Obama takes surprising stance in establishment case briefs
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In a brief filed in the U.S. Supreme Court last week, the Obama administration came down clearly on the side of allowing Christian prayers before city council meetings. A few years ago, it filed a brief in favor of allowing state governments to give tax credits that greatly benefit religious schools. In both cases, the Obama administration took a position strongly favored by the religious right and opposed by civil liberties groups.

In neither case was the Obama administration required to file a brief at all. The federal government was not a party to either suit. But in both cases, the Obama administration decided to participate and wrote briefs that are indistinguishable from what would have been expected from the Bush administration. It is deeply disturbing that the Obama administration has so abandoned the idea of a wall separating church and state that prior Democratic administrations have consistently favored.

The case currently pending before the Supreme Court is Town of Greece v. Galloway, which will be argued this fall. The Town of Greece is in upstate New York and has a population of about 100,000. Its town board meets once a month and prior to 1999 began each meeting with a moment of silence. From 1999-2007, the town invited only Christian ministers to deliver these prayers, and they often were overtly religious. As the 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals noted: "A substantial majority of the prayers in the record contained uniquely Christian language. Roughly two-thirds contained references to 'Jesus Christ,' 'Jesus,' 'Your Son,' or the 'Holy Spirit.'"

In 2007, the plaintiffs complained to the town board about this. In 2008, they filed a lawsuit alleging that the town board had aligned itself with the Christian faith in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. For four months in 2008, the town board had prayers delivered by other than Christian ministers. But except for that, the prayers have always been by Christian clergy and usually expressly Christian in their content. For example, for 18 months in 2009 and 2010, while the litigation was pending, it is estimated that 90 percent of the prayers were explicitly Christian in their content.

In 2007, the plaintiffs complained to the town board about this. In 2008, they filed a lawsuit alleging that the town board had aligned itself with the Christian faith in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment. For four months in 2008, the town board had prayers delivered by other than Christian ministers. But except for that, the prayers have always been by Christian clergy and usually expressly Christian in their content. For example, for 18 months in 2009 and 2010, while the litigation was pending, it is estimated that 90 percent of the prayers were explicitly Christian in their content.

Thirty years ago, in Marsh v. Chambers, 463 U.S. 783 (1983), the Supreme Court held that clergy-delivered, nonsectarian prayers before legislative sessions do not violate the Establishment Clause. The court stressed that the prayers in that case, before sessions of the Nebraska Legislature, did not exploit, proselytize or advance any one religion. But the prayers at the Greece town board meetings clearly violated this; over an 11-year period, they were virtually always delivered by Christian clergy.
and consistently explicitly Christian in their content.

The 2nd Circuit followed clearly established law and ruled against the Greece town board. *Galloway v. Town of Greece, 681 F.3d 20 (2d Cir. 2012).* The court said that the question was "whether the town's practice, viewed in its totality by an ordinary, reasonable observer, conveyed the view that the town favored or disfavored certain religious beliefs." The court concluded, "on the record before us, that the town's prayer practice must be viewed as an endorsement of a particular religious viewpoint." The court, in an opinion by Judge Guido Calabresi, noted that the town's selection process for clergy to deliver the prayers virtually ensured that Christian ministers would be selected, that virtually every prayer had been delivered by a Christian minister, and that the prayers usually had an explicit Christian content.

This should be an easy case. For decades, the Supreme Court has held that the government violates the Establishment Clause if the reasonable observer would perceive the government as endorsing religion or a particular religion. It is not possible to see the Town of Greece's practices in any other way. *Marsh v. Chambers* approved nonsectarian legislative prayers, but the Greece town board had consistently sectarian ones.

Liberals and conservatives agree to very little with regard to the meaning of the Establishment Clause, but they have shared the view that the government cannot favor some religions over others. But that is exactly what the Town of Greece was doing.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor said that the purpose of the Establishment Clause is to make sure that no one is made to feel like an insider or an outsider by his or her government. She wrote: "Direct government action endorsing religion or a particular religion is invalid because it sends a message to nonadherents that they are outsiders, not full members of the political community, and an accompanying message to adherents that they are insiders, favored members of the political community." Any non-Christian attending the Greece town board meetings would immediately feel like an outsider, that he or she did not belong there.

I thus expected that if the Obama administration participated at all, it would file a brief in favor of affirming the 2nd Circuit. In fact, I thought that the Obama administration might choose not to participate because the 2nd Circuit opinion was so narrow and fact specific. The 2nd Circuit was clear that it was not invalidating all legislative prayers or even holding that they must always be nonsectarian. It just found based on the facts of this case that the Greece town board impermissibly aligned itself with Christianity.

But the Obama administration filed a brief urging the Supreme Court to reverse the 2nd Circuit and to rule in favor of the Town of Greece. It did not go as far as the town and its conservative advocates in urging the court to use this case to dramatically change the law of the Establishment Clause and to hold that the government acts unconstitutionally only if it literally establishes a church or coerces religious participation. But the Obama administration's brief clearly and unequivocally comes down on the side of the practices of the Greece town board.

By itself, this would be inexplicable, except for a brief the Obama administration filed in *Arizona School Tuition Organization v. Winn,* 131 S.Ct. 1436 (2011). Arizona law provides for a tax credit of up to $500 for those contributing money to a school tuition organization. The overwhelming majority of these funds have gone to support Catholic and Evangelical Christian schools. The 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals declared the Arizona tax credit system unconstitutional as an impermissible establishment of religion. The Obama administration filed a brief on behalf of Arizona urging the court to dismiss the case for lack of standing or in the alternative, to uphold the Arizona law. The Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision, did the former and made it much harder for plaintiffs to challenge government support for religion.

Together, the two cases show the Obama administration's views of the Establishment Clause and they are much more on the side of the religious right than with civil liberties groups. As one who believes that Thomas Jefferson was right when he called for a wall separating church and state, the Obama administration's position is deeply disturbing. I hope that the Supreme Court will agree with the 2nd Circuit and find that the Greece town board violated the Establishment Clause.
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and facilities, such as restrooms, regardless of the student's gender.
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