

---

# F R I C H

<http://frich.flatirons.org>

[submit@frich.zzn.com](mailto:submit@frich.zzn.com)

---

## Balance the Scales

Ever wonder where the terms 'left' and 'right' were first used to describe political orientation? The English Parliament. The representatives from the House of Lords sat to the right of the King, and those representatives of the House of Commons sat on the King's left. Ever since then, the left has stood for largely liberal ideals, and the right, for those ideals typically held by conservatives.

With that boring-as-hell-I'm-sure introduction, I will now reveal my peeve. As any student who reads FRICH knows, every month or so there is some *far* left article about the evils of capitalism. To said articles and their respective authors, I say, "No <censored>, Sherlock." Anyone with enough brains to avoid stepping in dog doo knows that money has not been the best influence on the human condition and how it has affected history. To quote one particularly ill-conceived article, "Britney Spears=poverty." For one, I wasn't aware that Britney had any money troubles, and two, just because she has no artistic talent, value, or relevancy doesn't mean she causes Street Corner Bob to blow all his cash on Thunderbird.

The second reason that I view those far left articles with so much distaste is that such anarchistic arguments are flawed. I'm not saying that this country does not have a tremendous amount of highly painful and difficult problems to overcome. I *am* saying that writing such "Consumer Report" articles is a waste of time. When will radicals learn that virtually no high school students care about governmental corruption to the degree that they do? For instance, most high schoolers don't know or care that Dick Cheney's former oil company, Halliburton, sold Saddam Hussein highly needed oil drilling equipment which helped finance (read: buoy) Iraq's economy, ignoring Saddam's real interest in learning how to refine plutonium.

Reading this, one could garner the impression that I

am as Republican as one dude could possibly get. No. To be frank, I find Republicans to have as many faults as radical Democrats. Dubya's ideological war on Iraq has yet to provide any non-rhetorical evidence that Saddam must go, and his little secret military tribunal stunt was an absolutely *brilliant* move. Republicans also seem to have a teensy problem with the fact that humongous tax cuts for the top 1% of moneyed Americans don't help a pregnant, single, 17-year-old girl from Queens pay the bills and get through high school.

The point of this article is that it is not for any one person to sit in judgment of another and say "You have nothing to contribute." Both sides of any argument or conflict in history can be seen to have good points and flaws. For instance, I know that I am going to catch some major flak for saying this, but even Hitler did a few beneficial things. I *know* that he was a monstrous person who rightfully symbolizes evil in its deepest, darkest, most horrid depths, forever poisoning Germany's history with his hand in yet another chapter of the Jewish Diaspora. Yet, before the war, he gave the German people pride: pride in themselves, their country, and their culture. The Treaty of Versailles plunged Germany into economic despair on a lower level than The Great Depression did, and it made them ashamed of who they were. Hitler restored Germany's patriotism. Keep in mind that this was minor compared to the horrible, horrible atrocities he committed against mankind by dehumanizing homosexuals, Jews, Communists, and many other peoples.

In the end, history must be examined on an even, balanced scale. Then, and only then, can the authors of *Consumer Report* (and the authors of Falwell's speeches) see that their opponents' sides do have a point in existing.

π Ira Hayes π

<redmenace@frich.zzn.com>

## *Dialectic Ranting*

### Medieval Paladins: Mightiest of all Heroes

I'm not talking about Dungeons and Dragons. I'm talking about the real guys. Chivalrous and great, paladins are the guys that do good deeds from the goodness of their hearts, without any thought of reward. Yeah, those guys.

Back in the medieval times, anyone could walk the earth with a sword and a shield calling themselves a hero. Rescue one damsel in distress or brave a fire to save someone and you were set for life. Now, the paladins back then were different from knights. They still were chivalrous and maybe did some jousting, but they had their own code of ethics. A paladin was bound by honor to do what was good rather than what was lawful. If the laws of the land interfered with the rights of the individuals, it was the paladin's duty to support the individuals' inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Paladins loved to increase their honor. To the paladin, honor was doing whatever it took to bring about the greatest good for all. Paladins went out of their way to increase their honor.

But times have changed. In the 21st century, it takes a lot more to be a hero. We live in a world where most of us look for trouble rather than honor, and look out for only one person: ourselves. We need some modern-day paladins. You don't need a sword or a shield, to belong or to be an outcast, to be within or without, to be smart or strong, to be talented or ordinary, or to be pretty or plain to be a paladin. *We all* can be paladins. We all have the ability and the need to help others in this world that we live in. Interested? First, prepare yourself: Start helping others and seeing on the inside of everybody. Be kind 24/7, and, eventually, you'll find us.

You *will* find us.

### π Bodhisattva and Space Monkey π

What the heck is this!? An actual section within FRICH? Well, Timmy, we made this place, *Dialectic Ranting*, for the sake of having a way to print two articles on opposite sides of the same topic. Pretty cool, huh?

You know what that means, right? Now you can trick your buddy into writing an article, write something better that disproves his claims, and be printed in FRICH one-upping your pal. And isn't *that* what friends are for?

### Community Service Sucks

Why should you do community service or feel guilty for not helping those in need? Why is "need" a sufficient claim to money or food, and why do we have to earn them through hard work (or embezzling)? What right do people who "need" have to claim our earned money or food or land or anything? I agree that someone who needs money to climb out of a tight spot, but can also pay you back, should get it. But why do bums, people who will not work and will not or cannot contribute to society, feel that they have the right to take from the workers who earn everything? What right and what standards do poor people of other countries have to claim that we, as Americans, are bad because we have money that was raised up from nothing by hard work? Why let the needy loot your life savings?

Feel free to be charitable if it makes you feel good about yourself, but don't do it to impress others, and don't do it to sanction the looters as they victimize you.

"For centuries, the battle of morality was fought between those who claimed that your life belongs to God and those who claimed that it belongs to your neighbors - between those who preached that the good is self-sacrifice for the sake of ghosts in heaven and those who preached that the good is self-sacrifice for the sake of incompetents on earth. And no one came to say that your life belongs to you and that the good is to live it." - Ayn Rand, *Atlas Shrugged*

People call me selfish. They call me an egomaniac, an egotist, an egoist, and a confidence junkie. (Okay, I made that last one up, but it sounds good, no?) I say, "Hell yeah, I am!" and walk away. If I had a choice between my life and that of an innocent, little baby, then "buh bye, baby"; I'd eat it if I had to have something to survive! Don't be a slave to compassion; be a trader with competence. Trade value for value, and never let yourself be looted, robbed, or victimized in any way. Follow your own ideas and ideals, and don't be a looter or a sheep (we all hate ewe!). "Man will go on. Man, not men." - Ayn Rand, *Anthem*

### π Undefined Temple π

## State of Television Affairs

As of late, I have noticed a disturbing trend in the programming on television: It's getting dumber. Now, many of you will furrow your brows in disbelief at the preceding statement, so let's look at the facts. In the 1990s, the so-called "bread and butter" of television was the situational comedy, or sitcom. These programs were, and still are, shows based on an underlying theme displayed via the characters, which could be adapted so that, if the show was profitable, it could be continued until the vice was true. These shows, while superficially simple, were often laced with jokes and puns that made the show interesting for viewers with brain-pans capable of grasping concepts deeper than "Look at the shiny TV." Prime examples of these are The Simpsons, Seinfeld, and News Radio. However, somewhere recently, things have taken a turn for the worse.

Lately, I have noticed a proliferation of so-called "Reality" TV shows and downright drivel. Key examples are American Idol, The Osbournes, and The Anna Nicole Smith Show. These shows have no depth, no true value, and no future. American Idol was a chorus of untalented singers who would burst into tears when told they were tone-deaf. It had the goal of finding the next "Music Idol" who would sing pre-arranged, canned pop music. The Anna Nicole Smith Show and The Osbournes are not much better. While I have been told that The Osbournes is an amusing show, the premise is still flawed. The

entire basis of these shows is putting cameras in someone's house and watching them pursue mundane, day-to-day tasks. One entire episode of The Anna Nicole Smith Show was watching her buy a house. This isn't entertainment. This is tripe aimed at, dare I say, losers who cannot acquire a life of their own and have to live vicariously through others.

Another disturbing trend that has arisen is in the new sitcoms. The \*ahem\* "Hit TV Series" Boston Public is a prime example of this new trend: The show's plot line is based entirely on sexually taboo subject matter! The base plot is not flawed; a show about a public school does have possibilities, if properly executed. This show, however, was not. Apparently, the television executives feel that the only way to sell a show to the general public is to lace it with sex.

What does all of this mean? Someone, somewhere, working for a television corporation thinks that *you* are an idiot. Let's prove them wrong. Don't support the advertisers of these show, nor those of other equally demeaning shows that I have not mentioned. If the advertisers do not make money, they will not sponsor the shows and the shows will fail. Let's end this lapse in TV executive judgment and prove that we are capable of thinking for ourselves.

π Nikoli Nikolievich π

## Osama the Cockroach

Recently, the United States Army has been running around like chickens with their heads cut off. Why? Simply because they're chasing an old man with kidney failure and a nerve-dead arm who, on top of that, has the same facial hair and turban as the entire population of stereotypical Afghanistan and the Middle East. Hmm, this should be easy.... But, then again, Osama is like a cockroach, a Twinkie and Jerry Springer: They just don't die. You could go right out and nuke 'em, and all it would do is force them to mutate. Then we would have bearded cockroaches that are cream-filled and fattening and cheat on their lovers with their cousins. So, I think that option number one has been eliminated.

What else could we do? Maybe we could use psychological warfare. Such tactics may include, but

are not limited to, telemarketing, playing Britney Spears's latest CD, non-stop broadcasts of "The Rosie O'Donnell Show," and using Dan Akroyd as an ambassador. Fight extremely cheap and dirty.

Then there is option number three: create the ultimate survivor game. We could make not only those little yellow packages of food, but also little yellow bombs. Then, we would paint American flags on both and write the words "God Bless America" on the sides. They'll never know what hit them. So instead of all this chasing, I say we just modify our tactics a little. There has to be something that can take him down. Sooner or later, someone will find him.

π Vassili Zaitsev π

## Pearls of Wisdom

I overheard a conversation in my math class the other day. One girl was excitedly describing a wild rabbit that she plans to keep with her domesticated bunny. Another girl listened earnestly, but upon hearing that the rabbits were to be placed in the same cage, she cried, "You can't do that!"

"Why not?" asked the first girl.

"Because rabbits are cannibals. The wild one will eat the tame one."

"No!" said the first girl in disbelief. "That's not true."

"Oh yes, it is. The wild ones are cannibals."

"Well, only certain breeds are cannibals," said the rabbit owner.

"Cottontails are the most vicious!" said the second girl firmly, and the face of the first girl fell. She was clearly disappointed that her newfound pet was a cannibalistic monster. I wanted desperately to comfort her and tell her that rabbits aren't cannibals, but it was just too damn funny. I was laughing too hard to offer words of solace.

I am continually impressed by the level of intellect at Niwot High. The snatches of conversation I overhear, the debates I witness in class, and the discussions I have with (thankfully distant) acquaintances never fail to surprise and delight me. Here are just a few of the wise words of Niwot's finest thinkers.

- "They can't get rid of the Pledge of Allegiance. I mean, people have been saying it for thousands of years."
- "Humans have been around a lot longer than all other animals, so it's only reasonable that we would be way more advanced."
- "I don't care what you say! There are fat people in Europe."
- "Oh wow! It really smells like pee in here." (Remark made just after the speaker walked into a bathroom.)
- "One of the most funner times was when I asked if that was a mint to some old guy." (Said an IB Chemistry student.)
- "If you were me, first of all, you'd have a <ensored>."
- "The pope was selling something similar to indulgences to raise money for the turn of the millennium."
- "Why are we writing essays; this is *english* for God's sake. Aren't we supposed to be learning about the English or something?"

Once, I tried to explain political systems in terms of monkeys. I got blank looks and questions like "So if the Communist monkeys all want the bananas, why don't

they just eat them all at once?" and "If I were a Capitalist monkey I would give my banana away anyhow because I don't like bananas."

Even teachers can occasionally be funny by making a stupid statement or two.

- "That money should be going to Governor Bill Owens," said one, "so that he can help us."
- Another remarked, "Well, I'm sure the Student Council does have a budget. They have to, don't they?"
- A history teacher asked innocently, "Do you guys all know what beavers are?"

But sarcasm aside, only one thing really needs to be said. My friend Jared described it best when he wrote: "Not to play the part of the tormented genius, but my life will never escape my interactions with a few stupid people, and the many more people stupid enough to believe what they hear. If stupidity were a disease, my biggest lament is that it's not fatal."

If only it were.

$\pi$  Margaret Mead  $\pi$

### Disclaimer:

FRICH Consolidated LLC and all of its subsidiaries would like to remind the formerly unenlightened party (which shall, from this point on, be referred to as 'you') that they are not responsible for any damages that may occur in the process of or as a result of reading this product. Also, we reserve the right to make with the choppy-choppy and snippity-snip for general editing purposes.

Some people claim that we have an "agenda" other than that of printing a newspaper. At that, we laugh heartily. Some even go so far as to try to make their own newspaper and/or challenge our authority as your forum.

At that, laugh heartilier.

With that said, we should probably place more emphasis on putting an email address on articles you submit through our website. It saves you and your friends from having to make your own 'forum' to print your stuff, and it saves us the trouble of keeping something that's almost printable in our article pool. All of this from one little email address. See how this is a win/win situation? Hurray for cooperation! Now remember these quotes to live by:

"Competition makes us look better."

"Duffman says a lot of things."

**"Please don't sue!"**