal inspectors, customs officials, and administrative judges."[123] In response to Mitchell's reliance on *Lucia*, HHS has noted that such members serve as independent experts, and there-

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

fore lack a "continuing and formalized relationship of employment with the United States government."[124] This case pushes the frontier of *Lucia* even further. It may create another opportunity to satisfy corporate groups like the Pacific Legal Foundation, which has urged the Court to clarify — and thus to expand — the definition of "principal officers."[125]

These Appointments Clause cases ought to be read as a total assault on the administrative state as well as the public sector unions which represent many of its employees. Mitchell's litigation shares a lineage with President Trump's executive order in October 2020, which (if it had been implemented) would have moved many career civil service workers into a new category ("Schedule F"), thereby removing them from their collective bargaining units and making them into at-will employees subject to partisan control.[126] It also accords with a broader strategy formulated by the Heritage Foundation and adopted by dozens of conservative legal movement organizations to facilitate a quick and total remaking of the federal bureaucracy upon their expected presidential victory in 2024.[127] The consequence would be to undo much of the 1883 Pendleton Act and other means by which the crony party machine model of bureaucratic governance was replaced by a more professionalized, nonpartisan one.[128] Ridding the administrative state of career civil servants would enable a Republican administration (buttressed by a sympathetic Supreme Court) to make unfettered policy changes.

Second, the Mitchell team's strategy builds on the 5-4 decision in *Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau* (2020), which was driven by opponents of federal regulations on industry.[129] Established through the 2010 Dodd–Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act in response to the 2008 financial crisis, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) aim was to curb the unbridled power of the financial industry. The Court found that the CFPB's structure violated the Vesting Clause by making its single director removable only for reasons of "inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office."[130] As Justice Elena Kagan noted in her dissent, the decision "wipes out a feature of that agency its creators thought fundamental to its mission — a measure of independence from political pressure."[131] Indeed, as soon as Trump took office, he appointed Mick Mulvaney as head of the CFPB, who had in his prior congressional campaigns received over $63,000 in financial contributions from payday lenders. In his first actions as director, Mulvaney canceled an Obama era investigation of a lender who had previously been one of Mulvaney's campaign contributors.[132] Subsequent industry litigation invoking *Seila* has attempted to nullify the Federal Housing Finance Agency's work to stabilize the housing market after the 2008 crash.[133] Lastly, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals cited *Seila* in its 2022 holding that the SEC's primary mechanism for enforcing securities law is unconstitutional.[134]

Throughout challenges to state and federal COVID-19 public health policies, industry-funded religious liberty legal organizations have invoked the First Amendment, RFRA, and anti-administrativist doctrines. First, just as Becket has used the free exercise clause and RFRA to undermine the ACA, it has also used these tools to simultaneously erode government administrative authority and the civil rights of sexual and gender minorities.

In Mitchell's case, the relevant HHS officials have been charged with wielding a "unilateral authority" that is insulated from presidential influence and, therefore, violates the Vesting Clause.[135] HHS has termed the argument "absurd" given that a wide range of non-agency actors including nongovernmental organizations as well as state and foreign governments are frequently asked to provide guidance in crafting regulations.[136] Just as in the case of *Lucia*, some corporate interests are hoping that *Seila's* holding will soon be expanded.[137]

Religious Liberty, Public Health, and Social Services

Throughout challenges to state and federal COVID-19 public health policies, industry-funded religious liberty legal organizations have invoked the First Amendment, RFRA, and anti-administrativist doctrines. First, just as Becket has used the free exercise clause and RFRA to undermine the ACA, it has also used these tools to simultaneously erode government

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

administrative authority and the civil rights of sexual and gender minorities.

At the state level, Becket and others challenged a 2020 California bureaucratic rule prohibiting in-home gatherings of more than three households. In the shadow docket case *Tandon v. Newsom* (2021), Federalist Society attorney Ryan J. Walsh successfully sued California for violating the free exercise rights of worshippers seeking to flout the public health measure.[138] Becket was a lone outlier in filing a brief in *Tandon*, supporting Walsh's case.[139] Again, this litigation was advanced by and ultimately served industry interests. Walsh had previously defended Wisconsin's right-to-work law while serving as the state's Chief Deputy Solicitor General.[140] Outside of the courts, concurrent efforts led by Koch network groups spread COVID-19 misinformation in hopes to end *all* lockdown restrictions, both to benefit their short-term bottom-lines as well as to undermine public health authority more generally.[141]

It is hard to overstate the impact of *Tandon* on the future of public health regulations.[142] While California's restriction applied equally to secular and religious meetings, the Court ruled that the lack of equal strictures on gatherings in commercial spaces constituted a free exercise clause violation.[143] Prior to 2021, no federal court had ever granted a religious liberty exemption to a vaccine mandate.[144] Now, federal courts are far more likely to see any use of bureaucratic discretion in evaluating an exemption as constituting a free exercise clause violation.[145] After *Tandon*, federal judges have begun to rule in favor of religiously-motivated vaccine objectors.[146]

As for the antidiscrimination connection, *Tandon* was litigated on very similar grounds to Becket's then-ongoing case in support of a faith-based social service contractor seeking to discriminate against queer would-be foster and adoptive parents. In *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia* (2021), Becket represented Catholic Social Services (CSS) in its challenge to Philadelphia's decision not to renew its contract with CSS to provide foster and adoptive care services.[147] The religious social service providers in *Fulton* are themselves products of the public-private U.S. social welfare state and its path dependencies, given that child welfare has historically been provided through a fragmented array of local and state institutions (many of which are reliant upon private contractors).[148]

In *Fulton*, Chief Justice John Roberts wrote that Philadelphia had indeed violated the free exercise rights of CSS. The city did so by not granting an exemption even though its standard contract with foster care and adoption providers includes a provision that gives officials discretion over potential exemptions to its nondiscrimination rule. Although Philadelphia had never in its history granted such an exemption, its contract gave the Department of Human Services the discretion to do so. Given that mechanism's existence, the fact that the city *could* have granted CSS an exemption meant that *not* doing so constituted a free exercise clause violation. As critics have noted, public-private contracts are by their nature individualized; they inherently require pragmatic determinations and discretion.[149] Routine bureaucratic decisions can now be effectively charged as discriminatory on religious liberty grounds.[150] The upshot of *Fulton* is that even laws providing for secular exemptions must now favor religious ones as well. This is a radical departure from an older standard.[151] Previous case law generally upheld those government policies (e.g., public health regulations) which were "neutral and generally applicable" (i.e., not a mere pretext for religious discrimination).[152] *Fulton* and *Tandon* flipped that logic, forcing the government to prove that it had not violated religious liberty.

Lowering the threshold for religious exemptions could have an enormous impact on the regulation of social services, which are often reliant on faith-based agencies.[153] In a brief filed in support of Philadelphia, a group of mayors and other officials from over 166 cities, towns, and counties representing over 53 million Americans warned that a ruling in favor of CSS would "affect every aspect of public services offered through public-private partnerships."[154] Additionally, the American Civil Liberties Union cautioned that *Fulton* could allow publicly funded homeless shelters, food banks, hospitals, disaster relief agencies, and other faith-based humanitarian organizations to discriminate in the name of religion.[155] As evidence, *Fulton* has been cited by a federal district court judge siding with a faith-based women's shelter in Anchorage, Alaska, which had invoked its Christian beliefs to bar trans women from its facilities (notably, the ADF represented the shelter).[156] In those geographies where religious social service providers are the most prevalent distributors of state-funded care, exemptions could severely limit who can rely on social welfare.

Lastly, the industry-funded ADF invoked religious liberty in efforts to quash OSHA's COVID-19 vaccination-or-testing mandate.[157] The business case against the OSHA regulation was relatively straightforward. In a 2022 shadow docket case, the Supreme Court cited the major questions doctrine to rule in favor of the National Federation of Independent Businesses against an agency rule requiring vaccine-or-testing policies for companies with at least 100 employees.[158]

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

In a concurrent case representing Republican Party-controlled states such as Florida and Missouri as well as religious schools, colleges, and seminaries, the ADF combined its usual First Amendment and RFRA arguments with the major questions doctrine.[159] Ostensibly a religious organization, the ADF emphasized its opposition to "government overreach" and the mandate's effects on small businesses, often eschewing any mention of its religious concerns.[160]

This religious anti-administrativism is ultimately the culmination of a half-century of political developments. As free market ideologues like Paul Weyrich founded organizations like the Heritage Foundation with money from manufacturing industry leaders, the nascent Religious Right of the 1970s too sought to harness religious liberty's deregulatory potential.[161] The televangelist Jerry Falwell was in many ways Weyrich's creation. As the Moral Majority took off, Falwell used his fame to support far-right Republican Party candidates while spouting the message that regulatory bodies such as OSHA were enemies of a free Christian people.[162] While this project has had its share of setbacks along the way, this corporate-religious alliance has become steadily entrenched in the Republican Party.[163]

Conclusion: Culture War and Public Control

The combined insights from our political economic and legal analyses reveal how attacks on sexual and gender minority rights today are driven by a corporate money-fueled movement masquerading as a religious liberty one. This politics of "church against state" is not driven by the organic protest of Christian traditionalists, though they are useful agents for this agenda. Instead, it has been funded and directed by industrialists whose core ambition is not only to limit government healthcare regulations and services, but also to end social welfare and regulation as we have come to know them.

Fragmented citizenship for those caught in the crosshairs extends from the fragmented nature of many U.S. social welfare and regulatory institutions. As our political developmental approach shows, government itself has been repeatedly undermined *through* its delegated nature. Industrialists have leveraged the incentives of private-sector providers and contractors to expand their own autonomy through further privatization and deregulation; in the process, they have both shrunk state capacity to offer services in total while also reducing the scope of who is included in the *demos* that are served. The ultimate aim is to hollow out the state entirely. To accomplish this, the corporate-religious coalition has resuscitated New Deal era oppositions to the federal bureaucracy, both by using existing strictures in administrative law as well as by reciting erroneous historical accounts to justify new ones.

The merger of attacks on civil rights, social welfare, and the administrative state bolsters the political-economic power of industry leaders. In the name of liberty, public control of public institutions shifts from citizens to corporations. A promise to end bureaucracy's alleged arbitrary rule masks a grab for power.

Acknowledgements

This research was funded in part by the American Political Science Association's Diversity and Inclusion Advancing Research Grant for Early Career Scholars. We are especially grateful for comments provided by Jessica A. Clarke, Elizabeth W. Sepper, and Linda White. We also benefited from presenting this work to audiences including the Vanderbilt University Law School's LGBTQ+ Rights Roundtable, the University of Maryland Law School's Discussion Group on Constitutionalism, the University of Pennsylvania's Field Center for Children's Policy, Practice & Research, the Toronto Political Development Workshop, the Princeton University LGBT Lunch & Learn Series, and the 2022 annual gatherings of the Law and Society Association and the American Political Science Association.

References

1. B. Fraga, "Right-Wing Catholic Causes Got Millions from Group that Funded Some Capitol Rioters," *National Catholic Reporter*, January 6, 2022, *available at* <https://www.ncronline.org/news/people/right-wing-catholic-causes-got-millions-group-funded-some-capitol-rioters> (last visited March 11, 2024).
2. *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014); Becket Fund, "*Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*," June 24, 2022, *available at* <https://www.becketlaw.org/case/dobbs-v-jackson-womens-health-organization/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
3. G. Lafer, *The One Percent Solution: How Corporations Are Remaking America One State at a Time* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017); J. Mayer, *Dark Money: The Hidden History of the Billionaires Behind the Rise of the Radical Right* (New York: Anchor, 2017).
4. D. U. Himmelstein and S. Woolhandler, "Privatization in a Publicly Funded Healthcare System: The US Experience," *International Journal of Health Services* 38, no. 3 (2008): 407-419; J. Wuest and B. S. Last, "With Gay Adoption Decision, Will the Supreme Court Erode the Regulatory State?" *Boston Review*, April 15, 2021, *available at* <http://bostonreview.net/law-justice/joanna-wuest-briana-last-fulton-v-philadelphia-supreme-court-gay-adoption> (last visited March 11, 2024).
5. E. Sepper and J. D. Nelson. "Disestablishing Hospitals," *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 49, no. 4 (2021): 542-551.
6. E. Sepper, "Free Exercise Lochnerism," *Columbia Law Review* 115, no.6 (2015): 1452-520.
7. A. L. Campbell and K. J. Morgan, *The Delegated Welfare State: Medicare, Markets, and the Governance of Social Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); J. Hacker, *The Divided Welfare State: The Battle Over Public and Private Social Benefits in the United States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
8. L. D. Brown, "Pedestrian Paths: Why Path-Dependence Theory Leaves Health Policy Analysis Lost in Space," *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 35, no. 4 (2010): 643-61.
9. A. Hertel-Fernandez, *State Capture: How Conservative Activists, Big Businesses, and Wealthy Donors Reshaped the American States — and the Nation* (New York, Oxford University

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

Press, 2019); ALEC Leaders Boast About Anti-Abortion, Anti-Trans Bills," *Exposed by CMD*, October 4, 2021, *available at* <https://www.exposedbycmd.org/2021/10/04/alec-leaders-boast-about-anti-abortion-anti-trans-bills/?eType=EmailBlastContent&eId=cf745228-ac07-4f00-8373-b43277121667> (last visited March 11, 2024).

10. M. Beckel, "Dark Money Illuminated," *Issue One*, September 11, 2018, *available at* <https://issueone.org/articles/dark-money-illuminated-the-top-15-dark-money-groups-in-the-post-citizens-united-era/> (last visited March 11, 2024); D. Moore, "Koch Group Fights Drug Price Reforms After Taking Big Pharma Money," *Brick House*, May 6, 2021, *available at* <https://thebrick.house/koch-group-fights-drug-price-reforms-after-taking-big-pharma-money/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
11. J. Klein, *For All These Rights. Business, Labor, and the Shaping of America's Public-Private Welfare State* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), at 94.
12. See Lafer, *supra* note 3; D. Carpenter and D. A. Moss, eds. *Preventing Regulatory Capture: Special Interest Influence and How To Limit It* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013); N. F. Jacobs, D. King, and S. M. Milkis "Building a Conservative State: Partisan Polarization and the Redeployment of Administrative Power," *Perspectives on Politics* 17, no.2 (2019): 453-69.
13. G. H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America Since 1945* (New York: Basic Books, 1976); D. Schlozman, *When Movements Anchor Parties: Electoral Alignments in American History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015); J. S. Hacker and P. Pierson, *Let Them Eat Tweets: How the Right Rules in an Age of Extreme Inequality* (New York: W. W. & Norton Company, 2020).
14. K. Kruse, *One Nation Under God: How Corporate America Invented Christian America* (New York: Basic Books, 2015).
15. Center for Media and Democracy, "Contributions of the Bradley Foundation,"; Center for Media and Democracy, "Becket," (n.d.), *available at* <https://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Becket#Ties_to_the_Bradley_Foundation> (last visited March 11, 2024); Center for Media and Democracy, "Alliance Defending Freedom," (n.d.), *available at* <https://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Alliance_Defending_Freedom> (last visited March 11, 2024); K. Stewart, *The Power Worshippers: Inside The Dangerous Rise Of Religious Nationalism* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2020), at 266.
16. A. Southworth, *Lawyers of the Right: Professionalizing the Conservative Coalition* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2008); S. Teles, *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for Control of the Law* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008); A. Hollis-Brusky, *Ideas with Consequences: The Federalist Society and the Conservative Counterrevolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).
17. R. Hirschl, *Towards Juristocracy: The Origins and Consequences of the New Constitutionalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007); K. Whittington, *Political Foundations of Judicial Supremacy: The Presidency, the Supreme Court, and Constitutional Leadership in U.S. History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007); G. Silverstein, *Law's Allure: How Law Shapes, Constrains, Saves, and Kills Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
18. C. R. Epp, *The Rights Revolution: Lawyers, Activists, and Supreme Courts in Comparative Perspective* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998); J. Decker, *The Other Rights Revolution: Conservative Lawyers and the Remaking of American Government* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).
19. W. Batchis, *The Right's First Amendment: The Politics of Free Speech & the Return of Conservative Libertarianism* (Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press, 2016); A. R. Lewis, *The Rights Turn in Conservative Christian Politics: How Abortion Transformed the Culture Wars* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017); D. Bennett, *Defending Faith: The Politics of the Christian Conservative Legal Movement* (Lawrence, KA: University Press of Kansas, 2017).
20. J. Hacker, *The Great Risk Shift: The New Economic Insecurity and the Decline of the American Dream* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); J. S. Hacker and P. Pierson, *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer — and Turned Its Back on the Middle Class* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2010); J. Stein, *Pivotal Decade*: *How the United States Traded Factories for Finance in the Seventies* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011); M. Busemeyer and K. Thelen, "Institutional Sources of Business Power," *World Politics*, 72, no.3 (2020): 448-80; D. Béland, A. L. Campbell, R. K. Weaver, *Policy Feedback: How Policies Shape Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2022).
21. G. E. Metzger, "Foreword: 1930s Redux: The Administrative State Under Siege," *Harvard Law Review* 2131, no.1 (2017): 1-95; See also: K. Orren and S. Skowronek, *The Policy State: An American Predicament* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017); C. Isabel Ceballos, D. Freeman Engstrom, and D. E. Ho, "Disparate Limbo: How Administrative Law Erased Antidiscrimination," *Yale Law Journal* 131, no.2 (2021): 370-474.
22. See Campbell and Morgan, *supra* note 7.
23. See Klein, *supra* note 11, at 94.
24. *Bradfield v. Roberts*, 75 U.S. 291 (1899).
25. J. Quadagno, *One Nation Uninsured: Why the US has No National Health Insurance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).
26. M. Chowkwanyun, "The Strange Disappearance of History from Racial Health Disparities Research," *Du Bois Review*, 8, no.1 (2011): 253–70.
27. See Quadagno 72-4, *supra* note 25; J. E. Zelizer "The Contentious Origins of Medicare and Medicaid," in *Medicare and Medicaid at 50: America's Entitlement Programs in the Age of Affordable Care,* eds. A. B. Cohen, D. C. Colby, K. A. Wailoo, and J. E. Zelizer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015): 3-20.
28. D. Barton Smith, *The Power to Heal: Civil Rights, Medicare, and the Struggle to Transform America's Healthcare System* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2016).
29. R. Fein, "The Early Days of Medicare and Medicaid: A Personal Reflection," in *Medicare and Medicaid at 50: America's Entitlement Programs in the Age of Affordable Care,* eds. A. B. Cohen, D. C. Colby, K. A. Wailoo, and J. E. Zelizer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015): 39-54; J. Oberlander and T. R. Marmor, "The Road Not Taken: What Happened to Medicare for All?," in *Medicare and Medicaid at 50: America's Entitlement Programs in the Age of Affordable Care,* eds A. B. Cohen, D. C. Colby, K. A. Wailoo, and J. E. Zelizer (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015): 55-74.
30. J. Oberlander, "Through the Looking Glass: The Politics of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act," *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 32, no. 2 (2007): 187-219; See Himmelstein and Woolhandler, *supra* note 4.
31. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104–193—AUG. 22, 1996 110 STAT. 2105, Section 104; M. L. McCormick, "Religious Privilege to Discriminate as Religious Freedom: From Charitable Choice to Faith Based Initiatives to RFRA and FADA," *Washburn Law Journal* 56 (2007): 229-43.
32. J. Richardson, "Charitable Choice: Expansion by Executive Action," *Congressional Research Service*, January 12, 2005.
33. L. Geismer, *Left Behind: The Democrats' Failed Attempt to Solve Inequality* (New York: Public Affairs, 2022), 253-4.
34. V. Burke, "Comparison of Proposed Charitable Choice Act of 2001 with Current Charitable Choice Law," *Congressional Research Service*, June 22, 2001, *available at* <https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metacrs2068/m1/1/high_res_d/RL31030_2001Jun22.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); Executive Order 13279, "Equal Protection of the Laws for Faith-Based and Community Organizations," December 12,

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

2002; S. W. Carlson-Thies, S. W., "Faith-Based Initiative 2.0: The Bush Faith-Based and Community Initiative," *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 32, no.3 (2009): 931-48.

35. American Civil Liberties Union, "Connecting the Dots," February 2021, *available at* <https://www.aclu.org/fact-sheet/connecting-dots> (last visited March 11, 2024); R. S. Maril, "The Religious Freedom Restoration Act, Trinity Lutheran, and Trumpism: Codifying Fiction with Administrative Gaslighting," *Northwestern Journal of Law & Social Policy* 16, no.1 (2020), *available at* <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1212&context=njlsp> (last visited March 11, 2024).
36. S. Carlson-Thies, "The Biden Partnerships Plan Is Faith-Based Initiative 5.0," *HistPhil*, March 9, 2021, *available at* <https://histphil.org/2021/03/09/the-biden-partnerships-plan-is-faith-based-initiative-5-0/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
37. D. Beland, P. Rocco, and A. Waddan, *Obamacare Wars: Federalism, State Politics, and the Affordable Care Act* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2016); P. Herd and D. P. Moynihan, *Administrative Burden: Policymaking by Other Means* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2019), 95-120; M. K. Gusmano and F. J. Thompson, "The Administrative Presidency, Waivers, and the Affordable Care Act," *Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law* 45, no.4 (2020): 633–46.
38. L. Uttley and C. Khaikin, "Growth of Catholic Hospitals and Health Systems," 2016, *availbale at* <http://static1.1.sqspcdn.com/static/f/816571/27061007/1465224862580/M> (last visited March 11, 2024); D. Leemore, "Hospital Industry Consolidation—Still More to Come?", 2014, *available at* <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24328443/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
39. E. Sepper, "Zombie Religious Institutions," *Northwestern University Law Review* 112, no. 5 (2018): 929-88.
40. S. Russell-Kraft, "The Rise of 'Zombie Hospitals," *New Republic*, November 16, 2016, *available at* <https://newrepublic.com/article/138065/rise-zombie-religious-hospitals> (last visited March 11, 2024); American Civil Liberties Union, "Healthcare Denied," March 2016, *available at* <https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/field_document/healthcaredenied.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
41. M. Santos, "Democrats Seek to Stop Hospital Mergers that Limit Abortion Access," *Axios*, June 22, 2022, *available at* <https://www.axios.com/local/seattle/2022/06/22/democrats-stop-hospital-mergers-limit-abortions> (last visited March 11, 2024); See Sepper and Nelson, *supra* note 5.
42. K. Hasson, "Contributor," *HuffPost*, (n.d.), *available at* <https://www.huffpost.com/author/kevin-hasson> (last visited March 11, 2024).
43. *Holt v. Hobbs*, 574 U.S. 352 (2015); *Darrell Patterson v. Walgreen Co.*, No. 16-16923 (11th Cir. 2018); *Mitchie A. Dalberiste v. GLE Associates, Inc.*, No. 20-11101 (11th Cir. 2020).
44. *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*, 565 U.S. 171 (2012); *Our Lady of Guadalupe School v. Morrissey-Berru*, 591 U.S. (2020); Alliance Defending Freedom, "*Seattle's Union Gospel Mission v. Woods*," September 3, 2021, *available at* <https://adfmedia.org/case/seattles-union-gospel-mission-v-woods> (last visited March 11, 2024).
45. *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 593 U.S. ___ (2021).
46. *Advocate Health Care Network v. Stapleton*, 137 S. Ct. 1652 (2017); See briefs at *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/advocate-health-care-network-v-stapleton/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
47. Becket Fund, "*Harvest Family Church v. Federal Emergency Management Agency*," 2018, *available at* <https://www.becketlaw.org/case/harvest-family-church-v-federal-emergency-management-agency/> (last visited December 10, 2022); In this case, Becket sought to build on its support for the Supreme Court's decision in *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer*, 582 U.S. ___ (2017).
48. State Policy Network, "Week in Review," July 9, 2021, *available at* <https://spn.org/blog/week-in-review-july-9-2021/> (last visited March 11, 2024); See Hertel-Fernandez 4, *supra* note 9.
49. State Policy Network, "Accountant," 2021, *available at* <https://spn.org/job_posting/accountant/> (last visited March 11, 2024): P. Hamburger, *Is Administrative Law Unlawful?* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2014); D. Armiak, "Koch Spent Nearly $150 Million in 2020 to Extend His Influence and Promote His Agenda," November 29, 2021, *available at* <https://www.exposedbycmd.org/2021/11/29/koch-spent-nearly-150-million-2020/> (last visited March 11, 2024).; New Civil Liberties Alliance, "Philip Hamburger," 2022, *available at* <https://nclalegal.org/philip-hamburger/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
50. I. Hogue, "Becket Fund: Shadow Agents of the Religious Right," *Conscience*, 1 (2021); Center for Media and Democracy, "Becket,"; L. Fang, "Sphere Of Influence: How American Libertarians Are Remaking Latin American Politics," *The Intercept*, August 9, 2017, *available at* <https://theintercept.com/2017/08/09/atlas-network-alejandro-chafuen-libertarian-think-tank-latin-america-brazil/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
51. See Lafer, *supra* note 3; V. Novak, "Exclusive: Center to Protect Patient Rights Gave Millions in 2011 to Outside Spenders in Election," *Open Secrets* December 17, 2012, *available at* <https://www.opensecrets.org/news/2012/12/center-to-protect-patient-rights-ga/> (last visited March 11, 2024); B. Schwartz, "Koch Network Pushes Private-Sector Health-Care Agenda to Counter Biden's Public Option," *CNBC*, March 9, 2021, *available at* <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/09/koch-network-tries-to-counter-biden-public-option-obamacare.htm> (last visited March 11, 2024); J. W. Peters, "Patience Gone, Koch-Backed Groups Will Pressure G.O.P. on Health Repeal," *New York Times*, March 5, 2017, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/05/us/politics/koch-brothers-affordable-care-act.html> (last visited March 11, 2024).
52. See Sepper, *supra* note 6.
53. *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, (2014); *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 591 U.S. ___ (2020).
54. See *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby*, *supra* note 53.
55. See Sepper, *supra* note 6; J. Wuest, "State, Economy, and LGBTQ+ Rights," *Law and Political Economy Project Blog*, February 2, 2022, *available at* <https://lpeproject.org/blog/state-economy-lgbtq-civil-rights/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
56. *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 597 U.S. ___ (2022); *National Federation of Independent Business v. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration*, 595 U.S. ___ (2022).
57. See Metzger, *supra* note 21.
58. G. Shepherd, "Fierce Compromise: The Administrative Procedure Act Emerges from New Deal Politics," *Northwestern University Law Review* 90 (1996): 1557; See Orren and Skowronek at 107-8, 115, *supra* note 21.
59. The Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. §§ 551–559., Section 706.
60. G. Elinson and J. Gould, "The Politics of Deference," *Vanderbilt Law Review* 75 (2022).
61. Complaint, *Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc. v. Burwell*, (W.D.O.K. 2012) (No. 12-1000-HE), 2.
62. *I d.*, 36.
63. M. Agnes Carey, "Hobby Lobby Ruling Cuts Into Contraceptive Mandate," *NPR*, June 30, 2014, *available at* <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2014/06/30/327065968/hobby-lobby-ruling-cuts-into-contraceptive-mandate> (last visited March 11, 2024); M. Ziegler, "The Jurisprudence of Uncertainty: Knowledge, Science, and Abortion," *Wisconsin Law Review* no.3 (2018): 317-67; A. Ahmed, "The Future of Facts: The Politics of Public Health and Medicine in Abortion Law," *University of Colorado Law Review* 92, no.4 (2021); J. Wuest, *Born This Way: Science, Citizenship, and Inequality in*

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

the American LGBTQ+ Movement (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2023).
64. *Supra* note 61.
65. People for the American Way, "Buying A Movement: Right-Wing Foundations and American Politics," 1996, *available at* <https://files.pfaw.org/pfaw_files/buyingamovement.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); T. R. Day, L. M. Diaz, and D. Weatherby, "A Primer on *Hobby Lobby*: For-Profit Corporate Entities' Challenge to the HHS Mandate, Free Exercise Rights, RFRA's Scope, and the Nondelegation Doctrine," *Pepperdine Law Review* 42 (2014): 55-108, at 88; *J. W. Hampton, Jr. & Co. v. United States*, 276 U.S. 394 (1928).
66. J. Davis Mortenson and N. Bagley, "Delegation at the Founding," *Columbia Law Review* 121, no.2 (2021): 277-368; K. E. Whittington and J. Iuliano, "The Myth of the Nondelegation Doctrine," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 165 (2017): 379-431.
67. See Metzger 52-7, *supra* note 21; *A.L.A. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States*, 295 U.S. 495 (1935); For subsequent cases that rejected nondelegation, see: *Nat'l Broad. Co. v. United States*, 319 U.S. 190 (1943); *Yakus v. United States*, 321 U.S. 414 (1944); *Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass'n*, 531 U.S. 457 (2001).
68. Brief for *Amicus Curiae* Becket Fund for Religious Liberty in Support of Petitioners, *Gundy v. United States*, No.17-6086 (June 1, 2018), *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/17/17-6086/49253/20180605122713334_17-6086tsacBecketFundForReligiousLiberty.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024) at 17.
69. *Zubik v. Burwell*, 578 U.S. ___ (2016).
70. Writ of Certiorari, *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home v. Burwell*, No. 13-1540, 10th Circ., July 2015, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2015-07-23-LSP-RSI-Petition_Final.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); T. Reese, "Can Joe Biden Solve the Little Sisters of the Poor Dilemma?," *Religion News Service*, February 8, 2021 *available at* <https://religionnews.com/2021/02/08/the-little-sisters-of-the-poor-and-the-biden-administration/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
71. Brief *Amicus Curiae* Of Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund, Inc., In Support Of Petitioners, *Zubik v. Burwell*, Nos. 14-1418, 14-1453, 14-1505, 15-35, 15-105, 15-119, 15-191, January 11, 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/EFELDF-ACA-Mandate-Br.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024), at 29-31,
72. Brief For The Cato Institute And Independent Women's Forum As *Amici Curiae* Supporting Petitioners, *Zubik v. Burwell*, Nos. 14-1418, 14-1453, 14-1505, 15-35, 15-105, 15-119, 15-191, January 11, 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Cato-Institute-LSP-Amicus-Brief1.pdf> (last visited December 10, 2022), at 27, 29; Note, "Major Questions Objections," *Harvard Law Review* 129 (2016): 2191-222.
73. *Supra* Brief for The Cato Institute And Independent Women's Forum As *Amici Curiae* Supporting Petitioners, *Zubik v. Burwell*, at 29-30.
74. L. A. Steven, "Non-Delegation, Major Questions, and the OSHA Vaccine Mandate," *Notice and Comment*, November 8, 2021, *available at* <https://www.yalejreg.com/nc/non-delegation-major-questions-and-the-osha-vaccine-mandate-by-lee-a-steven/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
75. *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120 (2000).
76. *King v. Burwell*, 576 U.S. 473 (2015); *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120 (2000).
77. Brief for *Amicus Curiae* Becket Fund for Religious Liberty in Support of Petitioners, *Gundy v. United States*, 14-5.
78. S. Gordon, "How Trump's Birth Control Rules Run Afoul of The APA," *Law360*, February 12, 2019; The administration actually did adhere to the procedure but only *after* modifying the regulation.
79. *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 591 U.S. ___ (2020).
80. Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari, *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania*, No. 19-431, October 2019, *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-431/117670/20191001155725864_PetitionForAWritOfCertiorari.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024) at 24-6.
81. Brief For The Cato Institute And Jewish Coalition For Religious Liberty As *Amici Curiae* Supporting Petitioners, *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania* and *Trump v. Pennsylvania*, Nos. 19-431 and 19-454, November 1, 2019, *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-431/121086/20191101144139780_Little%20Sisters%20Cert%20Brief.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024) at 10; Jewish Coalition for Religious Liberty, "About Us," 2022, *available at* <https://www.jcrl.org/about-us> (last visited March 11, 2024).
82. See 20, *supra* note 79; *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania* (Alito and Gorsuch *concurring*).
83. *American Hospital Association v. Becerra*, 596 U.S. __ (2022).
84. See Elinson and Gould, *supra* note 60.
85. *Id.*
86. *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984); *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452 (1997).
87. T. Stoltzfus Jost and K. Keith, "The ACA And The Courts: Litigation's Effects On The Law's Implementation And Beyond," *Health Affairs* 39 no. 3 (2020): 479–86.
88. Complaint, *Franciscan Alliance, and Texas et al. v. Burwell*, (No. 7:16-cv-00108-O), (N.D.T.X. 2016), *available at* <https://www.aclu.org/legal-document/franciscan-alliance-v-burwell-first-amended-complaint> (last visited March 11, 2024).
89. *Whitman-Walker Clinic v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*, Case 1:20-cv-01630, *available at* <https://www.lambdalegal.org/sites/default/files/legal-docs/downloads/whitman_us_20200622_complaint.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024) at 69.
90. *G. G. v. Gloucester County School Board*, No. 15-2056 (4th Cir. 2016); U.S. Departments of Justice and Education, "Dear Colleague Letter," February 22, 2017, *available at* <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201702-title-ix.pdf/> (last visited March 11, 2024); M. George, "Bureaucratic Agency: Administering the Transformation of LGBT Rights," *Yale Law & Policy Review* 36 (2017): 83-154.
91. J. A. Ferg-Cadima, "Letter to Emily T. Prince, Esq.," U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights, January 7, 2015, *available at* <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/20150107-title-ix-prince-letter.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, "Dear Colleague Letter on Transgender Students," 2016, *available at* <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201605-title-ix-transgender.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
92. See *Auer v. Robbins*, *supra* note 86.
93. E. Whalen, "Title IX in the Restroom: Transgender Activism Has Produced a Legal Absurdity," *National Review*, May 23, 2016.
94. Reply In Support Of Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, September 26, 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/16-273-pet-cert-reply.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
95. M. S. Schmidt, "Behind the Texas Abortion Law, a Persevering Conservative Lawyer," *New York Times*, September 12, 2021, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/12/us/politics/texas-abortion-lawyer-jonathan-mitchell.html> (last visited March 11, 2024); Center for Media and Democracy, "New Civil Liberties Alliance," (n.d.), available at < https://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/New_Civil_Liberties_Alliance> (last visited March 11, 2024).
96. *Kitchen v. Herbert*, 755 F.3d 1193 (10th Cir. 2014).

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

97. *Id.*, 7.
98. Brief For The Cato Institute And Professors Jonathan H. Adler, Richard A. Epstein, And Michael W. McConnell As *Amici Curiae* In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, September 27, 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/16-273-cert-amicus-cato.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
99. *Id.*, 4.
100. Brief *Amicus Curiae* Of Pacific Legal Foundation, Arlen Foster, And Cindy Foster, In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, January 2017 *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/16-273-amicus-petitioner-pacificlegalfoundation.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024), at 7.
101. Brief Of *Amicus Curiae* Wisconsin Institute For Law & Liberty In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, September 27, 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/16-273-cert-amicus-WILL-.pdf>(last visited March 11, 2024); *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012).
102. See Lafer, *supra* note 3; Center for Media and Democracy, "Wisconsin Institute for Law & Liberty," (n.d.), *available at* <https://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Wisconsin_Institute_for_Law_%26_Liberty> (last visited March 11, 2024).
103. M. Loyola, "EPA's Unprecedented Power Grab," *National Affairs*, 2015, *available at* <https://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/epas-unprecedented-power-grab> (last visited March 11, 2024).
104. Brief *Amici Curiae* of The General Conference Of The Seventh-Day Adventists And The Becket Fund For Religious Liberty In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, January 2017, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/16-273-amicus-petitioner-generalcounselforseventhdayadventistsandthebecketfund.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
105. M. Walsh, "Restroom Guidance a Thorny Study in Administrative Law," *Education Week*, June 7, 2016, *available at* <https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/restroom-guidance-a-thorny-study-in-administrative-law/2016/06> (last visited March 11, 2024); Alliance Defending Freedom, "Court Stops Federal Overreach, Says Schools Can Protect Student Privacy In Locker Rooms, October 18, 2017, *available at* <https://adflegal.org/press-release/court-stops-federal-overreach-says-schools-can-protect-student-privacy-locker-rooms> (last visited March 11, 2024).
106. Brief Of Liberty, Life, And Law Foundation, Wethepeopleinorder.Com, And The National Legal Foundation As *Amici*, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, September 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/16-273-cert-amicus-LLL.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); Brief *Amicus Curiae* Of Eagle Forum Education & Legal Defense Fund In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, September 23, 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/16-273-cert-amicus-EFELDF.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); Brief Of North Carolina Values Coalition And The Family Research Council As *Amici Curiae* In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, January 2017, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/16-273-amicus-petitioner-north_carolina_values_coalition_et_al.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
107. Brief Of *Amici Curiae* National Organization For Marriage And Center For Constitutional Jurisprudence In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, September 2016, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/16-273-cert-amicus-NOMCCJ.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024), at 7.
108. L. Goodstein, "Christian Leaders Unite on Political Issues," *New York Times*, November 20, 2009, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/20/us/politics/20alliance.html> (last visited March 11, 2024).
109. Brief Of *Amicus Curiae* Center For Constitutional Jurisprudence In Support Of Petitioner, *Seila Law Llc V. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, No.9-7, January 2019, *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-7/125488/20191213145447944_19-7%20TSAC%20CCJ.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
110. M. S. Schmidt and M. Haberman, "The Lawyer Behind the Memo on How Trump Could Stay in Office," *New York Times*, October 2, 2021, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/02/us/politics/john-eastman-trump-memo.html> (last visited March 11, 2024).
111. *Kisor v. Wilkie*, No. 18-15, 588 U.S. ___ (2019); *American Hospital Association v. Becerra*; *Empire Health Foundation v. Becerra*, 597 U.S. ___ (2022).
112. Brief *Amicus Curiae* of the Little Sisters Of The Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home in Support of Petitioners, *Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, No. 22-451, July 2023, *available at* < https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-451/272801/20230724183944307_Loper%20Bright%20Enterprises%20v.%20Raimondo%20Amicus%20Brief%20FINAL.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
Brief *Amici Curiae* Of The General Conference Of The Seventh-Day Adventists And The Becket Fund For Religious Liberty In Support Of Petitioner, *Gloucester County School Board v. G.G.*, No. 16-273, January 2017, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/16-273-amicus-petitioner-generalcounselforseventhdayadventistsandthebecketfund.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
113. J. F. Mitchell, Brief In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion For Summary Judgment, *Kelley et al. v. Becerra et al.*, (No. 4:20-cv-00283-O) (N.D.T.X. 2021).
114. T. Sneed, "Judge Notorious for Anti-Obamacare Rulings Has Another Crack," *CNN*, January 2, 2022, *available at* <https://www.cnn.com/2022/01/28/politics/obamacare-reed-oconnor-biden-doj-health/index.html> (last visited March 11, 2024); L.O. Gostin, E. A. Friedman, and A. Finch, "Will Our Judiciary Elevate Religious Freedoms Above Public Health?" *Med Page Today*, September 12, 2022, *available at* <https://www.medpagetoday.com/opinion/the-health-docket/100664> (last visited March 11, 2024).
115. J. F. Mitchell, Brief In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion For Summary Judgment, *Kelley v. Becerra*, 32.
116. *Id.*, 31.
117. Defendants' Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss First Amended Complaint Pursuant To Rules 12(B)(1) And 12(B)(6), *Kelley et al. v. Becerra et al.*, (No. 4:20-cv-00283-O) (N.D.T.X. 2020), 11.
118. *Id.*
119. *Id.*, 24-5.
120. *Lucia v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 585 U.S. ___ (2018); Brief Of The Chamber Of Commerce Of The United States Of America As *Amicus Curiae* Supporting Petitioners, *Lucia v. SEC*, No.17-130, February 2018, *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/17/17-130/37077/20180228161300894_Lucia%20Brief.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); Brief For The Cato Institute As *Amicus Curiae* In Support Of Petitioners, *Lucia v. SEC*, No.17-130, February 21, 2018, *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/17/17-130/36094/20180221135133720_Lucia%20merits.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); *Braidwood Management v. Becerra*, (No. 4:20-cv-00283-O) (N.D.T.X. 2022), *available at* <https://affordablecareactlitigation.files.wordpress.com/2022/09/gov.uscourts.txnd_.330381.92.0_1.pdf> (last visited December 12, 2022); *Braidwood Management v. Becerra*, (No. 4:20-cv-00283-O) (N.D.T.X. 2023), *available at* https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.txnd.330381/gov.uscourts.txnd.330381.113.0_4.pdf (last visited March 11, 2024).

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

121. J. F. Mitchell, Brief In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion For Summary Judgment, *Kelley et al. v. Becerra et al.*, (No. 4:20-cv-00283-O) (N.D.T.X. 2021).
122. J. F. Mitchell, Brief In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion For Summary Judgment, *Kelley v. Becerra*, 12-4.
123. J. Mascott, "Who are "Officers of the United States'?", *Stanford Law Review* 70 (2018), 443.
124. Defendants' Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss First Amended Complaint Pursuant To Rules 12(B)(1) And 12(B)(6), *Kelley v. Becerra*, 8-9; *Riley v. St. Luke's Episcopal Hosp.*, 252 F.3d 749 (5th Cir. 2001).
125. Brief *Amicus Curiae* Of Pacific Legal Foundation In Support Of Petitioners, *Lucia v. SEC*, No.17-130, February 27, 2018, *available at* <https://pacificlegal.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/2018.02.27-PLF-Amicus-Lucia-Merits.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024), at 15.
126. Executive Order 13957: Creating Schedule F in the Excepted Service, E.O. 13957 of October 21, 2020; E. Wagner, "Stunning' Executive Order Would Politicize Civil Service," *Government Executive*, October 22, 2020, *available at* <https://www.govexec.com/management/2020/10/stunning-executive-order-would-politicize-civil-service/169479/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
127. P. Wegmann, "Conservatives Already Preparing for Post-Biden Presidential Transition," *Real Clear Politics*, June 24, 2022, *available at* <https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2022/06/24/republicans_already_preparing_for_post-biden_presidential_transition__147797.html> (last visited March 11, 2024).
128. D. P. Carpenter, *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001).
129. *Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 140 S. Ct. 2183, 2197 (2020); Notably, this case validated Justice Kavanaugh's opinion in *PHH Corp. v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 839 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2016) and his dissent in the *en banc PHH Corp. v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, 881 F.3d 75 (D.C. Cir. 2018).
130. See *Seila Law* 1, *supra* note 129.
131. *Seila Law v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, (Kagan, E., dissenting), 4.
132. N. Confessore, "Mick Mulvaney's Master Class in Destroying a Bureaucracy from Within," *New York Times,* April 16, 2019, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/16/magazine/consumer-financial-protection-bureau-trump.html> (last visited March 11, 2024); G. Thrush, "Mulvaney, Watchdog Bureau's Leader, Advises Bankers on Ways to Curtail Agency," *New York Times*, April 24, 2018, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/24/us/mulvaney-consumer-financial-protection-bureau.html> (last visited March 11, 2024); A. Rappeport, "Payday Rules Relax on Trump's Watch After Lobbying by Lenders," *New York Times*, February 2, 2018, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/02/us/politics/payday-lenders-lobbying-regulations.html> (last visited March 11, 2024).
133. *Collins v. Yellen*, 594 U.S. ___ (2020).
134. *George R. Jarkesy and Patriot28, LLC v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, No. 3-15255, (5th Circ. 2022).
135. J. F. Mitchell, Brief In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion For Summary Judgment, *Kelley v. Becerra*, 27-30.
136. Defendants' Reply In Support Of Motion To Dismiss First Amended Complaint Pursuant To Rules 12(B)(1) And 12(B)(6), *Kelley v. Becerra*, 10.
137. Series on *Seila Law* and the Roberts Court, *The University of Chicago Law Review Online*, August 27, 2020, *available at* <https://lawreviewblog.uchicago.edu/2020/08/27/seila-series/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
138. *Tandon v. Newsom*, 141 S. Ct. 1294 (2021).
139. E. Rassbach, "Motion for Leave to File Brief Amicus Curiae in Support of Applicants by the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty," *Tandon v. Newsom*, No. 20A151 (April 2021), *available at* <http://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20A151/175204/20210407175033782_Tandon%20v%20Newsom%20Amicus%20Brief%20by%20The%20Becket%20Fund.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
140. R, J. Walsh, "Reply in Support for Emergency Application for Writ of Injunction or in the Alternative Certiorari Before Judgment or Summary Reversal," *Tandon v. Newsom*, No. 20A151 (2020), *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/20/20A151/175331/20210409133101098_Reply%20ISO%20Emergency%20Application.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); R. J. Walsh, "About," *The Federalist Society*, n.d., *available at* <https://fedsoc.org/contributors/ryan-walsh> (last visited March 11, 2024).
141. G. Yamey, "Covid-19 and the New Merchants of Doubt," *British Journal of Medicine Opinion*, September 13, 2021, *available at* <https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/09/13/covid-19-and-the-new-merchants-of-doubt/> (last visited March 11, 2024); Walker Bragman and Alex Kotch, "How The Koch Network Hijacked The War On COVID," *The Daily Poster*, December 22, 2021, *available at* <https://www.dailyposter.com/how-the-koch-network-hijacked-the-war-on-covid/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
142. J. M. Oleske, Jr., "Free Exercise (Dis)Honesty," *Wisconsin Law Review* 689 (2019); E. Sepper, "The Role of Religion in State Public Accommodations Laws," *Saint Louis University Law Journal* 60 (2016): 631-71; D. Laycock, "The Broader Implications of Masterpiece Cakeshop," *Brigham Young University Law Review* 1 (2019): 167-204; L. Greenhouse, "What the Supreme Court Did for Religion," *New York Times*, July 1, 2021, *available at* <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/01/opinion/supreme-court-religion.html?action=click&module=Opinion&pgtype=Homepage> (last visited March 11, 2024).
143. *Supra* note 138.
144. D. Rubinstein Reiss, "Thou Shalt Not Take the Name of the Lord Thy God in Vain: Use and Abuse of Religious Exemptions from School Immunization Requirements," *Hastings Law Journal* 65 (2014): 1551-1602.
145 Z. Rothschild, "Individualized Exemptions, Vaccine Mandates, and the New Free Exercise Clause," *Yale Law Journal Forum*, 131 (2022): 1106-40; W. E. Parmet, "From the Shadows: The Public Health Implications of the Supreme Court's COVID-Free Exercise Cases," *Journal of Law and Medical Ethics* 49, no.4 (2021): 564-79; See also: D. Lithwick and M. J. Stern "Gorsuch's Crusade Against Vaccine Mandates Could Topple a Pillar of Public Health," *Slate*, December 15, 2021, *available at* <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2021/12/vaccine-mandates-supreme-court-religious-liberty-pandemic.html> (last visited March 11, 2024); *John Does et al. v. Janet T. Mills, Governor Of Maine, et al.*, No. 21A90, 595 U. S. __ (2021) (Gorsuch, dissenting); *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/21a90_6j37.pdf> (last visited December 10, 2022); *Dr. A et al. v. Kathy Hochul, Governor Of New York et al.*, N.o. 21A145, 595 U. S. _____ (2021) (Gorsuch *dissenting*), *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/21a145_gfbi.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
146. See Rothschild 1110, *supra* note 145.
147. *Supra* note 45.
148. M. Katz, *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse* (New York: Basic Books, 1986), 216; M. Rosenthal, "Public or Private Children's Services? Privatization in Retrospect," *Social Services Review* 74, no.2 (2002): 281-305; E. Clemson, "Lineages of the Rube Goldberg State: Building and Blurring Public Programs, 1900-1940," in *Rethinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State*, eds. I. Shapiro, S. Skowronek, and D. Galvin (New York: New York University Press, 2006): 380-443; B. McBeath, Crystal Collins-Camargo, and Emmeline Chuang, "The Role of the Private Sector in Child Welfare: Historical Reflections and a Contemporary Snapshot Based on the National Survey of Private Child and Family Serving Agencies," *Journal of Public*

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.

Child Welfare, 6, no.4, (2012): 459-481; B. McGowan, "Historical Evolution of Child Welfare Services," in *Child Welfare for the 21st Century*, eds. G. P. Mallon and P. McCartt Hess (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 14; K. Tani, *States of Dependency: Welfare, Rights, and American Governance, 1935–1972* (New York: Cambridge University, Press, 2016), 33.

149. See Oleske, Jr., *supra* note 142.
150. See Rothschild 1122, *supra* note 145.
151. Z. Rothschild, "Free Exercise's Lingering Ambiguity", *California Law Review Online*, 11 (2020): 282-95; N. Tebbe, "The Principle and Politics of Liberty of Conscience," *Harvard Law Review*, 135 (2021): 267-321.
152. *Employment Division, Department of Human Resources of Oregon v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990).
153. M. L. McCormick, "Religious Privilege to Discriminate as Religious Freedom: From Charitable Choice to Faith Based Initiatives to RFRA and FADA," *Washburn Law Journal*, 56 (2017): 229-43; L. Soronen, "Symposium: Defending *Smith* by Ignoring Soundbites and Considering the Mundane," *SCOTUSblog*, November 2, 2020, *available at* <https://www.scotusblog.com/2020/11/symposium-defending-smith-by-ignoring-soundbites-and-considering-the-mundane/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
154. Brief of Local Governments, Mayors, and U.S. Conference of Mayors as *Amici Curiae* in Support of Respondents, *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, No. 19-123, August 2020, *available at* <https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-123/150839/20200820162722184_19-123bsacLocalGovernments%20--%20PDF-A.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024).
155. American Civil Liberties Union, "*Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, November 8, 2021, *available at* <https://www.aclu.org/cases/fulton-v-city-philadelphia> (last visited March 11, 2024).
156. *Hope Center v. Anchorage Equal Rights Commission*, No. 3:21-cv-00155-SLG, December 20, 2021, *available at* <https://adflegal.org/sites/default/files/2021-12/Downtown-Hope-Center-v-Municipality-of-Anchorage-2-2021-12-21-Order.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024), 22.
157. *The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Asbury Theological Seminary, Sioux Falls Catholic Schools d/b/a Bishop O'Gorman Catholic Schools, The King's Academy, Cambridge Christian School, Home School Legal Defense Association, Inc., and Christian Employers Alliance v. Occupational Health & Safety Administration*, No. 21A, *available at* <https://adflegal.org/sites/default/files/2021-12/In-Re-OSHA-2021-12-17-SCOTUS-appeal.pdf> (last visited March 11, 2024); *Supra* note 138.
158. *National Federation of Independent Business v. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration*, 595 U.S. ___ (2022).
159. *The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, v. Occupational Health & Safety Administration*, No. 21A_____.
160. Alliance Defending Freedom, "ADF's Frank Chang Explaining The Federal Ruling on OSHA," February 4, 2022, *available at* <https://m.facebook.com/AllianceDefendingFreedom/videos/adfs-frank-chang-explaining-the-federal-ruling-on-osha/736185960693043/> (last visited March 11, 2024).
161. K. Phillips-Fein, *Invisible Hands: The Businessmen's Crusade Against the New Deal* (New York: Basic Books, 2010), 219.
162. D. K. Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Religious Right* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 170-6.
163. *Id.*; See Schlozman 202-12, *supra* note 13.

The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 52 (2024): 151-168.