

---

Subject: "...under God"

Posted by [warranto](#) on Mon, 10 Jan 2005 23:22:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Nukeit: Your first point would be valid if it was never changed in the first place. However, now that the damage has been done (the original was changed to include God), people have to live with it. By removing it because it is unacceptable to include God, you are now excluding every religious person out there (or, if you so wish to debate it as such, the Christians)

So, I guess it comes down to who do you want to exclude more? Athiests or religious people?

Quote:The FLAG is what you are giving the Pledge to. The Flag is a symbol; it represents the connection between the country and the person giving the Pledge. Read the original Pledge again; it reads "I pledge allegiance to MY flag." That flag is meant to represent your loyalty and your love for your country. If God is included in that for you, fine. No one is stopping you from believing that. However, for myself and many others, that connection does NOT include God.

Thats exactly what I was saying. The "Under God" aspect has nothing to do with the pledging allegiance with God.

Quote:You are arguing to keep the Pledge the way it is because you do not want its meaning to be lost- it would not be. If anything, the Pledge is meaningless because it has been changed so many times; in order to have it mean something real again, it should be restored.

Wrong again (geeze, I thought repeating myself in my posts was bad form, but even then people can't understand).

I mentioned nothing, anywhere, about it losing it's meaning.

Quote:Tolerance has nothing to do with it. The Pledge is an oath of loyalty. You may believe that your God is in support of this country all you wish, but changing the Pledge so that it cannot possibly have meaning to everyone who gives it is, in effect, forcing that belief on anyone who is asked to say the Pledge. "under God" should never have been put into the Pledge to begin with; it should have been left in its original form. In that form, it is, as it should be, an oath of loyalty to the United States of America, not to an omnipotent God that many people do not believe exists.

Congratulation attacking someone's question as though it was a statement... Hint: When a phrase includes the grammatical expression "?", it is then turned from a statement into a question. To further explain myself (are people here so bad a grammar they can not understand the concept of a question?), it was a question intened to make people think of what the answer may be.

---