EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT MAJORITY OPINIONS DEMONSTRATING MANDATE FOR RELIGIOUS NEUTRALITY

(1) *Van Orden v. Perry*, 125 S. Ct. 2854, 2860 (2005) (discussing "'the very neutrality the Establishment Clause requires'"[1])
(2) *McCreary County v. ACLU*, 125 S. Ct. 2722, 2733 (2005) ("The touchstone for our analysis is the principle that the 'First Amendment mandates governmental neutrality between religion and religion, and between religion and nonreligion.'")
(3) *Cutter v. Wilkinson*, 544 U.S. 709, 720 (2005) (courts "must be satisfied that the Act's prescriptions are and will be administered neutrally among different faiths")
(4) *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*, 536 U.S. 639, 652 (2002) ("[W]here a government aid program is neutral with respect to religion … the program is not readily subject to challenge under the Establishment Clause.")
(5) *Good News Club v. Milford Cent. Sch.*, 533 U.S. 98, 114 (2001) ("[W]e have held that "a significant factor in upholding governmental programs in the face of Establishment Clause attack is their neutrality towards religion.")
(6) *Mitchell v. Helms*, 530 U.S. 793, 809 (2000) ("In distinguishing between indoctrination that is attributable to the State and indoctrination that is not, we have consistently turned to the principle of neutrality.")
(7) *Agostini v. Felton*, 521 U.S. 203, 234 (1997) ("We therefore hold that a federally funded program providing supplemental, remedial instruction to disadvantaged children on a neutral basis is not invalid under the Establishment Clause ...")
(8) *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Va.*, 515 U.S. 819, 839 (1995) ("A central lesson of our decisions is that a significant factor in upholding governmental programs in the face of Establishment Clause attack is their neutrality towards religion.);
(9) *Bd. of Educ. v. Grumet*, 512 U.S. 687, 696 (1994) ("'A proper respect for both the Free Exercise and the Establishment Clauses compels the State to pursue a course of 'neutrality' toward religion.'")
(10) *Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills Sch. Dist.*, 509 U.S. 1, 8 (1993) ("[W]e have consistently held that government programs that neutrally provide benefits to a broad class of citizens defined without reference to religion are not readily subject to an Establishment Clause challenge.")

[1] All internal citations are omitted in this listing.

(11) *Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 533 (1993) ("A law lacks facial neutrality if it refers to a religious practice without a secular meaning discernible from the language or context.")
(12) *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.*, 508 U.S. 384, 393 (1993) ("[T]he total ban on using District property for religious purposes could survive First Amendment challenge only if excluding this category of speech was reasonable and viewpoint neutral.")
(13) *Bd. of Educ. of Westside Cmty. Sch. v. Mergens*, 496 U.S. 226, 251 (1990) ("Government act is constitutional if it "evinces neutrality toward, rather than endorsement of, religious speech.")
(14) *Jimmy Swaggart Ministries v. Board of Equalization*, 493 U.S. 378, 384 (1990) (noting "'the constitutional requirement for governmental neutrality.'")
(15) *Texas Monthly, Inc. v. Bullock*, 489 U.S. 1, 13 (1989) (referencing "'the policy of neutrality'")
(16) *Bowen v. Kendrick*, 487 U.S. 589, 609 (1988) (recognizing the requirement that "the challenged statute appears to be neutral on its face.")
(17) *Corporation of Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Amos*, 483 U.S. 327, 335 (1987) ("Lemon's "purpose" requirement aims at preventing the relevant governmental decisionmaker -- in this case, Congress -- from abandoning neutrality and acting with the intent of promoting a particular point of view in religious matters.")
(18) *School Dist. v. Ball*, 473 U.S. 373, 382 (1985) ("The solution to this problem adopted by the Framers and consistently recognized by this Court is jealously to guard the right of every individual to worship according to the dictates of conscience while requiring the government to maintain a course of neutrality among religions, and between religion and nonreligion.")
(19) *Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38, 60 (1985) (recognizing "the established principle that the government must pursue a course of complete neutrality toward religion.")
(20) *Mueller v. Allen*, 463 U.S. 388, 398-99 (1983) ("a program ... that neutrally provides state assistance to a broad spectrum of citizens is not readily subject to challenge under the Establishment Clause.")
(21) *Bob Jones Univ. v. United States*, 461 U.S. 574, 604 (1983) (upholding "policy … founded on a 'neutral, secular basis.'")
(22) *Larson v. Valente*, 456 U.S. 228, 246 (1982) ("This principle of denominational neutrality has been restated on many occasions.")
(23) *Widmar v. Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263, 274 (1981) (denying challenge because "the University's policy is one of neutrality toward religion.")

(24) *Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Employment Sec. Div.*, 450 U.S. 707, 720 (1981) (noting "the governmental obligation of neutrality in the face of religious differences.")
(25) *McDaniel v. Paty*, 435 U.S. 618, 629 (1978) (noting the Establishment Clause's "command of neutrality.")
(26) *Meek v. Pittenger*, 421 U.S. 349, 372 (1975) (requiring "that auxiliary teachers remain religiously neutral, as the Constitution demands.")
(27) *Comm. for Public Educ. & Religious Liberty v. Nyquist*, 413 U.S. 756, 792-93 (1973) ("A proper respect for both the Free Exercise and the Establishment Clauses compels the State to pursue a course of 'neutrality' toward religion.")
(28) *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 220 (1972) (noting "the constitutional requirement for governmental neutrality.")
(29) *Tilton v. Richardson*, 403 U.S. 672, 688 (1971) (approving of "facilities that are themselves religiously neutral.")
(30) *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602, 618 (1971) (recognizing the mandate for "remaining religiously neutral.")
(31) *Gillette v. United States*, 401 U.S. 437, 449 (1971) ("the section survives the Establishment Clause because there are neutral, secular reasons to justify the line that Congress has drawn.").
(32) *Epperson v. Arkansas*, 393 U.S. 97, 103-04 (1968) **("**Government in our democracy, state and national, must be neutral in matters of religious theory, doctrine, and practice.")
(33) *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 409 (1963) (noting "the governmental obligation of neutrality in the face of religious differences.")
(34) *Sch. Dist. of Abington Twp. v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203, 215 (1963) ("examining this 'neutral' position in which the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment place our Government.")
(35) *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, 443 (1962) ("The First Amendment leaves the Government in a position not of hostility to religion but of neutrality.")