

GRADUATING SENIORS FEEL PREPARED TO ENTER REAL WORLD

As the month of May winds down, the Senior class is preparing to explore their futures. Researching the frequency and confidence in the students' plans, the University of Colorado at Boulder surveyed many schools in the state. With most planning to attend college next year, the study found the students eager and ready to use their varied and advanced skills to enter the real world.

A prime example was one Lisa Albers, a senior at Denver North High School. Planning to attend the University of Denver in the fall, she feels confident due to her experiences. "I received tons of awards in high school," she explained. "I got on the academic honor roll, a \$1,000 scholarship, completed all of my hours in National Honors Society, was accepted to be in the Who's Who Among American High School Students book, and even had perfect attendance. These unique accomplishments have increased my self-esteem tremendously and taught me that I can do anything I set out to do. College should be a breeze." After recording these comments, the researchers chose to speak with Lisa's English teacher, Ms. Cindy Asmussen. "Lisa's a brilliant student," Asmussen said, glowing with praise. "Her beautiful posters and perfect five paragraph essays always manage to impress me. The keen skills she displays with these creations hint at the fantastic aptitude she possesses."

The study also inquired as to how schools prepared their students for higher education. "Our goal in teaching," stated an administrator at Creede High School, "is not only to enhance a student's knowledge but also his or her work ethic and drive to achieve. In order to create an environ-

ment where this will happen, we encourage our teachers to handout extra credit generously, give open book tests with ample time to complete, use take home tests, allow month late assignments with bogus excuses and assign copious amounts of busywork."

Looking at the study's overall statistics, it's found that an impressive 75% of the graduates will continue their education at a college level. The remaining hope to use their already existing skills to climb up the corporate ladder.

"My experience in academic lab and as a counseling aid provided me with the dexterity to tackle a wide variety of complex and challenging problems," stated Shawn Cornally of Limon High School, reminiscing about his high school career. "So I don't really need to go to college. The typing techniques I acquired in keyboarding and the political skills I attained in student council will be unbelievably helpful in my rise from a receptionist (earning \$15 bucks an hour!) to an accomplished politician."

Finally, the University spoke of an outstanding student named Billy Shipp. As a 4.0 graduate with honors, Billy expressed no desire to go on to college, feeling that he had all ready attained enough knowledge to cut it in the real world. "Yeah, high school wasn't hard at all. I did so much better than everyone else, and since I'll be competing against the same people in life, I might as well get a head start. Of course, I programmed my calculator with all the equations and notes conceivable, memorized spanish vocabulary immediately before the test, forgetting the words afterwards, bribed the student aid who corrected my tests, changed my grades in the gradebooks when the teacher wasn't looking, peered over Musser's shoulder during exams and wrote answers on my arm, but heck, I can just do the same things at my job."

π Defined By Pain π

Pot and South Park deemed essential components of time of your life

"High school is the time of your life," one of my friend's mothers insisted in the car on the way to freshman orientation, "The next four years are going to be the best years of your life." The woman said this wistfully, eye lashes batting. I hoped I would not have to see her mascara run. In any case, the woman was convincing.

Her statements were convincing enough to spring to my mind as graduation crept near. I found myself surrounded by people convinced that high school was really life's field day. I open my yearbook and find, "I cant believe all the good times are over." And "I'm going to

Continued on page 2

Continued from page 1

miss you so much when I don't see you anymore after graduation. This summer we have to hang out everyday!" At the senior bbq, girls hug each other, "I'm going to miss you so much next year when we are both at CSU!"

I panic then, wondering if my time has run out. Are all the good times over? ...Nights sitting home and crying because I wasn't invited to The Party and all the nights I did go to The Party just to get a ticket after running from the cops. The long lunch lines. The little Debby snack cakes. The many valuable hours of Freshman Seminar and the bleep drill in PE. Mostly the assemblies though, I'll miss the assemblies. I wonder if I will miss these people when we are hanging out this summer, everyday? And will the weepy girls miss each other at CSU or CU or UNC after this summer? One thing is for sure: both the girls and I are sure to miss our girlfriends talking behind our backs and the exaggerated run downs of (((last night our boyfriends give their friends.))) The only thing we will miss more than that is the names ex-boyfriends still call us by and that embarrassing nick name leftover from 8th grade. The one everyone still uses. The nickname that girl used when she expressed just how much she liked me by carving a chain of touching profanities into that bathroom stall. I'll miss her a lot.

I decide that high school really must be the best four years of our lives, but only if living it up means getting stoned and watching The South Park movie 14 times. Personally, I don't like bad animation, but that doesn't mean high school has been a wasteland. Or a utopia either. It doesn't matter whether high school is meant to be the time of your life or just a few pimply years meant to prepare you for the real time of your life. Give high school a chance and that which comes after it too. Then maybe you'll know what has been the real time of your life. Maybe you'll be able to name a few.

π Sam(antha) Adamsπ

First, FRICH brought you Senior Wills. Now we're bringing back "Senior Predictions." To see this year's senior predictions, and to submit your own, visit FRICH's webpage and click on the "Senior Predictions" link.

<http://frich.flatirons.org>

SENIOR FRICHIES MAY THEY REST IN PEACE :

Sam(antha) Adams (Nadia Coleman)

Split down the middle in FRICH vs. SouthPaw custody battle

Paul Revere (Jesse Bartley)

Caught by the red coats after failing to post lanterns on time.

Defined By Pain (Xakylie Garrotte)

Went soul searching, became too well defined.

General Patton (Mike Mikulak)

Caramelized then beaten to death by candy-asses.

Benedict Arnold (Brad Hendrickson)

Placed in a robotic suit after falling into a pit of lava. Following his betrayal of FRICH in order to join an university underground newspaper, he changed his name to Henry Clay.

Cody Dawson (Nate Seals)

Lost believers. Ceased to exist.

Skizel (Andy Neary)

Strangled by imprisoned hooker during firefight with CIA and FBI, thus ending a tri-state fourteen year-long manhunt.

John Hancock (David Markham)

Disappeared in a mysterious weapons experiment. Came back exactly the same, but dumber.

Jesus Christ, Mustafa Kamal, Alexander Kerensky (Justin Ellison)

Crushed to death by his own ego.

Karl Barth (Andrew Gibbens)

Lynched by militant "Tolerantists" for proclaiming that "Jesus accepts all."

King George IV (Brent Depuy)

Attempted suicide but failed, given death penalty for attempted first degree murder.

Leaf Erikson (Jen Tobias)

Killed by editors who know how to spell name right.

I Eat Babies (Thaddeus)

Crucified. Resurrected as a cheese wedge.

Violet Xenos (Emily Bishton)

Added to Edward Gorey's next alphabet book.

Satire is Good

Since the publishing of FRICH #18, there have been many counterarguments against I Eat Babies' *Satan is Good* article, which tend to hover around God not "waiting for you to slip, but He'll catch you when you fall," as stated by a writer named Love. Virtually every point that was made in the article has been criticized by one writer or another. Usually, we at FRICH would encourage criticism, and we'd publish the best response that we received, but this case is a little different.

I Eat Babies heard of the backlash and composed his own response in anticipation of the onslaught. "Those who objected to the idea of the article didn't misread, but they did misinterpret the passage. The entire paper is under the pretext of satire. Satire pokes fun and makes one notice inconsistencies, contradictions, and how certain things seem absurd when you look at them from a different angle. I took something generally perceived as good, turned it around, and lampooned it. I side with the majority of the readership in that I don't agree with the article."

Coincidentally, I Eat Babies is among the ranks of another satirical writer who eats babies, Jonathan Swift. In 1729, Swift wrote "A Modest Proposal," in which he suggests that the poor people of Ireland should raise and sell babies as a culinary delicacy. Many people were aghast by the idea of eating babies, but Swift himself didn't believe what he wrote. His paper's purpose was to exaggerate their poverty and illustrate the extent of British oppression.

Similarly, I Eat Babies' article was meant to cause people to think. According to the author, "The *Satan Is Good* piece was only directed to conflict with the sensibilities of those who are bigots: people who do hate homosexuals, people who do hate non-Christians and non-theists... I'm fully opposed to hate of any form. Hate has no soul, hate has no logic, hate is uneducated, and hate is immoral." The only intended targets were those who fully deny others the right to their own beliefs.

Satan is Good wasn't intended to be quite as offensive as how it was received, but it does show just how strongly the Christians in our school are willing to defend their faith, something which they should be proud of. In the end, the article did complete its objective of making people think. Anyway, with the closing of this paragraph, the *Satan is Good* debate is officially closed. Thank you, and remember that, as Aristotle once said, "it is the mark of an educated mind to be able to entertain a thought without accepting it."

π Winston Churchill π <winston@frich.zzn.com>

A long time ago in a galaxy far, far away...

I saw *Attack of the Clones*. Despite all of the hype, or perhaps because of it, the movie sucked. While the action scenes and the special effects sure are nifty, the movie has poor acting, slow dialogue, and a stupid attempt at "intergalactic romance." Bad as this is, it gets worse. George Lucas piles on the blatant racism. Star Wars is bloated with insidious racial propaganda. For example, one of the races allied with the evil separatists is a savage race of winged beasts who wield spears to torture animals in cruel coliseums. This may *seem* harmless, but when they speak, the language is akin to Swahili. It seems that George Lucas believes that Africans are monstrous, savage, "spear-chuckers." The Jedi Council of freaks and monsters also has a token Blackman. Apparently, George Lucas thinks that blacks are freaks that belong in a freaky council. Finally, Lucas revives the character of Watto, a greedy, gouging, large nosed merchant, an obvious allusion to the Jews. He tries to manipulate all and tries to cheat those who deal with him. Haven't the Jews been through enough without Georgie's hate?

This is not the only racist *Star Wars* film. In *Star Wars: A New Hope*, the Blackman, Darth Vader, must serve a white master, the Emperor. He might as well be picking crops and cleaning the house. In *The Empire Strikes Back*, the token Blackman betrays his white friends to gain power and money, and when Princess Leia is about to be taken, his lust for the white woman drives him to action. In *Return of the Jedi*, Vader is redeemed, becoming white when unmasked. Apparently the blacks are evil and hateful, but if they work hard enough, they can become white. Finally, we arrive at *The Phantom Menace*, the most racist of all. The main villains are the evil Trade Federation, complete with stereotypical Asian accents and eyes, who are greedy cowards that attack poor innocent, defenseless, white planets. Battling the evil Trade Federation are the powerful, sophisticated races with white English accents. Every powerful group (the Naboo, Jedis, etc...) is English.

Finally, there are the Gungans with their exaggerated slave accents. All they're missing is the word "Massa" with everything they say. "Whata mee-sa sayin'; Ouch time; mee-sa tinkin' it be good time to pick da cotton, Massa; I aint uppity, Massa. Please don whip me, Massa."

George Lucas must know that we won't tolerate this. We must ban all *Star Wars* movies and products. Don't condone this discrimination and racism.

π Jesus Christ π

Is a Response to a Response Really a Response if it's a Response to a Response?

First off, I would like to thank Leaf for her response to my article. I must admit that I blushed when I saw that someone was going to counter my observations. I appreciate it, for I feel that contemplating such matters is of immense importance, and, sadly, many of our peers do not think critically about such topics. This is not to say they don't think about them at all. Thank you Leaf, for your proactiveness in the lives of our fellow students! [Don't misinterpret this as sarcasm.]

I think it is important to examine the purpose of my previous article, "A Brief Look @ Beliefs." Let us start with the title, focusing on the second word "Brief." The article was in no way an attempt to be the definitive explanation of "the religion issue." No, it was simply a *brief* cataloging of some observations I have made after examining some of the fundamental beliefs and characteristics of our world's plethora of religious systems.

Yes, I have a bias in my writing: I believe Jesus Christ is "*the way, the truth, and the life.*" And due to that, it can be granted that I believe, at their core, all beliefs other than the Christian one are not sufficient to provide souls with eternal salvation. This, however, doesn't make me closed-minded. I don't leave my brain at the door when I walk into the church. I don't allow myself to simply be told that, for instance, Atheism is incorrect and that's that. I actually see a stem of rationalism in those who think that there is no God; look at all the pain in the world. But I don't stop there. Simply saying that there is pain and therefore God cannot exist does not solve the problem of pain. Anyway, I want to just state that I don't simply take something and believe it without reason.

I feel that it is important for me to touch on the subject of pantheism. In the last article, as Leaf said, "I doggedly stuck to my unsupported point." I repent, and will follow through this time with support. Saying that "the idea of the loss of self is such an insignificant part of modern Hinduism that it is almost irrelevant" is arguable. Classical Hinduism is a pantheistic religion. Classical Hinduism does believe in oneness. [Here comes some support, and although it is only one citation, that does not mean I don't have more.] The Hindu philosopher, Shankara, said, "Brahman alone is real, the phenomenal world is unreal, or mere illusion." To say that loss of self, or denial of its reality is not an important tenant of Hinduism is simply wrong. True, because of their belief in an infinite amount of gods, Hindus are polytheists, but in the end, at the core of their beliefs, they are also pantheists. To continue the discussion on pantheism, it is true that Buddhists are atheists. It should also be pointed out that Buddhism began as a heretical sect of Hinduism. When I wrote about Buddhism in "Brief", I wanted to show how it is illogical. To do this more effectively now, I will quote the Buddha himself. Some of his advise to his disciples was to do the following; "Do not go by reasoning, nor by inferring, nor by argument." That's all I've got to say about that.

Next, I'd like to touch on Leaf's claim that "modern science (and a good majority of the rational modern world) believes that the universe is infinite." This is simply no longer the truth. I could list a number of findings regarding the ways modern science is finding that the world is finite, even created, but instead I will simply list some names prominent in cosmology whose work is showing this and trust that the "majority of the rational" people will do some research: Stephen Hawking, Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson (Nobel prize winners, 1978), George Smoot (NASA's COBE satellite), Alan Guth (father of inflationary big bang theory), and Robert Jastrow (director of NASA's Mt. Wilson Obsevaroty).

I agree with Leaf that my wording regarding Atheism was obscure. However, my statements regarding Atheism were not meant to imply that atheists are horrid people who abuse little girls, but simply a statement about the ultimate beliefs of Atheism. I do not doubt that the great majority of atheists do have morals, but my point is that they have nothing to base their morals upon. To deny the existence of God or any transcendental truth is to deny an ultimate reality, for if there is no true reality beyond what we are able to perceive in our current state of being, there is no foundation for us to place our morality upon. We cannot even claim ourselves as the foundation, because if we have no objective existence (an eternal soul of sorts), why should we trust ourselves in any way? As I said in my last article, to be able to be sure of the non-existence of God, one must be God.

I will attempt to answer Leaf's proposed objection to Christianity: "Can God be completely 'good' if He created Satan?" I think that Leaf is ultimately questioning God's authority, which is a valid concern. How could a loving, perfect God allow someone like Satan to exist? Satan was originally an angel in God's heavenly assembly who stirred up a revolt against God so that he could have God's power. God created Lucifer for a noble purpose, but God also created him with the ability to choose, just as God has given us the ability to choose. Now does this undermine the authority of God that He created beings with the luxury of choice? No. Now, we can either be mad at God for allowing us to choose, because the product is sometimes pain, or we can thank Him that he has given us the ability to choose. We could ask God to stop all things that are evil, but by doing that we would be asking God to no longer allow us to choose. I'll end with this: If you were to ask God to stop all of the pain and suffering on all levels in the world, would you live until midnight?

π Karl Barth π <krlbrth@aol.com>

DISCLAIMER

Another year has come and gone without any sort of crippling lawsuits. If we wish for another year to pass, we here at FRICH must remind you that we are not accountable for any of the tripe you may read in these pages. Another batch of writers has revealed who they are, so now you can go out and kindly dispute your differences with them. Otherwise, wait for the writers with whom you have issues to graduate so that you can find out who they are and argue with them then. Either way, leave us out of it, and as always: PLEASE DON'T SUE!