

owens: What do you think is the function of a pledge of allegiance—not just the American version, but a pledge of allegiance as such?

newdow: The function of a pledge, I think, is to get people to respect

owens: Do you think it's appropriate to use the pledge in naturalization ceremonies or VFW meetings or other such gatherings?

owens: It seems to me that this pledge is a form of civic education to conform people's ideas of what America ought to be or what we are as citizens. Beyond the words that are there, does the pledge point to a certain mode of citizenship in your mind—a particular vision of America— or is this nation so diverse that you can't say that?

newdow: I think the words stand for noble ideas that few people would be against. The pledge's purpose was to unify us, to make us think that this nation has some especially noble and good qualities that we defend. What I don't like about this is that it implies that other countries aren't as good as ours. I think our form of government may well be the best, but it doesn't follow that we as Americans are superior to citizens of other nations.

newdow: In any private meeting, there's no problem whatsoever, because individuals can do whatever they want. There are two questions here. One is my personal view on pledging, and the other is the constitutional issue. The latter is all I'm trying to argue. Constitutionally, I think the government can ask its citizens to affirm any values that the majority chooses, except those that are prohibited by the Constitution. There's really one that matters more than any and that's religion. The government is not allowed to

the coercion test, which is actually an extreme test. Coercion is about the free exercise realm of the religion clauses, and the Supreme Court has stated clearly that this is an establishment clause violation. I think it is coercive, especially with little kids. There's no question; by that test, it fails. But it also fails by any other test.

owens: There is no question that the phrase "under God" is religious. But a lot of people have argued that this is ceremonial deism and therefore, because it's ceremonial, it's not religious beliefs, let alone a requirement to affirm religious beliefs. Can you comment on this idea and on the argumentative posture religious people assume when they say this?

newdow: Why do religious people make this argument? It's an issue of equality. No one is asking for special favors for atheists; we're simply asking to be treated equally. That's why we have an establishment clause, and this claim about ceremonial deism shows that we need it. If you look at what Congress said in 1954, there was nothing about it being ceremonial. They were talking about believing in the Christian God. Maybe you could stretch it to the Judeo-Christian God, but it certainly was a particular view of God. The appeal to the founding fathers and their dedication to the Almighty is not historically accurate. This isn't ceremonial; it is religious belief in a supreme being, and that's what everybody had in mind until it got challenged. Then all of sudden, they come up with these bogus excuses.

owens: One of the other arguments is that perhaps "under God" was religious in that context, but no one believes it anymore. So it doesn't really matter; there's no harm given by this "religious" expression. How do you respond to that?

newdow: I think Justice Souter made that argument, and I'm not sure even he believed it. He may have just been posing the question. The fact is, the phrase "under God" bothers some people. The people for whom it is not meaningless

are either the people who want it there because it's religious or the people who don't want it there because it's religious. Either way, it sounds religious to me. So get it out of there.

owens: You've filed a lawsuit trying to strike the national motto—In God We Trust—from our currency for the same reason, that it violates the establishment clause. Can you differentiate that case from the pledge case?

"It's an issue of equality. No one is asking for special favors for atheists; we're simply asking to be treated equally. That's why we have an establishment clause."

newdow: One difference is that religious people ought to be against having the motto on currency. A minister of a church might say, "I can't collect money in my church because we refuse to take money that says In God we Trust. It's sacrilege." But the biggest difference is that there is no context in which you are required to read money out loud, whereas you actually stand up and affirmatively voice the pledge, which includes the statement that we are a nation under God. You can opt out of doing this, but that's not the issue. In the end, both

cases are clear violations of the principles I'm emphasizing.

owens: In your opinion, are there any tolerable examples of government speech or action that mention God—for example, military chaplains, prison chaplains, holiday displays on public properties?

newdow: I don't want the government to be forbidden from talking about religion, or anything like that. But I'm against religious holiday displays on public properties, because when this happens, the government is taking a side in the biggest controversy of religious dogma: whether or not God exists. It's saying, yes, God does exist.

I have no problem with supplying chaplains in the military, because I don't have a problem with giving military members the option to have spiritual assistance. However, the fact that Congress has official chaplains seems a little bizarre to me.

owens: Would teaching about religion in schools be acceptable to you?

newdow: Absolutely. But only if it's from a neutral standpoint, to explain what the different religions are. Teachers shouldn't be claiming that Jesus is good or Buddhism is wonderful.

owens: Do you think we have the tools we need to deal with church-state relations in the United States today?

newdow: I think we need to read the Constitution. The public can talk about anything it chooses in terms of religion. That's a free exercise question. But the government is not the public square; government is forbidden to take a position. That needs to be crystal-clear.

owens: A common reaction to your pledge lawsuit is that you are trying to take away the right of a majority of Americans to express their religious beliefs.

newdow: If you can find a single sentence where I've suggested that any individual or group is forbidden from ex-

