

---

# F R I C H

## Forum for Research Into Communication History

---

Man, that last issue just sucked. You may be thinking, "Man, all those dorks do is bitch and whine and moan about stuff." And you're right. So, to make it fair, I'm offering you the chance to complain. Want to say something that won't be published in the school newspaper? Is a teacher or administrator going off on you? Just want to get something off your chest? Sick of the speed bumps in the parking lot? Email me at <lafayette@frich.zzn.com> and let me know! Send it anonymously, I don't care. I'll print it and see that it's distributed. Maybe we can get something done instead of just talking about it like <some people> do[].

π Marquis de Lafayette π

### 10 Constitutional Amendments Which Do Not Apply Here

1. Congress shall make no law... prohibiting the free exercise of religion.
2. The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.
4. The right of the people to secure in their persons... against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated.
5. No person shall... be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.
6. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy, and public trial.
8. ...[N]or cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.
10. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution...are reserved... to the people.
13. Neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude... shall exist within the United States.
14. ...[N]or shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.
27. ...[T]he manufacture, sale, or possession of intoxicating substances... is hereby unprohibited.

### Um... Nice Thingy...

What's a roach? What's a blow? What's an orgy? Why are you smiling like that? Why should he take a cold shower? What are you talking about?

These are the inquiries of the naïve mind. Annoying, aren't they? People seem stupid or prudish if they wonder aloud what the word "dildo" means. But let's not jump to conclusions. These poor devils are victims of a defective education. I myself sat in that seat for a spell. Remember the Seinfeld episode where Jerry dates a woman but never gets her name? When he tries to pry it out of her, he gets one clue: that it rhymes with a part of the feminine anatomy. At the end, when he finally figures out that her name is Delores, I was very confused. I had no clue what the coinciding rhyme was. I was a freshman about this time, and I decided that to check Niwot's library in hope of enlightenment. The resources available were less than satisfying. Every sex-ed book was either much too vague or just out of date. Eventually, I figured out the answer

through other sources, but I am still disappointed in the paucity of useful material offered by our school's library.

After a great deal of thought, I have come up with a solution to this horrifying dilemma. Sure, we could appeal to the school board with a demand for a more comprehensive collection of literature, but that would require actual planning and effort. Nay, instead I urge all of you to share your knowledge with others. Let your younger sibling borrow your porn, teach your friends how to play strip poker. I know if we all do our part, no one will have to listen to the phrase "Who is Dirk Diggle?" again.

π Misha Promiskiev π

### Competition in our school today: competition or rivalry?

Today in our beloved school of Niwot high, most of us enjoy participating in extra-curricular events. We strive to be the best by putting many hours in accomplishing what we think as "team spirit" and "Cougar Pride." Yet, no matter how much we strive to accomplish the ultimate goal of winning there is at least one person who feels unsatisfied or cheated. Why is that?

The answer is this: although we may feel as though we are competing against one another, we are in fact rivaling against one another. Right about now you're probably wondering "so what's the difference? Aren't rivalry and competition the same?" The fact of the matter is no, they are not. True, both are used as a good motivator and reason to win, but the process and outcome of using rivalry and competition are entirely different. Webster's dictionary describes competition as having a honor as a base. Honor is hard to describe. I think it is because so very few people actually experience the feeling. Honor is doing something in which one is required to do regardless of how the individual feels. A good example of competition is when two teams play a game without cheating or gaining an unfair advantage. By competing on a level of fairness, they are both able to use their natural abilities to their highest expectations. Plus they are not tormented with guilt about cheating if they win or lose. I guess that's what all of those coaches in gym consider good sportsmanship.

Rivalry on the other hand is the antithesis of competition. Rivalry is nothing but a desire for one's selfish gratification. This breeds hatred, which results in cheating, fighting, and complete loss of reason. Why should we care? For years students and teachers at Niwot have used the second cousin of competition as a justification of their own desires and self-gratification. Time and time again we are told to compete in school, in academics, and in life. That's how you succeed in life. Advanced placement classes are now what the intellectuals are expected to be in, while varsity is the bear minimum of the "star athlete". Those who can accomplish such tasks are

given awards, patted on the back, and recognized at assemblies in front of the other low-lives who haven't accomplished such things. They are made examples of and teachers expect every single student to push through the proverbial meat-grinder to become exactly like the Pygmalion statue that they have sculpted into perfection. But we can't all be 4.8 gpa student, and we all can't letter four or five times in athletics. That's the real world. We all can't be the best at everything.

I think it is safe to assume that teachers know this as well. But why do they continually tell us to be good at everything? Why do they encourage it?

Many people find this frustrating. They not only learn to hate those who can accomplish the tasks that they couldn't, but they also feel like the only way to accomplish those tasks themselves is by cheating. For many rivalry is something that gets them through their high school careers. The results of rivalry becomes tangled and dissatisfaction.

It is disheartening to think about it; that our whole way of accomplishing and being motivated towards winning is a form of selfish gratification. But consider this an opportunity to leave this hierarchy of antagonism. I think of it in a way as people being on a ladder. Those above you intimidate you, while the ones below you, you intimidate. If you step off of that ladder, and join the circle of humanity, where everyone is equal in opportunity and statute, then, in the words of John Lennon, we can "join the human race"

π Betsy Ross π

## WTF is Wrong With These People's Heads?

Let's take a trip, shall we, through my standard day at Niwot High. After drifting along through the intellectual wastelands that are my first classes, I finally wake up at around 9:15, trying to remember what year it is. I drift back to sleep after some brief notes, reawaken half-way through my next (to which I have conveniently been dragged), take a few notes, then proceed to fall asleep (again) in a mad state of confusion. At the end of the day, somebody nudges me, I get up, and I head for the bus.

Yet I still manage to keep up a bare-minimum of a 3.5 GPA in the advanced programs that have been offered to the \*cough cough\* "gifted students" of our wonderful school.

Now, I'm not sure what is going on here. I understand that I'm smart. I've been through the government testing to prove it. But I can't be THAT much smarter than the average person.

Something has to be wrong. I've never studied for a test for more than fifteen minutes (and even that, due to convenient scheduling, usually comes during the lunch period prior to the test), so that can't be it. I've never read a single textbook assignment, yet I can survive Mr. Williamson's (one of Niwot's few outstanding teachers, if you ask me) HORRIFIC exams by just listening to the man talk. And I have, as of writing this, not taken up the practice of making sacrificial offerings to please the testing Gods.

So, as I sat around one day, waiting for my inevitable sleep to come, I came up with the solution: De-evolution. The way I figure it, about a hundred and thirty years ago, some scientists were sitting

around a table talking about how the "dude with the peas" might be right about genetics. So they figured that with intelligence being (to some extent) a matter of heredity, the concept of natural selection would make the members of humanity grow to become steadily smarter. So they established that the information given by high schools should, over due time, grow to become increasingly more complex.

Little do the commoners of today realize this long-running plot against their feeble-minded offspring. So while those of us who have gone along with the evolutionary flow are okay, certain others are forced to furrow their brows in a vain attempt to understand the material.

So, I suppose I'm here to propose a solution to the problem that I have been addressing. I am sending a call-to-arms out to all members of the Niwot High School community. DON'T go fooling around with somebody based on their car. The quality of your future relationship is NOT a function of breast size. Remember, you're not just messing up your life when you knock up some random < censor >, you're destroying the genetic fabric of the future.

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

## Tolerance... A Virtue?

When did tolerance become the ultimate virtue? These days, not only is tolerance regarded as more important than the views it claims to protect, but it also takes precedence even to itself. Let me explain: It seems we can no longer discuss such subjects as politics or religion, for fear of appearing, "closed-minded." We must "accept everyone's beliefs," and mustn't dare to insinuate that they're wrong. But what if my belief is that someone else is wrong? Should that view be considered intolerable? According to the virtue of tolerance, yes *and* no. Tolerance contradicts itself. By virtue of tolerance, I have to tolerate everyone else's views, but if my personal view is that *they* are wrong, is my view not to be accepted as well? This very question leaves us with the conclusion that tolerance is a logical fallacy.

Tolerance has become so socially vital that it's begun replacing that most essential of virtues: *Love*, in the broadest sense of the word – that is, caring about each other human being. May I demonstrate with an analogy: Imagine you are exploring a condemned building, having no idea that it's scheduled to be blown up in half an hour. What would be the tolerant thing for me, the passer-by, to do: leave you in the building because you seem to be enjoying yourself? By reacting in such a way, I *am* tolerating your actions, and saving you the unpleasant information that you are about to be killed. But what would be the more loving action for me to take? Simple logic dictates that I ought to warn you of the danger, so you won't be blown to smithereens. In this case, which is more important – love or tolerance? True, in some cases, tolerance is *part of* love. However, there are many instances in life, regardless of one's particular views, that love must triumph over tolerance.

π John Morton <martin@frich.zzn.com> π  
(Editor's Note: I'll tolerate this article, but don't love it)