# Supreme Court case highlights parental challenges in opting out of school LGBTQ curriculum



During oral arguments in the case Mahmoud v. Taylor, Supreme Court Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson addressed the issue of parental rights in the context of public school curricula, inadvertently highlighting the challenges faced by many parents seeking alternatives to school programs they disagree with.

The case stems from a dispute with the Montgomery County public school system in Maryland, which had implemented an “LGBTQ-inclusive” curriculum featuring storybooks for children as young as pre-kindergarten. The books—such as "Born Ready," "Pride Puppy," "Love, Violet," and "Prince & Knight"—focus on themes including gender identity, same-sex attraction, and participation in Pride events. According to the school system, the intention behind this material was to "disrupt" traditional binary understandings of gender among young students.

A group of religious parents, led by a Muslim family, challenged the curriculum not with the aim of halting these teachings but to secure the right to opt their children out of the specific lessons. Montgomery County, however, denied their request, arguing that allowing opt-outs on such a scale would be disruptive to the classroom environment.

In the court proceedings, Justice Jackson acknowledged the difficulty parents face when they disagree with what their children are taught in public schools. She noted, "You don’t have to send your kid to that school. You can put them in another situation," highlighting the theoretical availability of alternative education options. However, she recognised the reality that in Maryland, parental choice regarding education is severely limited due to a lack of sufficient alternative schools or open enrolment policies. Maryland’s limited voucher programmes, scarce charter schools, and restrictive homeschooling regulations leave many parents with little practical option other than to comply with the local public school’s curriculum.

Maryland’s educational system often requires children to attend the nearest public school, regardless of how well it aligns with their individual needs or family beliefs. This situation leaves parents with fewer choices about their children’s education than they might have regarding other significant household purchases, such as televisions.

Critics of school choice argue that expanding alternatives could undermine public schools by encouraging an exodus of families and associated funding. Conversely, proponents emphasise that a competitive education marketplace ensures quality by giving families options appropriate to their values and needs. Voucher programmes are primarily utilised by middle- and working-class families seeking to avoid educational environments they consider incompatible with their beliefs. Montgomery County, as one of the wealthiest counties in the United States, may offer its residents more resources to pursue alternatives, but such options remain scarce or inaccessible.

The refusal by Montgomery County public schools to allow opt-outs from curricula promoting inclusivity—including materials with a focus on gender and sexuality—has been criticised as emblematic of a broader cultural agenda with limited accommodation for individual parental concerns. Justice Jackson’s remarks during the Supreme Court oral arguments highlight the difficulty in balancing parental rights and public education mandates when alternatives are limited or non-existent.

David Harsanyi, a senior writer at the Washington Examiner, discusses these issues and considers the case a pivotal moment for discussions on universal school choice and parental control over educational content. The outcome could have significant implications for how public school systems across the United States address curriculum disputes and parental opt-out rights in the future.
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