thereby increasing the weekly attendance and pacifying the bored congregation during the remainder of the ritualistic ceremony. Instead of plates of dry crackers we shall pass platters heaped with juicy delectable Swiss steak. This meat will justly signify the “body” or flesh, as the crackers do. Each member who has pledged his allegiance to the church is allowed one piece of steak. Paper plates will be found in the hymnal racks on the back of each pew along with plastic knives, forks, and spoons which bear the engraved signet of the church. Broccoli, or a similar green vegetable, will also be served in order to balance the sacred meal. Hot rolls will be given to the deacons and trustees of the church while others will receive a slice of white or brown bread. For refreshments there shall be large goblets filled with exotic, blood red wine. The wine, which symbolizes the “blood”, shall be imported from the Holy Land, giving it further significance.

These privileged church members will be permitted to dine while the remainder of the ritual is being performed. This is a relaxing break which will appease the congregation until the benediction can be recited. Many concerned church members ask, “How often should we partake of communion?” This is an easily answered question. Jesus told us that as often as we observe the Lord’s Supper, we should do it in remembrance of Him; therefore, let us partake of this supper quite often, in fact every Sunday, since we are having such a delectable meal.

The Individual and the State
Mary Sue Stranhan

In his essay “Civil Disobedience,” Henry David Thoreau makes the statement, “There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly.” Such an observation, however, is highly illogical when related to John Locke’s principles of civil government, because the essence of Thoreau’s statement is the very definition of Locke’s State. Thoreau claims a free State cannot exist unless it recognizes the individual as a higher power, and Locke asserts that any government created in accord with natural laws is actually formed by individuals and in their control. To further understand this concept, Locke’s ideas on civil government should be examined.

In 1760, the English philosopher John Locke wrote his well-known treatises in which he presented certain principles of government and its formation—natural rights, the compact theory, the purpose of government, the right of revolution, and the control of government. In building his political philosophy, Locke begins with his conception of the state of nature in which men, with an inherent sense of Natural Law, live as equal and separate beings. Each is
free to do as he wishes as long as he does not infringe upon the rights of another. Each man may claim any property with which his labor has been mixed, but taking that which belongs to another is a breach of the Natural Laws. In such a case, the wronged person, his family, or his friends may punish the trespasser as they see fit, and the offended may seek reparation for the harm that has been done him. Thus, man has certain natural rights—life, liberty, and property—and the authority to protect them.

Although man, living as a separate being, was basically free of others and free to do as he pleased, his social nature prompted him to seek out others of his kind and live as a group. Thus, man began his government, starting with the family and the natural rule by the father. Then man’s social nature continued to drive him even more into society, but when society entered, the laws of nature broke down. They were not sufficient; they did not explain how to live with others. Therefore man, discovering he could better succeed individually if all members of society would cooperate, pooled his natural powers with others in a trust for the benefit of all. The people then discovered three basic imperfections in the Natural Laws and prepared to correct them. In the state of nature, with each man a judge for himself, each had to decide alone what was good or bad, the result usually being influenced by one’s own involvement in the case and his biased opinion. Each man, also, had to execute the desired punishment but often lacked the ability to do so. Moreover, in the state of nature, one man’s ideas often varied from the views of others, and judgment of different men in similar cases differed greatly. All these problems were met in society by vesting the power of all members in a few people to serve as indifferent judges in solving problems. Universal laws were made by the people as a whole with all agreeing to abide by them or to suffer the consequences. Such agreement, however, was completely in accord with the Natural Laws. The people had willingly given up their powers in order to benefit from the assistance of others. This step of government Locke considers in his compact theory. Logically following, it is then the duty of the created government to preserve the natural rights of the individuals, the reason for which the institution was formed.

Therefore, according to Locke and his conception of nature, an absolute monarchy is inconsistent with civil society. Man certainly would not voluntarily leave his state of nature for a society in which all members but one would be under the restraint of laws, and that privileged one would retain his same liberty with increased power. It is also inconceivable that man would give himself up, willingly or unwillingly, to a despot who has the power of life and death over his subjects because, according to Locke, Nature does not give to man the right to destroy himself, and a person cannot give to another that which he does not himself possess. The only basic form of civil government which is consistent with the nature of man is the govern-
ment in which the legislative power is supreme. A group of citizens, serving for a short time and subject to the will of the majority, would form laws for the betterment of society. An executive power would execute the laws of the legislature.

With the preceding system, man is most nearly within the state of nature, but since the government is instituted to preserve the natural rights of the individuals, it can be dissolved by the people if the ruler is not protecting those rights. In such a case, the people have a right to revolt, and it is up to them to decide whether the government has gone beyond its trust. The people are the creators and beneficiaries of the government and, thus, the sole controllers. Therefore, a democratic State, such as our American government, is already under the authority of the individual from the moment of its creation. It can never be a question of whether the government recognizes the individual as the higher power, but whether the individuals believe their personal rights of life, liberty, and property are no longer being preserved and the government should be dissolved.

The Child
Linda Seidle

THE CHILD: I am prepared to become the man; I have become impatient with being the child.

THE MAN: Do not be impatient with childhood. The warmth and comfort of childish illusions will all too soon disappear, and you will be left with only the stark clarity of disillusionment as your companion and playmate.

THE CHILD: But I am weary of games and songs and innocent laughter. I no longer find satisfaction in mere dreams. My mind demands knowledge, and I must seek it. I can have no peace, knowing I have not attempted the search, even though it be in vain. Will not this search make me a Man?

THE MAN: The search itself cannot make you the Man, but the culmination of the inevitable quest will forever alienate you from Childhood. In this alienation from the security of Childhood, Manhood consists. When he attains knowledge, the Child can no longer be nourished on the illusions of Childhood.

THE CHILD: But is not knowledge one with truth? Ought not truth to be cherished and sought above all else?

THE MAN: Even though knowledge is truth, it does not necessarily follow that knowledge be considered such an ultimate prize. Knowledge is fear, and fear is detrimental to the Man. Have you known fear in Childhood?

THE CHILD: I have feared only the unknown.

THE MAN: How much greater will be your fear when the unknown is known! Your nightmarish fantasies will be replaced by realities, and you will know and understand fear.