

## News and Current Events :: Weblog: Supreme Shocker—'Under God' Stays Because of a Technicality

**Weblog: Supreme Shocker—'Under God' Stays Because of a Technicality - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/6/14 20:12**

If you can stomach it... (<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2004/124/12.0.html>) <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2004/124/12.0.html>

A couple of excerpts:

*O'Connor*

*"Whatever the sectarian ends its authors may have had in mind, our continued repetition of the reference to 'one Nation under God' in an exclusively patriotic context has shaped the cultural significance of that phrase to conform to that context," she wrote. "Any religious freight the words may have been meant to carry originally has long since been lost."*

The understatement of the year?

*"But Thomas demonstrates that the Pledge case is tricky only because of the Supreme Court's muddleheadedness, not because of the Constitution"*

Be sure to put on your rhetoric hat first.

**Re: Weblog: Supreme Shocker—'Under God' Stays Because of a Technicality - posted by Gideons (), on: 2004/6/14 20:12**

Here's the thing I found interesting when I read through the opinion

Quote:

-----"Facially religious references can serve other valuable purposes in public life as well. "

This was in Justice O'Connor's concurrence and is another reference to the humanism thread, as well as the Golden Cow.

It's not surprising, but it certainly shows how far we've fallen.

**Re: - posted by DelightedInU (), on: 2004/6/15 12:40**

So this whole constitution thing actually went to the Supreme court?

And they ruled to keep "one nation under God" in the constitution?

Sorry for the questions, just a little confused...

**Re: Constitution - posted by Matthew2323 (), on: 2004/6/15 13:06**

No, the "under God" quote controversy is about the Pledge of Allegiance. Some time ago an atheist brought a law suit because his daughter had to say the Pledge in school.

The liberals say this violates the "separation of church and state" clause of the Constitution. (Keep in mind this is not the literal wording of the First Amendment. It actually reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.")

In fact, it is the liberals who are violating the Constitution by preventing the "free exercise thereof". When children recite the pledge, this has nothing to do with "Congress making a law".

Another problem arises because we now have judges changing the laws (ie Roe v Wade). Laws are to be changed by elected officials. There are checks and balances to keep people from going too far. Federal judges don't have this restriction, which is why their job is to **interpret** the law, not change it. When judges over step their bounds, who can stop them... They should be impeached! (That is really the only way to stop their tyranny!)

However, as sad as this is, the real question remains: Where is the Church in all of this? If the Church itself is not "under God", does it really matter if the Pledge is altered?

**Re: - posted by DelightedInU (), on: 2004/6/15 17:55**

Gosh, I really am looney.

I meant the pledge of allegiance. I knew "one nation under God" is in there. I just mixed up constitution and pledge of allegiance.

Anyways, I just wanted to know if they ruled to leave it in or take it out. Did they rule yet? Or are they going to?

**Re: - posted by Matthew2323 (), on: 2004/6/16 15:54**

It is still in there, however it could be challenged again. Here is a quote on the Vision Forum web page.

Quote:  
-----On the 50th anniversary of the addition of the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance, the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed today a constitutional challenge to the words "under God" in the pledge. The Supreme Court decided to dismiss the case without deciding the key church-state issue, which is, "Can the State Acknowledge God?" In his arguments on behalf of the United States government before the Court, Solicitor General Theodore Olson stated: "The reference is an 'official acknowledgment of our nation's religious heritage,' similar to the 'In God We Trust' stamped on coins and bills." The justices ruled that California atheist Michael Newdow lacked the legal right to bring the challenge in the first place. "We conclude that Newdow lacks standing," Justice John Paul Stevens declared in the opinion. The Supreme Court refused to deal with the real issue in this case and subsequently this issue can be brought back before the court when another plaintiff decides to bring a challenge to the words, "under God."  
-----

Also, Judge Roy Moore had this to say:

Quote:  
-----"In the pledge case the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, the largest Federal Appellate Circuit Court, plainly entered an unlawful order, an order they had no authority to enter. If the U.S. Supreme Court had not taken that case, all of the children within the 9th Circuit would have been prevented from saying the Pledge of Allegiance. The danger still remains, as the Supreme Court dismissed the case on a legality. If the Constitution Restoration Act 2004, were to be passed in Congress, the federal courts could never again be used to strike down the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance. Congress should take action now to save the Pledge and other public acknowledgements of God."  
-----

(<http://www.visionforum.com/corner/blog/>) Link to article from Vision Forum

Finally, here is an article about judicial reform from a local ministry, Center for Arizona Policy:  
(<http://www.azpolicy.org/html/currentcitizen.html>) Judicial Reform

God bless,  
Matthew

**Re: Weblog: Supreme Shocker—'Under God' Stays Because of a Technicality - posted by InigoMontoya (), on: 2004/6/16 15:54**

It really amazed me reading how the various media outlets covered that verdict, to such polar conclusions.

We as a nation have simply become blind to how the separation of church and state was outlined in the constitution. It is sad... I pray for our government and people. I

I  
From the constitution, the federalist papers, the early courts, the early laws, all supported a respect, a humbleness, and awe for God. I People simply can't see that anymore as they've closed their hearts... and unknowingly closed their own eyes.