## **TABOO OPINIONS #3**

By Richard E. Geis

rerwingeis@cs.com Copyright 2004 by Richard E. Geis For Adults Only!

**3-29-04** A small grump is in order concerning the Pledge of Allegiance hooroar. >From what I can glean from the internet, the Pledge was conceived and written by a Baptist minister in 1891 and published in 1892.

Apparently it was adopted swiftly by most of the primary schools in the nation and kept in use---millions of children were forced to recite it---to this day.

I remember reciting it in Kenton grammar school in Portland, Oregon in or about 1939.

In 1954 Congress added the words 'under god'. And kids recite the Pledge to this day.

All those children were and are brainwashed (brainseeded?) by a Pledge which is unconstitutional. Was it not created by a Christian minister (and a socialist, besides?) and pushed into the schools by religious forces? Without a vote by the people? And without passing the First Amendment test? Yes, according to the history books.

So forget 'under god'. The whole damn Pledge is an illegal intrusion into the secular education system of today. Send it to the Supreme Court, say I!

And isn't it amazing how Christians and Patriots put so much store in symbols? And amazing how they think forcing kids to recite a Pledge of Allegiance a few thousand times will bind those kids when grown to a piece of cloth and a geographic concept.

Kids today are inundated by attempts to manipulate their thinking and behavior. They swim in a sea of commercials and mottos and political catch-phrases and 'sound bites.'

Kids are now so cynical and tuned out that the Pledge is small potatoes, a trivial bit of school shit they have to put up with and otherwise ignore.

So I change my opinion: forget caring about the 'legitimacy' of the Pledge. It doesn't matter.

**3-31-04** I watch HBO's new Sex-n-Violence series, "Deadwood." I enjoy it for its exploitive ventures into ugly western-frontier realism and for its use of the western stereotype plot as a vehicle for this new level of what-people-love.

People---cable watchers, anyway---who dote on "Sex and the City," "Six Feet Under," and "The Sopranos" obviously enjoy the 'cutting edge' taboo-breaking realistic action and dialogue.

Alas, on "Deadwood" the dialog is too often overloaded with 'fuck' and 'cocksucker' from the villains---the deadly, ruthless, psychopathic owner of the main-drag saloon & whorehouse, and his cohorts, employees and hangers-on. And they have a lot of scenes.

The sex & nudity is in a sense wonderful---quick, sometimes startling, and understated. [As in "The Sopranos."]

The plot is too simple in "Deadwood." Good vs. Evil, with Evil getting most of the attention. Fine acting, which saves the series.

I do wish, though, that Keith Carradine who plays the flawed, withdrawn Wild Bill Hickock, had more to do. I anticipate that in episode 12 (the last of the series) he will be shot in the back while playing poker, holding aces and eights.

END THIRD ISSUE