

How a Children's Game Reflects the Current Political Climate

Let's pretend we are kids again. I remember playing king of the hill as a child. We'll brush up on the rules, such as they were, changing as they often did, depending on the neighborhood and age mix of the kids. I freely call upon dependable Wikipedia to help us, to which I give credit.

The game can be any sort of competition or social activity in which a single winner is chosen from among multiple competitors, and a hierarchy is devised by the heights the competitors achieve on the hill—the “pecking order”—where winning can only be achieved at the cost of displacing the previous winner.

I'm going to respect your intelligence and insight to think for yourself, so I'm not going to tell you “the moral of this story” or how this child's game might apply or be an analogy to the current political climate. I'm simply going to nudge you to think for yourself via some parenthetical comments.

King of the hill, also known as king of the mountain or king of the castle, is a children's game, the object of which is to stay on top of a large hill or pile or any other designated area (Washington, D.C.) as the “king of the hill.” Other players (the opposition party) attempt to knock the current king (“all those in authority”) off the pile and take their place, thus becoming the new king (national ruler) of the hill (The Capitol is sometimes called “The Hill”).

The way the “king” (president) can be removed (a new election, impeachment, coup, health or death, and so on) from the hill depends largely on the rules (the Constitution) determined by the players (“We the People”) before the game starts (1776).

Ordinarily pushing (peaceful democratic action) is the most common way of removing the king from the hill. Punching and kicking (hate speech or violent actions) are not allowed (in a democratic republic). The potential for rougher versions of the game (coups, assassinations) have led to it being banned from certain schools (the USA).

There are many versions of the game (the banana republics and other forms of government around the globe).

Classic version: The first to get on the hill at the start becomes the king (George Washington). To become a king, you need to go up the hill and push the king off (King George of England) through (the violent Revolutionary War, but now by the electoral process). At the end, the king (the duly elected president and party) wins.

Team version: In this version, there are two or more opponent teams (political parties); the king (the president) is the leader of the first team to get up the hill at the start (the current officeholder president); To become the new king, the leader of an opposing team (party, the challenger) must get on the hill and push the king off (through a truthful, not fraudulent, electoral process); Allies of the king, his team, (the Cabinet and presidential appointees) can push away opponents and enemies (would-be usurpers) off the hill and the (current officeholders) can try to defend themselves (peacefully) against their opponents.

And who owns "The Hill"? "We, the People!" That makes any king (president) the steward, not the landlord, correct?

In real time, this is not child's play. At the end (of the earthly age of governments), the King and his allies (the King of kings, Jesus, and the Christians) win!

Meanwhile, "I urge, then, first of all, that petitions, prayers, intercession and thanksgiving be made for all people—for kings and all those in authority, that we may live

peaceful and quiet lives in all godliness and holiness” (1 Tim. 2:1-2, NIV). {eoa}

Leona Choy *is among the “gray hairs” still experiencing dreams and visions at 95 years young. She is an author, speaker, publisher and broadcaster.*

The original article can be viewed [here](#).