

Letters on the "Pledge" ruling, the Supreme Court and democratic rights

19 July 2002

Below we post a selection of recent letters to the WSWS.

I am very concerned with the issues you so succinctly bring forth in your publication. I would like to think there is something I can do to change things, but really don't know where to start. I am involved minimally with the ACLU, mainly sending emails to representatives. I do not want to see our country move any further into religious fundamentalism, and all that represents. Actually, I am for total and complete separation of church and state, and personally view religion as destructive and anti-intellectual.

I would love to think we could change things enough so that every person would have adequate housing, water, food and other basic requirements. I would appreciate any suggestions as to what exactly I can do to bring about such changes.

Sincerely,

LR

Texas

13 July 2002

To the Editor: Thank you for your article on the response to the anti-“under God” decision [“US political establishment vilifies ‘Pledge’ plaintiff”]. It was especially helpful for me to be able to read the excerpts from the discussion, in which the plaintiff held his own under attack from two defenders of God. (One would think “the Omnipotent” would be able to defend himself against a single unbeliever.)

GG

10 July 2002

I wish more people would realize that the phrase “under God” was inserted as a political and propaganda tool by Eisenhower. He used it to make democracy seem more godly as opposed to ungodly communism.

JY

10 July 2002

Keep up the coverage of the pledge issue. America and the world need to know.

CG

10 July 2002

On “US Supreme Court Justice Scalia on capital punishment: ‘Death is no big deal’”.

Absolutely astounding! What is more surreal—his nasty statements, or his bold declaration of them since he believes they are acceptable in a civilized society, or the lack of news coverage on them, or the lack of outrage over them. Would he continue to hold these extremely crass views if he were sentenced to death in court?

Thank you for your exposing the dementia of a very powerful man.

TQ

Assistant to a public defender

7 July 2002

Dear WSWS:

You have done yeoman service to my awareness of yet another reactionary aspect of my government. While many bemoan George W's presence in the White House, along with his cabal of fascists, it is the Supreme Court that functions as our most exclusive White Man's club in history.

The insights offered in the series of articles on their reactionary character in nullifying civil rights codes based on the commerce clause of the 14th Amendment is so shocking because it has been utterly ignored in the mainstream press. The *Los Angeles Times*, (to which I am subjected out of habit, mostly) never digs beneath the surface.

I was not surprised that in a front page *Times* article on the “Death of the Zionist dream,” there was only limited historic coverage and no mention of the bloodbath out of which the (and this hurts) “Jewish State” emerged. They hid the failure of that vision, just

as the *Times* (and all mainstream media) hide the truth behind an obscuring melodrama when discussing sensitive issues. The entire article was based on a kind of emotional depression over a set of parents over their children's fleeing Israel, thus dooming the country (for a distinct pattern is now discernable) to an unendurable loss of its youth.

The lack of historic background is so vital to keeping readership-viewership in the dark. Thanks again for turning on the light.

SC

12 July 2002



To contact the WSWWS and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact