

Public Commentary in Support of the Teacher

Comment by D. Cowdrey, Minister of US

March 4, 2026

This case concerns coercion and compelled speech.

Federal law under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires employers to provide reasonable religious accommodations unless doing so creates an undue hardship. In *Groff v. DeJoy*, the Supreme Court made clear that “undue hardship” requires substantial difficulty or cost rather than minor inconvenience.

What penalties and humiliations did this teacher experience as a result of this coercion against his will?

In this situation, another teacher was available to read the book. The curriculum was delivered. Students were not denied instruction. Accommodation was therefore possible.

Instead of honoring that accommodation, the school warned the teacher that he must personally teach similar lessons or face consequences. When a school compels an individual to personally deliver a message that conflicts with his faith, especially when an alternative exists, this raises *serious constitutional concerns.

The First Amendment protects against compelled speech. In *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, the Supreme Court held that the government cannot force individuals to affirm beliefs they do not hold. In *303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*, the Court reaffirmed that the state cannot compel expressive conduct that violates conscience.

This teacher showed no hostility toward anyone’s identity. Public institutions must prioritize rights over philosophy. Many Americans, religious and non religious alike, believe that marriage and family are defined in specific ways. They are entitled to hold that belief without being forced to personally promote views they do not share.

Sexual orientation receives protection from discrimination under federal law, including under *Bostock v. Clayton County*. Religious belief also receives protection. A pluralistic society must protect both rather than elevate one while suppressing the other.

When accommodation is available yet rejected in favor of compelled participation, it resembles coercion.

The issue concerns whether true pluralism allows space for conscience. What occurred was coercion and subjugation, a forcing of a teacher to submit to the beliefs of the school.

The school ultimately declined to accommodate the teacher’s free speech or religious rights and instead prioritized institutional messaging over individual conscience protections. Many

people hold particular views on marriage and family, and in a diverse society, space must remain for principled disagreement.

As an anti trafficking advocate, I support protecting children from exploitation and grooming and ensuring that serious criminal issues remain the focus of public concern, including human trafficking within the spheres of LGBT where revenge pornography and pornography of children has thrived.

Now this teacher faces public scrutiny, shaming, humiliation, political attacks, and potential harassment. This situation could have been mitigated and resolved within the local community rather than publicized, yet events unfolded in a way that further exemplifies coercion and force.

No one should face punishment or coercion to adhere to a philosophy they do not believe in. In this case, he would have been required to teach it to children. Many religious individuals disagree with LGBT philosophy, while still supporting individual rights. Disagreement does not equal discrimination. Free speech also protects scrutiny, as it should. Compelling someone to teach a philosophy that conflicts with their religion and beliefs violates conscience. The Constitution protects individual thought and freedom.

~US www.unionofsaints.world

US doesn't comment often, but we did in this case:

https://www.themonastery.org/blog/christian-teacher-who-refused-to-read-lgbtq-book-to-students-faces-discipline?utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=Email&utm_content=Clash+in+the+Classroom&utm_campaign=March+4th%2C+2026