

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910974812903321
Autore	Bishop Ronald <1961->
Titolo	Taking on the Pledge of Allegiance : the news media and Michael Newdow's Constitutional challenge / / Ronald Bishop ; foreword by Nadine Strossen
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Albany, : State University of New York Press, c2007
ISBN	9780791479551 0791479552 9781435616721 1435616723
Edizione	[1st ed.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (218 p.)
Disciplina	342.7308/52
Soggetti	Flags - Law and legislation - United States Religion in the public schools - Law and legislation - United States
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 183-197) and index.
Nota di contenuto	Master myths, frames, narratives, and guard dogs -- A case of first impression -- An impermissible message of endorsement -- A reputation for unorthodox opinions -- Their own little world -- The good mother -- On to the Supreme Court -- Tepid and diluted -- Nice try, young man -- We're saved for now.
Sommario/riassunto	Taking on the Pledge of Allegiance explores the landmark lawsuit filed by avowed atheist Michael Newdow against the Elk Grove Unified School District in California, in which he claimed the words "under God" in the Pledge of Allegiance amounted to an unconstitutional endorsement of religion. Newdow's original suit was ignored by the public and the news media until June 26, 2002, when the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the Pledge of Allegiance was unconstitutional. This decision touched off a firestorm of negative reaction, both from politicians and from the public. The U.S. Supreme Court eventually overturned the ruling on Flag Day 2004. This book contains interviews with many of the parties involved, including Newdow and journalists who covered the case. Ronald Bishop examines how the news media marginalized Newdow after the Ninth Circuit's ruling—acting as a "guard dog" for the

government and for the ideas supposedly at the ideological heart of America—by framing the decision as an aberration, a radical act by a hopelessly liberal federal circuit court. Bishop concludes that journalists relegated Newdow to a rhetorical "protest zone"—he was heard, but from a safe distance.
