



**Testimony of Becky Straus, Legislative Director
In Opposition to HB 3014; In Support of Dash 1 Amendment
Senate Committee on Education and Workforce Development
May 30, 2013**

Chair Hass and Members of the Committee:

HB 3014 requires district school boards to procure the United States flag for and cause the flag to be displayed in each classroom, and to provide time for students to salute the flag once daily during school hours. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in opposition to this bill and in support of the Dash 1 amendment.

HB 3014 Heightens Existing Constitutional Concerns

Under current law, school boards are required to provide an opportunity for students to salute the flag once weekly. The ACLU of Oregon has had long standing concerns about this statute. Because ORS 339.875 sets forth the requirement that public schools provide students the opportunity to recite the version of the pledge of allegiance on a weekly basis that includes “One Nation under God,” we believe that it is vulnerable to a challenge under Oregon Constitution’s religious freedom provision, Article I, section 5. That provision states in part: “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any religious (sic), or theological institution. . . .”

HB 3014 would increase the number of times in a week that school boards are required to provide an opportunity for students to recite this pledge and would impose upon employees or students the obligation to lead students in the pledge. In our view, the bill only serves to heighten existing concerns about the religious freedom implications of the current law.

For most of this nation’s history, the Pledge originally did not include God. It stated, instead:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

It was only in 1954, in the midst of the McCarthy era “red scare” period, that Congress added “Under God.” The hallmark of the McCarthy era was its pressure to conform in politics and religion, in speech and belief. The prevailing assumption was that all good (non-communist) Americans believed in a monotheistic God. Untrue in the 1950s, this assumption is more strikingly untrue today. Many Americans subscribe to no religion. And even people who do worship a monotheistic God show great variation in their definition of the deity; many do not subscribe to the idea that God’s role is to organize the affairs of humans and countries, as embodied in the phrase “one nation under God.”

HB 3014 Increases the Burden on Students to Set Themselves Apart from Their Peers

The law allows a child to “maintain a respectful silence during the salute.” Through the intake line in our offices, we have received a number of complaints by parents and students since this law was passed, requiring them to stand and otherwise force them to participate in the pledge against their beliefs, be they religious or for other reasons.

The right to express oneself by not participating in the pledge includes the right to remain seated while others stand. The famous case of *Tinker v. Des Moines School Dist.*, 393 US 503 (1969) upheld the rights of students to silently protest by wearing black armbands. Remaining seated during the pledge is a form of silent expression just like the black armbands in *Tinker*.

The practical result of this law is to risk that students will be ostracized when they cannot or choose not to participate in the pledge for whatever reasons they or their parents decide. It is callous for the government to force schoolchildren of minority faiths to isolate themselves from their classmates to avoid participating in a religious exercise in violation of their conscience. Under HB 3014, children will be forced daily to set themselves apart from their peers.

The Oregon Supreme court has recognized the importance of our public schools in protecting our children.

Parents and lawmakers may and do assume that the hours, days and years spent in school are the time and the place when a young person is most impressionable by the expressed and implicit orthodoxy of the adult community and most sensitive to being perceived as different from the majority of his or her peers; famous constitutional cases have involved this socializing rather than this intellectual function of the schools. *Cooper v. Eugene School District 4J*, 301 Or 358 (1986).

The most powerful testimony on how dangerous it is when governments begin to require adherence to compulsory measures reflecting national unity was made in the 1943 U.S. Supreme Court case *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 US 624 (1943). There, Jehovah's Witnesses challenged the requirement that they participate in the Pledge of Allegiance. In siding with the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Court noted the following lesson of history.

Struggles to coerce uniformity of sentiment in support of some end thought essential to their time and country have been waged by many good, as well as by evil, men. Nationalism is a relatively recent phenomenon, but, at other times and places, the ends have been racial or territorial security, support of a dynasty or regime, and particular plans for saving souls. As first and moderate methods to attain unity have failed, those bent on its accomplishment must resort to an ever-increasing severity. As governmental pressure toward unity becomes greater, so strife becomes more bitter as to whose unity it shall be. Probably no deeper division of our people could proceed from any provocation than from finding it necessary to choose what doctrine and whose program public educational officials shall compel youth to unite in embracing. Ultimate futility of such attempts to compel coherence is the lesson of every such effort from the Roman drive to stamp out Christianity as a disturber of its pagan unity, the Inquisition, as a means to religious and dynastic unity, the Siberian exiles as a means to Russian unity, down to the fast failing efforts of our present totalitarian enemies. Those who begin coercive elimination of

dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard.

Support of Dash 1 Amendment

Because the Dash 1 amendment addresses the above concerns, we respectfully request that you either do not move the bill forward or adopt the Dash 1 before moving the bill forward.

Thank you for your consideration of our position and please feel free to contact me at any time.

