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**Summarize the salient points of the Supreme Court Case Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow.**

Elk Grove Unified School District against Newdow was an unprecedented case adjudicated by the Supreme Court of United States. The Supreme Court of the United State argued that Newdow was in no position to bring the case to the court because he never had that much custody of his daughter (Quillen, 2018).

School going kids need to be adequately acquainted with the importance of liberty and the importance of being partisan in the United State of America (Martin et.al, 2017). In order to do so, every morning the teacher explains to the kids by revising the promise to demonstrate commitment. The declarations "under God" became the argument of the case Elk Grove vs. Newdow (Prouser, 2005). As during the case, Mr. Newdow contended that the declaration "under God" is in complete contradiction to his beliefs in which he believed as a nonbeliever (Russo & Mawdsley, 2007).

This conundrum appeared consistently through the course of the case in which Mr. Newdow was mired in a custody battle against his former wife Miss Banning. Miss Banning, the ex-wife of Mr. Newdow, was a believer unlike her former husband apart from being the sole custodian of their daughter who was in Elk Grove Unified Elementary. Since the rules and regulations in the California statute stripped Mr. Newdow of the right to contend a case as a buddy, he needed to have a thoughtful position in order to challenge the rules of the school in the highest court of the United States (Prouser, 2005). The condition of the position bereaves from any legitimate and prudential boundaries of the authorities of an unelected individual, misleading judiciary (Russo & Mawdsley, 2007).

Additionally, this case takes into consideration the rights of Miss Banning that allowed to have her the custody of their daughter. Furthermore, the case judgment also considered what might be the implications for their daughter as she was the center o attention of a highly anticipated community case (Quillen, 2018). Mr. Newdow's position was at a significant disadvantage as he had no right to be in any sort of connection with his daughter whatsoever apart from lacking the right to contend the petition as a subsequent buddy of her daughter. Certainly, the attentions were diverging and in complete disagreement with each other. The parental position of Newdow was determined using state law with the Supreme Court suspending the state-act interpretation within a local federal court (Prouser, 2005).

Mr. Newdow contended that his daughter reading the promise of allegiance violated his rights. While, Miss Banning, the ex-wife of Mr. Newdow did not have any issue with her daughter reading the allegiance pledge. Since Mr. Newdow struggled with the pledge of allegiance and did not possess enough custody of her daughter, the Supreme Court of the United States of America voted to roll back the decision of the inferior court that supported Mr. Newdow's view.

**Discuss the levels of the court through which the case evolved before it reached the Supreme Court.**

There are several levels that exist in the American judicial system before the case ends up in the Supreme Court of the United States of America. Mr. Newdow had a daughter who was studying in the public school that goes by the name of Elk Grove Unified School. The public school is located in the state of California. It is a routine activity to start the day at the Elk Grove Unified School by going through voluntarily participating in the Pledge of allegiance (Quillen, 2018). Moreover, the statements "under God" which were added in 1954 through congressional law are also revisited.

Mr. Newdow held an opinion against this routine activity of the school. Mr. Newdow moved into central court of California with a petition that contended the following; if the young kids go through the statements "under God", it infringes the American Constitution's First Adjustment establishment section (Prouser, 2005).

As Mr. Newdow was an atheist protestor, he announced that he will take the petition to the high court as soon as he completed the case in the lower court. Meanwhile, speculation was seen doing the rounds on media that impartialities would be tied at 4 and 4, which raised the demand of a panel judge in position. The real problem was whether Mr. Newdow is in a position to go in the court contending the custody of his daughter or not (Martin et.al, 2017).

Every plaintiff that intends to go to the court must meet the standing. Standing, a type of element found in every petition, that every plaintiff must meet (Martin et.al, 2017). For a decision to go in the favor of an individual, they must exhibit interest in the case that would be determined by the court. Therefore, an individual facing the death penalty must have the standing to challenge their conviction based on diversity. For this reason, the individual has a palpable motive which the Supreme Court would decide. On the other, individuals facing charges less than the death penalty have no standing to challenge their decision. To make things worse, most commentators argue that no one in the court is martinet until recently.

**Explain the decision of the Supreme Court in this case in brief.**

The American Supreme Court gave the ruling that the statements of “under God” are not illegal and would remain the part of the Pledge of commitment. If the American Supreme court gave ruling in the favor of Mr. Newdow, most school-going children of the state of California would be influenced and rise against the state in opposition (Quillen, 2018).

The judgment of the court suggests that the panel overlooking the case in the Supreme Court are of the view that the statements “under God” are related to loyalty and have nothing to do with faith (Martin et.al, 2017). Additionally, the Supreme Court said that each individual has a right to exercise religion. However, Mr. Newdow was in no position to bring the case to the court, the decision read.

The three fairness who thought that Mr. Newdow has standing wrote on the establishment section issue. They argued that the pattern and organization of the Pledge of commitment are legitimate (Prouser, 2005).

Some days later after the case was taken into the court, Mr. Newdow told both the Church and State about the burly nature of his case. Furthermore, Antonin Scalia, the ninth fairness, separated himself from the case. In brief, Mr. Newdow was forced to withdraw from his case for want of standing (Martin et.al, 2017).

**Explain the fundamental impact that the court decision in question has had on American society in general and on ethics in American society in particular. Provide a rationale for the response.**

The fundamental impact the Supreme Court of America had is related to American society and school (Quillen, 2018). Furthermore, the kids might not have a full understanding of the wording of the Pledge of commitment and what the real meaning is. In my opinion, the kids must be permitted to recite the pledge which will motivate them to serve the state one day. If the statements under the Pledge are removed, the kids would not know what our soldiers died while defending (Martin et.al, 2017). With faith gone from the Pledge, it would take away the thinking to decide what is correct or what is wrong. Therefore, the Pledge includes religious faithfulness to educate children (Martin et.al, 2017).

**Discuss whether you believe that the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance is a religious issue or a sign of respect for the United States.**

The issue of whether or not the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance is a religious issue or a display of respect to the United States has a personal aspect attached to my life to it (Humphrey, 2011). As someone who grew up in a poor and rude home, serving the country would be an option to exercise my liberty. Whenever I give a listen to the pledge of Allegiance, it reminds me of how far we have come as a country (Martin et.al, 2017). On the other hand, if a person has an issue in reciting the words of allegiance to the country, they should remain silent and do not criticize those reciting it. Therefore, a person reciting the pledge of allegiance has nothing to do with religion, it is a matter of liberty (Humphrey, 2011).

**Discuss whether or not you think public schools should be allowed to recite the pledge.**

Certainly, I completely believe that the schools throughout the country should always be allowed to recite the Pledge of Allegiance (Martin et.al, 2017). School forms an important part in the learning of the child. The parents of the children work so hard to send them to school. The pledge of commitment would help the children understand how hard their parents are serving their country.

The Pledge of Allegiance is the primary source for these kids to be reminded that their liberties are guaranteed under the Pledge of Allegiance (Quillen, 2018). They would understand how people around the world are suffering from their rights being violated through repressive regimes (Martin et.al, 2017). Therefore, the Pledge of Allegiance is a way of safeguarding their rights and liberties. The schools in no situation whatsoever consider abandoning the Pledge of Allegiance (Humphrey, 2011). Although the students might be too young to fully understand the connotation of the Pledge of Allegiance, it would be inscribed on their hearts for the rest of their lives. Once they become adults, they would get to know what truly the wordings of Pledge of Allegiance mean. The kids are the future of the country and they will become the future leaders of the country. These leaders in the future would lead the country. So it is imperative to have someone at the helm that truly understands the meaning of the wordings of the Pledge of Allegiance. Certainly, the Pledge of Allegiance is merely a small initial step towards ensuring that the country remains free.
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