

DOJ to Supreme Court: Religious Beliefs Aren't Important

If we wanted your religious beliefs on abortion-pill coverage, we'd give them to you appears to be the latest in an untenable string of arguments from the Obama DOJ over the **HHS mandate**.

On Friday, the DOJ filed its response to the Supreme Court in the **Hobby Lobby** case.

Politico has the latest on the DOJ's arguments:

"In arguments filed late Friday, Justice Department lawyers told the court that an employer's religious beliefs aren't a legitimate reason to deny something as important as preventive care to an employee who is entitled to it under the health law.

" 'The connection is too indirect as a matter of law to impose a substantial burden' on employers' right to practice their religion, the lawyers wrote in their opening argument defending the contraceptive requirement against Hobby Lobby Stores Inc."

The crux of the Obama administration's legal argument seems to boil down to two points:

1) Opposing forced coverage of **abortion pills** isn't a legitimate religious belief; and 2) our pro-abortion agenda is far more important than your silly religious beliefs anyway.

If that sounds like an argument to turn the religious liberty protections of our Constitution on its head, that's because it is. The moment the government can tell us what is and is not an important part of our faith and further that what we consider to be a sin is far too attenuated to actually be real

sin in God's eyes is the moment we have lost our **religious liberty**.

This argument comes days after Obama's DOJ attempted to convince the court that forcing Catholic nuns to pay for abortion pills in no way violated their faith because all they had to do was sign a form and let someone else violate their faith for them.

The absurdity of these arguments is astounding. There is no stronger principle upon which our nation was founded than **religious freedom**. If the government can say my religious beliefs don't count, then what religious liberty can we possibly have?

The **Supreme Court** is set to consider this exact question later this year. At the ACLJ, we are preparing to file a brief on behalf of thousands of concerned Americans and our clients (each of which we have put a stop to the mandate for as their cases continue). Join the fight by signing on to our amicus brief today.

Matthew Clark is associate counsel for government affairs and media advocacy with the ACLJ. A lifelong citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, he lives with his wife and three boys in Northern Virginia. Follow Matthew Clark on Twitter at [@_MatthewClark](#). This article is crossposted on Red State.