
FRICH

<http://frich.flatirons.org>

submit@frich.zzn.com

"The Man" & His Plan

I was recently alarmed to hear that a member of the faculty is planning on writing an article for FRICH. Why, you may ask, would "The Man" ever embrace an underground publication? It's all about marketability and controlling the masses.

See, FRICH isn't as underground as it was once conceived to be. If the administration ever cared to, they could simply flex their collective muscles to bring this publication to its knees. Anonymity works as long as we keep on their good side. Don't give them reason to stomp, and they won't.

Instead of crushing FRICH, our benevolent Big Brother let it live. Lucky for them, too. In light of recent bashing of IB, a faculty member has decided to beat the writers at their own game: by using FRICH to persuade the general student body. (In related news, I've heard that certain higher-ups of the school have expressed an interest in finding out the identity of Snork Maiden for her article that makes light of IB, but that and the related story of an extortionist teacher are for another time.) By putting an article in FRICH written by the faculty, you, the readers, would be deceived. What you are reading on these pages is meant to be the voices of your peers speaking out above the loud voice of "The Man," not the loud voice of "The Man" disguising itself as one of your peers. This paper is a very useful tool because it's actually read by the 90% of the student body for whom, and by whom, it's written.

Since FRICH writers of the past have spoken out against the IB program, it's the perfect place to try to counter the bad press. Despite the disclaimers, FRICH is generally associated with the views of its writers. If "The Man" could present a well-written argument in favor of IB, it would negate some of FRICH's perceived bias against it.

But what if there is a hidden agenda to all of this? Two facts need to be observed in order to understand what "The Man" might actually be trying to do.

Fact #1: FRICH is a powerful publication in the fact that it can be seen as "the 'in' thing." Popular forums

are more persuasive than unpopular forums. Period.

Fact #2: The current image of most authoritative bodies is very "uncool."

A powerful administrative group is jealous of the popular rebel. What we end up with is pretty clever on their part. Rather than do the whole collective muscle flexing routine and making themselves more hated, the group simply takes control of the rebel, thus making themselves more loved. It's like if the mayor of Hamelin hypnotized the Pied Piper and used him to pacify the town's children. This could all be speculation, but I, for one, would hate to see such a mighty weapon of the common students fall into the wrong hands.

To me, the beautiful thing about FRICH has always been that it organizes a safe-haven from all of the loud views of "The Man." The whole purpose of an underground newspaper is to voice the opinions of the little guy. What good does it do anybody to create yet another place from which the loudest voice can speak? The popular opinions don't need to be reiterated, but the valid, lesser-known ones need a place to be...iterated.

IB already gets enough backing from teachers in the form of 8th grade informational meetings, visits by counselors, and the constant reinforcement that it's better than everything else is. Everybody has already been fed the beneficial information about IB (the loudest voice), but a lot of the counter-arguments haven't been given the same chance.

So I guess I'd like to close by asking one question of the faculty member(s) who would try to use FRICH against its own people: If you're so sure that you're right, why are you so afraid to give the opposing side a chance to point out your flaws?

π Frank D. Roosevelt <fdr@frich.zzn.com> π

Editor's note: FRICH has not, as of yet, knowingly received any article submission or editorial influence from any member of the Niwot faculty.

Yes, we are printing them again...

**SENIOR WILLS
DUE APRIL 1**

(this is not an April Fools' Day joke)

Response to "Brief Beliefs"

Well, I am extremely glad to have the religion issue cleared up for me! What a tremendous relief to have religion explained to me in small enough words so that even my sin-ridden, corrupt, non-believing mind could grasp the concept! Before I read "A Brief Look at Beliefs," (*found in FRICH #15*) I was merely another lost, miserable heathen wallowing in the horrors of open-mindedness! But now I have seen the light! Due to the brilliant persuasive qualities of said article, I have realized the error of my ways! (How silly of me to try to maintain some level of tolerance towards those who do not mindlessly convert to follow my personal dogma like the good little insipid sheep they should be!) In fact, thanks to the brilliantly "tangible" and ridiculously oversimplified article, my feeble non-Christian mind is now capable of understanding religion!

But enough bitterness. Instead, let's look at the utter lack of any logical reasoning whatsoever in the article. To begin with, it is questionable whether the author was unclear on the difference between pantheism, (a belief that, according to Webster's Dictionary, is "a doctrine which equates God with the forces and laws of the universe,") and polytheism, ("belief in or worship of many gods,") or if he simply chose to conveniently disregard the many religions which are not monotheistic but are also not pantheistic, (as well as various others which fit in neither category.) Furthermore, Buddhism is technically an atheistic religion. In fact, Buddha himself was an atheist. While it is true that Buddhism advocates the negation of the self and of earthly desires and possessions, (something which Christianity also advocates to some extent, as heaven, not earth, is what matters,) the idea of the loss of self is such an insignificant part of modern Hinduism that it is almost irrelevant to the argument. Moreover, New Ageism is not simply one unified religion of glassy-eyed disciples lying in the grass contemplating its vegetation-to-deity content ratio, as Karl Barth implies, but is rather a general heading for several different belief systems, some of which are pantheistic, (such as modern Shintoism) and some of which are not, (such as Gaiaism.)

As far as pantheism is concerned, it is Buddhism, not Hinduism, which places a strong emphasis on "oneness." (Incidentally, Buddha also stated that "just as joy is illusion, so is pain.") With regards to the brilliantly and lucidly worded sentence

concerning the reality of being really real in real reality, or whatever, ("...you must realize you are not real, but to believe that you are not real, you have to be real, so if you really aren't real, how can you really know you aren't real?") the point of the idea of "oneness" has been missed completely. The idea is not that one does not exist in the literal sense, (i.e. physically, intellectually, etc.) which, as Karl Barth so succinctly pointed out, is self contradictory; the idea is that the sense of the individual is an illusion. It is not the realization of nonexistence, it is the restructuring of one's self perception to incorporate the entirety of existence rather than existing as a solitary entity. If this still seems illogical, it is no more illogical than one of the fundamental concepts of Christianity, which very simply stated, is "God can do and create anything." Of course, if God can both do and create anything, is it possible for Him to create a rock that He cannot lift? In the words of Karl Barth, "...look at the claims of these beliefs and see if they can pass the test of... reason."

I would also like to point out that concepts which cannot be "conceived" can still be believed. An example of this is the fact that modern science, (and a good majority of the rational modern world,) believes that the universe is infinite. Although it is impossible for the human brain to grasp anything infinite, it is nonetheless believable. And finally, an atheist is, by definition, "one who denies the existence of God," not "one who denies the existence of an objective reality, morality, or underlying values and enjoys beating up kids and old ladies," as Karl Barth seems to imply. The argument provided for why atheism is contradictory is invalid if only for the reason that the term "atheist" implies absolutely nothing except a lack of belief in god(s). The argument is somewhat akin to saying that the word "liberal" means "one who eats only certified organic food, hugs trees, beats up old conservative ladies, and voted for Ralph Nader."

So despite the persuasive evidence and dazzlingly diverse array of religions surveyed in "A Brief Look at Beliefs," I am still just a teensy bit dubious of the argument presented. (Religion, I might add, is never based on logic. Religion is based on faith and logic on proof; by its very nature proof denies faith.) After all, Christianity has a few little paradoxes of its own which Christians would do well to resolve before attacking other religions, (i.e. can God be completely "good" if He created Satan?) Therefore, although I was duly impressed by Karl Barth's brilliant ability to construct long rambling sentences about the really real reality of the reality of realness and his willingness to doggedly stick to his unsupported point, I think I will take my chances with eternity. And anyway, if there is a hell, that's where all the interesting people are.

π Leaf Erikson π

Assessing Patriotism

Since September 11th, America has seen a surge of patriotism. This recent surge has led me to ponder on the meaning of patriotism. To me, patriotism is a love of one's country; a belief in liberty, freedom, and justice, and support of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I thought that this was the norm for most people, as well, but as I listened to the average American in school, on the radio, and on television I realized how wrong I was.

To most people, patriotism means a blind faith in anything and everything the government does. It means never questioning our elected officials and naively believing that they have our best interests at heart. This is profoundly un-American. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt "...to announce that there must be no criticism of the president or that we are to stand by the president, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public."

Not only does Patriotism mean blind faith in the government, but it also means deporting foreigners, stopping immigration, and massacring all Arabs everywhere. It means conducting secret military trials and convicting non-citizens in fascist courts, denying them any means of appeal. It means censoring and criticizing the media, which has been banned for fear that the miscarriage of justice that is denying people due process, Habeas Corpus, and freely chosen defense attorneys might be reported to the American public. It also means passing flag desecration laws, which would ban people from practicing legal, constitutional free speech.

But patriotism doesn't just stop there; it also is a justification for partisan politics. Patriotism is a validation for drilling for oil in Alaskan wildlife preserves because America shouldn't have to rely on foreign oil from the "Axis of Evil." Nevermind that President Bush, who got rich on oil, gutted the budget for research into alternative energy sources, an act that would increase America's dependence on oil, conveniently making himself richer. Patriotism is also a excuse for passing Bush's budget, because America needs to spend more money on improving the greatest military in the world and building Reagan's Star Wars system (we all know that terrorist fringe groups hiding in the cave in Afghanistan have access to sophisticated ballistic missile systems) which would incidentally violate Anti-Ballistic missile treaties the Unites States has with Russia. But Patriotism also means that America is better than all other countries on the face of the earth, so violating treaties with Russia is okay.

So to recap, Patriotism no longer means upholding the freedom and equality that this country was built on. It now means never questioning the government, abusing the rights of the defenseless, and passing partisan laws in congress, which would devastate the environment and make nuclear war safe for America. It also means that America is better than the rest of the world, that we should hold other countries to double standards (trying to force countries to have certain governments while being outraged that they don't like ours), and that we can violate international treaties whenever we feel like it. God bless America.

π Mustafa Kemal π

Truth in Advertising?

After a bit of investigative reporting, I have discovered that many advertisers do not think about what they say in their slogans. Here are several slogans I have found that support my belief.

At a gas station: "We will not sell gasoline to anyone in a glass container"

In a restaurant: "Customers who consider our waitresses uncivil ought to see the manager"

Outside an antique shop: "We buy junk and sell antiques"

In a clothing store: "Wonderful bargains for men with 16 and 17 necks"

In the offices of a loan company: "Ask about our plans for owning your home"

On a dry-cleaners: "38 years on the same spot"

In a dance hall: "Good clean dancing every night but Sunday"

In a maternity ward: "No children allowed"

In a restaurant: "Open 7 days a week and weekends"

In the window of a store: "Why go elsewhere and be cheated when you can come here?"

On a shop: "Our motto is to give our customers the lowest possible prices and workmanship"

In an appliance store: "Don't kill your wife. Let our washing machine do the dirty work."

π Benedict Arnold π

The System That Defines Our Lives

To many, September 11 has inspired pride, brought hope, and provided solace. As of now, the U.S. has nothing short of the epitome of all that is good, pure, and righteous. However, I simply cannot endure everything these events have come to represent. Fear, ignorance, and manipulation are what have truly been created by these attacks.

First and foremost, we now have misplaced sense of patriotism, due to emotions created from the attacks. Moreover, it is incredibly ironic that while our fellow countrymen were hating, killing, and generally manipulating each other for decades before, we ignored each other's questionable attitudes and actions; whereas, it took 5,000 spontaneous deaths, accused by a non-American, to make us "stand united."

Now, due to the military tribunals about to become standard (if not secret) practice, anyone can be arrested, questioned, imprisoned, and executed without being informed of their crime or provided with legal counsel. In the "land of the free," this soon to be Orwellian political system is analogous to that of the former Soviet Union. Furthermore, when Bush delivers a State of the Union Address chalked full of pseudo-patriotic terms to manipulate the American public into swallowing his supposedly "well-intentioned" policies, the majority of the nation's men, women, and children acquiesce to these chimeral notions.

The previous two points now set the stage for big business profit. Any commercial, advertisement, or slogan that now

reaches the public through the television, magazines, or Internet is immediately followed by the entirely non-symbolic American flag, or the statement, "United We Stand." Unfortunately, this phrase is nothing more than the equivalent of commercialized propaganda. Corporations are simply using these images to sell their products and gain a profit by pulling at your heartstrings.

In the end, no one wants to comment on the situation for fear of verbal, and possibly even physical, retribution from the "open-minded" who do not want to hear anything contrary to patriotic jargon. The masses need to become aware, comprehending, analytical individuals, not one large body representing ignorance and conformity.

π John Q. Adams π

Disclaimer - Despite the fact that you, the commonfolk of the world, may associate FRICH, a wonderful, underground publication, with the views of its writers, lifeless people who submit random drool, we, the really happy staff, wish that you wouldn't. We're so neutral that it'll blow your mind from here to Uzbekistan and/or Boulder. Oh yeah, can you dig? We're talkin' the Switzerland brand of neutral. We may provide you with the "Swiss army knives of knowledge," but it's up to you, the informed, intelligent, insightful, insidious readers, to form your own illogically conceived opinions. Therefore, if you're offended, don't sue us; go sue yourselves.

Sports = Terrorism

I blow up government buildings for kicks!

I massacre small children and animals.

We promote hate and violence!

It's just harmless fun!

Think it's just again! If you favor of terrorism of terrorism an output in Iraq, Exporting Cou money to his gasoline pow money to OPE sporting even tickets and sp evils of terroris

Message sponsored by