H-2200.1			
H - Z Z U U I			

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4023

State of Washington 58th Legislature

2003 Regular Session

By Representatives DeBolt and McMahan

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19 Read first time 03/05/2003. Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. BUSH, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AND TO THE HONORABLE JOHN ASHCROFT, ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE UNITED STATES, AND TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, AND TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, AND TO THE HONORABLE GARY LOCKE, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, AND TO THE HONORABLE CHRISTINE GREGOIRE, ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

WHEREAS, In the wake of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in Newdow v. U.S. Congress in June of 2002, holding that the phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance, "one Nation under God," violates the Establishment Clause, there is widespread confusion about whether school districts may continue student recitations of the Pledge; and

WHEREAS, Newdow $v.\ U.S.\ Congress$ was decided 2-1 by a three-judge panel of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, and the full court has refused to reconsider the decision en banc; and

p. 1 HJM 4023

WHEREAS, Shortly after the 9th Circuit's ruling that the Pledge of Allegiance was unconstitutional, the United States Senate approved a resolution "expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance" and asking Senate counsel to "seek to intervene in the case" with the Resolution passing 99-0; and

WHEREAS, Senator Dianne Feinstein issued a press release immediately after the 9th Circuit's ruling on the Pledge of Allegiance which said, "I find the 9th Circuit Court's opinion embarrassing at best, and I hope that this decision is promptly overturned by the United States Supreme Court. This nation from its foundation has had a belief in God, and has a long tradition of expressing that belief."; and

WHEREAS, The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in $Newdow\ v$. $U.S.\ Congress$ has been stayed, and all school districts around the nation, including those in Washington, may continue student recitations of the Pledge of Allegiance with the phrase "one Nation under God" included as long as the recitation is not mandatory with any person having a religious or other objection to the recitation being allowed to not participate; and

WHEREAS, The Ninth Circuit's decision in $Newdow\ v.\ U.S.\ Congress$ holding that the phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance, "one Nation under God" violates the Establishment Clause ignored the clear statements of a majority of current United States Supreme Court Justices who have addressed the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance and is almost certain to be reversed by the Supreme Court by holding that the Pledge of Allegiance poses no Establishment Clause problems; and

WHEREAS, The Pledge of Allegiance was originally printed in 1892 in the magazine Youth's Companion; and

WHEREAS, The original text has been altered only twice, in 1923 the words "the flag of the United States of America" were substituted for the words "my flag," and in 1954 Congress added the words "under God"; and

WHEREAS, The phrase "under God" first appeared in President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, which concluded that "this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom - and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."; and

HJM 4023 p. 2

WHEREAS, The United States Supreme Court has given abundant guidance to the lower courts on the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance and has considered the words "one Nation under God" in the pledge to be one of many permissible illustrations of the Government's acknowledgment of the Nation's religious heritage; and

WHEREAS, In its early decisions addressing school prayer and Bible reading, the Court was careful to distinguish between religious exercises in public schools, which it held unconstitutional, and patriotic exercises with religious references, which it said were permissible; and

WHEREAS, In $Engel\ v.\ Vitale$, 370 U.S. 421 (1962), the Court struck down a state law requiring school officials to open the school day with prayer but explained:

There is of course nothing in the decision reached here that is inconsistent with the fact that school children and others are officially encouraged to express love for our country by reciting historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence which contain references to the Deity or ... a Supreme Being, or ... belief in God. Such patriotic or ceremonial occasions bear no true resemblance to the unquestioned religious exercise that the [state] has sponsored in this instance.

; and

WHEREAS, In *Abington v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), Justice Brennan, concurring, indicated his belief that patriotic exercises with religious references such as the Pledge of Allegiance did not violate the Establishment Clause with the view that the religious references in the Pledge and patriotic songs were without religious significance:

This general principle might also serve to insulate the various patriotic exercises and activities used in the public schools and elsewhere which, whatever may have been their origins, no longer have a religious purpose or meaning. The reference to divinity in the revised pledge of allegiance, for example, may merely recognize the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded "under God." Thus reciting the pledge may be no more of a religious exercise than the reading aloud of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, which contains an allusion to the same historical fact.

p. 3 HJM 4023

1 ; and

WHEREAS, In Lynch v. Donnelly, 465 U.S. 668 (1984), a majority of the Court, including current Justices Rehnquist and O'Connor recognized that "there is an unbroken history of official acknowledgment by all three branches of government of the role of religion in American life," and that "[o]ur history is replete with official references to the value and invocation of Divine quidance in deliberations pronouncements of the Founding Fathers and contemporary leaders," and the Court listed many examples of our "Government's acknowledgment of our religious heritage, " including Congress' addition of the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954:

[E]xamples of reference to our religious heritage are found in the statutorily prescribed national motto "In God We Trust," 36 U.S.C. § 186, which Congress and the President mandated for our currency, see 31 U.S.C. § 5112(d)(1) (1982 ed.), and in the language "One nation under God," as part of the Pledge of Allegiance to the American flag. That pledge is recited by many thousands of public school children – and adults – every year.

20 ; and

WHEREAS, In Wallace v. Jaffree, 472 U.S. 38 (1985), Justice O'Connor, concurring, stated even more explicitly her opinion that the words "under God" in the Pledge do not violate the Constitution because they "serve as an acknowledgment of religion with 'the legitimate secular purpose of solemnizing public occasions, and expressing confidence in the future.'"; and

WHEREAS, In Allegheny County v. American Civil Liberties Union, 492 U.S. 573 (1989). Justice Kennedy, concurring and dissenting and joined by Justices Rehnquist and Scalia, indicated his views about the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance while voicing strong criticism of exactly the kind of formalistic approach taken by the Ninth Circuit in Newdow, and stated that the Establishment Clause did not ...

... require a relentless extirpation of all contact between government and religion. ... Government policies of accommodation, acknowledgment, and support for religion are an accepted part of our political and cultural heritage. ... "[W]e must be careful to avoid the hazards of placing too much weight

HJM 4023 p. 4

on a few words or phrases of the Court," and so we have "declined to construe the Religion Clauses with a literalness that would undermine the ultimate constitutional objective as illuminated by history."

; and

WHEREAS, As proof of his point that a formalistic approach to the Establishment Clause analysis is wrong, Justice Kennedy in Allegheny County v. ACLU demonstrated that it would lead to a holding that the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional, an extreme result that Justice Kennedy clearly thought undesirable and unwarranted ...

Either the endorsement test must invalidate scores of traditional practices recognizing the place religion holds in our culture, or it must be twisted and stretched to avoid inconsistency with practices we know to have been permitted in the past, while condemning similar practices with no greater endorsement effect simply by reason of their lack of historical antecedent. Neither result is acceptable. Like Thanksgiving Proclamations, the reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance, and invocations to God in sessions of Congress and of this Court, they constitute practices that the Court will not proscribe, but that the Court's reasoning today does not explain.

23 ; and

WHEREAS, Justice Scalia, since he has been on the Court, has dissented from every Court decision upholding a strict separation between church and state, See, e.g., Edwards v. Aguillard, 482 U.S. 578 (1987); Santa Fe Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Doe, 530 U.S. 290 (2000); and WHEREAS, Justice Thomas' views on Establishment Clause interpretation show quite clearly that he would also uphold the Pledge's constitutionality, See, e.g., Good News Club v. Milford Cent. Sch., 533 U.S. 98 (2001); Santa Fe Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Doe, 530 U.S.

32 290, 318 (2000); and

33 WHEREAS, In sum, all Supreme Court precedents referring to the 34 Pledge of Allegiance have stated that it poses no Establishment Clause 35 problems, and more significantly, a majority of the current Supreme 36 Court Justices have indicated that they would uphold the 37 constitutionality of the Pledge; and

p. 5 HJM 4023

WHEREAS, In Sherman v. Community Consolidated Sch. Dist., 980 F.2d 437 (7th Cir. 1992), the only other lower federal appellate court to have considered the question concluded easily that the Supreme Court would uphold the Pledge, rejected an Establishment Clause challenge to the words "under God" in the Pledge, and referring to the Supreme Court's various statements about the constitutionality of the Pledge, the court said "[i]f the [Supreme] Court proclaims that a practice is consistent with the establishment clause, we take its assurances seriously."; and

WHEREAS, The dissenting judge in the Ninth Circuit's decision in Newdow v. U.S. Congress, Circuit Judge Ferdinand Fernandez, said phrases such as "under God" or "In God We Trust" have "no tendency to establish religion in this country," except in the eyes of those who "most fervently would like to drive all tincture of religion out of the public life of our polity."; and that "My reading of the [majority ruling] suggests that upon Newdow's theory of our Constitution, accepted by my colleagues today, we will soon find ourselves prohibited from using our album of patriotic songs in many public settings ... 'God Bless America' and 'America the Beautiful' will be gone for sure, and while use of the first and second stanzas of the Star Spangled Banner will still be permissible, we will be precluded from straying into the third. And currency beware!"; and

WHEREAS, It is critical that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in Newdow v. U.S. Congress holding that the phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance, "one Nation under God," violates the Establishment Clause be reviewed and overturned by the United States Supreme Court;

NOW, THEREFORE, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that officers of the executive and legislative branches of both the federal and state governments take immediate and determined action to ensure the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in Newdow v. U.S. Congress holding that the phrase in the Pledge of Allegiance, "one Nation under God," violates the Establishment Clause is expeditiously and vigorously appealed, briefed, and argued before the United States Supreme Court.

NOW, THEREFORE, Your Memorialists further respectfully and specifically pray that Attorney General Christine Gregoire petition the United States Supreme Court at the earliest opportunity to file an

HJM 4023 p. 6

amicus brief on behalf of the State of Washington urging the court to overturn the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals' decision in *Newdow v. U.S.* Congress.

4

5

6 7

8

10

11 12 BE IT RESOLVED, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States, the Honorable John Ashcroft, Attorney General for the United States, the Honorable Members of the United States Supreme Court, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of Congress from the State of Washington, the Honorable Gary Locke, Governor of the State of Washington, and the Honorable Christine Gregoire, Attorney General for the State of Washington.

--- END ---

p. 7 HJM 4023