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LOVE IS DEAD, details inside
Although the United States developed the atomic bomb for use in World War II, as soon as the war ended this historically unique weapons technology was enslaved by an equally unique context and remained captive for decades. This context—a world split into two realms in irreconcilable ideological, political, and military conflict—shaped, or rather warped, American strategies for coping with weapons of mass destruction. With the Cold War now over, the drama of the nuclear age has entered a more volatile second act. It will end with the destructive use of nuclear weapons, and we will know not the hour nor the day.

Good fortune guided the world past all potential infernos during the first act. Neither Hitler nor Stalin gained a dominant head start in building atomic bombs. The Kremlin was never led by a lunatic nuclear gambler. And as technologies for these weapons began to escape meaningful international controls, the Cold War competition ended. Finally, despite several accidents and mistakes that could have sparked a large-scale nuclear war (and whose horrid details are still largely shrouded in secrecy), the superpowers always stopped just short of the abyss. At each of these fateful moments, the world escaped nuclear holocaust—seemingly by accident.

Having traveled this far, however, the world still teeters at the edge of the precipice. But the collapse of the Soviet empire provided a window of opportunity that offered a second chance. It is now up to the United States government and hostile forces to guide this transformation and the fate of the future. Throughout the Cold War the United States was the intellectual leader in the development of nuclear technology, strategy, and arms control regimes. European strategists collaborated constructively in this effort, and with a ten to twenty year lag, nuclear efforts in Moscow by and large also subscribed to American strategic theories, even before the Soviet Union's demise. Since the invention of the atomic bomb, political leaders understood that in times of both war and peace sovereign nations must accommodate the existence of weapons of mass destruction and accommodate their international life accordingly. This fact of international life was stressed by statesmen at a time when the weapons still had a strong emotional resonance, and every President from Truman to Reagan affirmed it. By exerting sustained leadership the United States can—again with some good luck—succeed where past projects that sought to establish an international authority that would exert worldwide authority over the entire field of atomic energy, was destined to fail.

Half a century, and 50,000 nukes, later this new project could obviously not prevent production of nuclear arms in every country, nor destroy existing arsenals. Its goal would be to establish sufficient guidelines over the use of weapons of mass destruction so that open societies could continue to flourish. Democracy cannot survive in a highly unstable world where Manhattan or Paris can be vaporized by the detonation of a smuggled nuclear weapon, and in a world where such calamities might reoccur. A scheme to preserve the tradition of nonuse is still a small matter. A place to start, indeed a necessary beginning, would be a consensus among the five major nuclear powers against first use, except in response to an attack involving other weapons of mass destruction. The principal nuclear powers must also prepare a coordinated response to penalize first-use and prevent repetition by destroying the nuclear capabilities of violators.

Unfortunately, in the absence of the emotional shock destructive nuclear detonations would generate, it seems highly unlikely that such a project will be implemented. The current nuclear powers are still mired in the deep trenches of Cold
War thought, and the Russian military views nukes as an inexpensive manner of border patrol. But the United States must realize that the best offensive and defensive weapons systems will not provide any protection in the new nuclear age.

Rather than make rash decisions in the wake of the coming nuclear calamity, the United States should at least think how best to respond, and prepare helpful measures beforehand. A nuclear blast would show the vaunted deterrent to be incapable of providing massive destruction at home. It will undermine democratic government and demoralize military services. As divided and unprepared democratic forces fumble and prepare for action, demagogues will rise to the forefront, convincingly promising protection. When the era of nonuse ends violently, nations will freely choose dictatorship to preserve order and survive. Conversely, the principle powers might adopt an ill-conceived scheme for world government that would either degenerate into world tyranny or—far more likely—prove totally ineffective.

Any serious international regulation of nuclear weapons is bound to entail troublesome incursions into national sovereignty. The need for ubiquitous intelligence must be balanced with the preservation of civil liberties. Indeed, maintaining a worldwide control over the use of weapons of mass destruction will require difficult choices and create new political and military dangers. But there is no alternative. THE STATUS QUO WILL NOT LAST.

"I'm too upset about Bill Gates being the richest man in the world to write an Eclectic article."
--Joseph Clark

"One thing about IBM: they know how to make a box."
--Frank Ducrest

Baby, You've Lost That Murky, Blurry, Underwater Feelin'

Album Reviewed: "Loveless" by My Bloody Valentine
Reviewer: Dave Aurich
Rating: **** 1/2 (of five)
Fast Forwards: "touched"
Best Stuff: the rest
Overall Impression:
My Bloody Valentine continues the "British Invasion" in music that everyone is always talking about. Like most people, I got several new CDs for Christmas, and Loveless by My Bloody Valentine was one of them. Now, I'm sure you're saying, "My Bloody Valentine, they must be a death metal band." Although the name might be misleading, it in no way detracts from the downright excellence and purity of this album.

Formed in 1984 by Irishman Kevin Shields, MBV has a catalogue that includes 4 full-length albums and 10-12 EPs and singles. Backed by drummer Colin O'Clossaig, bassist Debbie Gooze, and guitarist/vocalist Billinda Butcher, Shields and Co. have practically created a new category of music that cannot easily be explained in a conventional manner. You just have to hear Loveless to know what I'm talking about.

Shields' innovations in guitar playing have won him the recognition that he so much deserves. Released in 1991, Loveless combines every aspect of every innovation that Shields has ever created. From the thick, saturated, whammy-bar-driven guitars, to the tough drum programming and use of samples makes Loveless a modern masterpiece. The mix of the vocal tracks is surprisingly good. Although the vocal tracks seem to blend right into the music, they help add to the overall murky, blurry, underwater feeling of Loveless.

My Bloody Valentine (which, by the way, took their name from a Canadian Bmovie Horror Film) are alarmingly talented, but still have not gotten the attention they deserve. Actually, what is even more alarming is that Stephen Cedars and Blair Langlinais have actually seen the movie
My Bloody Valentine. Current plans for MBV include a new EP (gee, what a surprise) out possibly in February or March and a tour, not excluding the U.S., in the Spring of 1997 (Now, that is a surprise!). MBV, in their 12 years of existence, have only played a few times in the U.S., so this tour will be absolutely incredible. I can just imagine: the lights go down and MBV begins an incredibly intense, sonically pure session of feedback-induced jams. If you've heard Loveless you can agree that an MBV concert would be bliss.

HEY CORPORATE AMERICA, DOWNSIZE ME!
by Richy Baudoin

Ever since the Republicans gained control of Congress in the so-called "Revolution of '94," the United States political climate has been pretty bland. The 1996 Republican and Democrat conventions looked like pep rallies for an over-funded athletic team. During campaign season, I couldn't tell for what party Bill Clinton was running, and Bob Dole was well... Bob Dole. Sure there were glimpses of right-wing extremism (i.e. Pat Buchanan), but nothing to stir the country into a widespread political fury. I almost gave up on politics... then came Michael Moore.

After releasing his award-winning documentary, Roger and Me, on the economically-depressed Flint, Michigan in 1989, Michael Moore became somewhat of a celebrity. Since then, he has released two other movies, Pets or Meat: The Return to Flint and Canadian Bacon. He has also produced and hosted a popular but controversial TV series called TV Nation that basically makes fools out of everyone on the right. Since its cancellation Moore pretty much dropped out of the public eye. I became worried. Finally, a leftist on mainstream television and what happens? he is vaporized. I guess the left doesn't control the media after all. What was Michael Moore doing? Writing Downsize This!

The title says it all. Downsize This!

is a brutal attack on all of the American corporations who have somehow found it necessary to lay off tens of thousands of workers in the last five years. Moore handles this topic and many more in thirty-five hysterical chapters satirizing the flaws of the American political and economic system. In one of the chapters he attempts to commit the ultra-conservative Congressman from California, Bob Dornan. He also brainstorms new names for America, plans a riot celebrating the fifth anniversary of the Rodney King verdict, and proposes to General Motors a plan to sell crack for higher profits. While mainly a satire, Downsize This! does have a few social messages, including Moore's attack on America's apathy towards the working class. At best, this book will help create a more interesting political scene. At worst, it will be the victim of a mass book-burning sponsored by Pat Buchanan.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

"I'd bet there'd be some really weird creatures down there."
-- Tom Pau speculating on the possibility of the Marina Trench fauna

"What! Why am I writing this? No one will be able to understand this!"
-- Jerome Moroux

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

COUNTING CROWS,
part deux.
by William Barousse

Editor's Note: The author of this piece collapsed into a Cheetos and Jello-Pudding induced coma in mid-writing. His present condition is unknown--rumors coming out of the hospital about him demanding a foot massage in an Italian accent from an irate nurse are wholly unsubstantiated. Any incoherent babbling must be excused.

Artist: The Counting Crows
Album: Recovering the Satellites
Rating: ****(out of five)
Following the success of their 1993 "August and Everything After," the Counting Crows second album is a truly enjoyable piece of work. Though many bands that have successful first albums fall into a "sophomore slump," the Counting Crows do just the opposite. "Recovering the Satellites" contains many rock tunes, several ballads, and even a blues sounding track. Though the whole album is truly enjoyable, "Children in Bloom" as well as "Have You Seen Me Lately?" are the high points of the album. Both of these songs are well played and have amazingly catchy choruses. However, that is not to detract from the rest of the album, which showcases a variety of amazing vocal ability as well as some very intricate music. "Recovering the Satellites" is amazing from start to finish and is a very impressive follow-up companion to "August and Everything After." If you are a fan of good music, I highly recommend this album.

"Besides helping us avoid plot in novels, Existentialism helps us avoid cleaning up after parties."

--Adam Young

SPIRIT IN A PILL
by BEAU FLEMING

Before continuing, I would like to preface this article with my personal feelings. I feel that ESA is one of the best schools in the nation. The teachers are intuitive and friendly, and their classes are usually interesting and challenging. The physical environment of ESA encourages learning and a sense of peace. I have been dreading leaving this school that I have had the great fortune of calling my home for four brief years. The friends and memories I have gathered at ESA will be fondly remembered. One of the best features at ESA is that here, we can discuss our problems openly.

One of the many issues facing ESA in recent years has been a decline in so-called spirit. This topic has been of particular concern to the senior class and senior advisors, as the twelfth grade is perceived as the leader of the school. Perhaps I should clarify the popular definition of spirit. It may be defined as "The yelling and/or screaming in chapel, gymnasiums, or other public areas where you may be seen. It may also include posters, signs, or other physical trappings of 'love.'" However, not everyone shows their love of ESA by screaming on command.

I am one of these students who have been shamed by students and faculty for refusing to yell and participate in "spirited" activities. Teachers have told me that I must not care for ESA all that much, or that I don't care for my fellow students on various teams. I, for one, am sick of this kind of treatment. How does anyone know how I, or anyone else, feels? Merely because we feel embarrassed about acting like a crazed maniac, we are branded as "bad students," or bullied into doing these distasteful activities. I have even been called a "bad president." I would like one of my accusers to direct me to the section in the ESA constitution on the class president's responsibility to yell. Class officers and the like are required to act as a mediator between faculty members and their fellow students, not lunatics.

I would agree that there are problems with spirit here at ESA; however, none of them lie with the "spirit turncoats." First, the whole
idea behind spirit is that it be genuine. It should not be forced. You choose to attend athletic events and cheer for your team. You may choose to yell and scream in the stands. I certainly am not against allowing people to behave in that manner if it is of their own choosing. However, do not try to force people who feel uncomfortable into doing something they do not want to do. This coerced spirit only arouses the resentment and embitterment of the silent minority.

Another aspect of "school spirit" that disturbs me is the newly found vicious dark side of this supposed unifying feeling. One mistake that the senior class made was the "senior challenge." For those of you who have forgotten this stillborn child of spirit, we issued a challenge to the other classes that we could beat them in attendance percentages. If other classes managed to exceed our attendance, they would be rewarded with our seats in chapel. After a couple of games, people were accused of cheating and controversy ensued. During one specific "pep-rally," the seniors managed to win the spirit stick based on yelling, posters, and a skit. After that, we were accused of cheating by a certain group. This was a far-cry from the utopia we believed would arise from this challenge. However, before anyone begins to assume that this is an article by a senior attacking other classes, I would like to say that I am far from pleased with my own class. During last week's pep-rally, the cutthroat behavior I beheld at the bonfire on the parts of classmates was in truly bad taste. This person (or group of people) actually told me to do something unethical merely to win the spirit stick. Their reasoning was, "Because we're seniors." Should we sell our souls for a piece of wood? Furthermore, why should we automatically win the spirit stick merely because of our age? Every class has just as much right to the spirit stick as any other class.

Finally, I would like to address the most recent spirit event, the homecoming pep-rally. It was here that I witnessed one of the most interesting aspects of spirit at ESA. Before I continue, I would like to reflect back on an issue which touched off scandal here at ESA and another school. Many of you probably know the very article about which I speak. Well, many teachers and students felt that instead of concentrating on the negative aspects of one school, we should instead focus on the positive aspects of ESA. Many people would agree that this is a sound policy, and the heart of loving your school. Keep this in mind as I continue. During this pep-rally, people at Berwick were characterized as, and I quote, "...stinky people with accents." Everyone laughed and applauded when a cheerleader read this off. Now personally, I have no problem with either of the two incidents. However, I do have a problem with double-standards.

In conclusion, I do not feel that any one group of people is responsible for this tarnishing of spirit at ESA. I think we all have an equal share in this problem facing us. However, I think the key to solving it lies in understanding. Instead of yelling at a person to scream and, "Love your school," I think we should realize that some people simply don't show their spirit that way. And I want to emphasize that I am by no means saying we should do away with pep-rallies, or anything else. I merely believe we should respect each other's rights and realize that we do not always know how other people feel.

ORAN AT THE DOORSTEP

ADAM YOUNG

Population expansion raises the statistical probability that pathogens will be transmitted, whether from person to person or vector—insect, rodent, or other—to person. Human density is rising rapidly worldwide. Seven countries now have overall population densities exceeding two-thousand people per square mile, and 43 have densities greater than 500 people per square mile. High density need not doom a nation to epidemics and unusual outbreaks of disease if sewage and water systems, housing, and public health provision are adequate. The Netherlands, for example, with one-thousand eight-hundred people per square mile, ranks among the top twenty countries for good health and life expectancy. But the areas in which density is increasing are those not capable of providing such infrastructural support. They are, rather, the poorest on earth. Even countries with relatively low
densities have cities which have become focuses for extraordinary overpopulation. Some of these urban agglomerations have only one toilet for every seven-hundred and fifty or more or more people.

Most people on the move in the world come into burgeoning metropolises like India's Surat (where pneumonic plague struck in 1994) or Zaire's Kikwit (site of the 1995 Ebola epidemic) that offer few fundamental amenities. These new centers of urbanization typically lack sewage systems, paved roads, housing, safe drinking water, medical centers, and schools adequate to serve even the most affluent residents. They are squalid sites of human desperation where hundreds of thousands live much as they would in poor villages, yet so jammed together as to ensure astronomical transmission rates for airborne, waterborne, sexually transmitted, and contact-transmission microbes.

But such centers are often only staging areas for the waves of impoverished people that are drawn there. The next stop is a megacity with a population of ten-million or more. In the nineteenth century, only two cities on earth--New York and London--even approached that size. Five years from now there will be twenty-four megacities, most in poor developing countries: Sao Palo, Calcutta, Bombay, Istanbul, Bangkok, Tehran, Cairo, Mexico City, Karachi, and the like. There the woes of cities like Surat are magnified many times over. Yet even the developing world's megacities are the way stations for those who most aggressively seek a better life. All paths ultimately lead to these people, and the microbes they carry.

Urbanization and global migration propel radical changes in human behavior as well as in the ecological relationship between microbes and humans. Almost invariably in large cities, sex industries arise, and multiple-partner sex becomes more common, promoting rapid increases in STDs. Black Market access to antimicrobials is greater in large cities, leading to overuse or outright misuse of the precious drugs and the emergence of resistant bacteria, viruses, and parasites. Intravenous drug user's practice of sharing needles is a ready vehicle for the transmission of microbes. Under-funded urban health centers often become unhygienic centers for the dissemination of disease rather than its control.

Poverty and Overpopulation are the enemies. Emblematic diseases without borders stand poised for the invasion and subjugation of the world, waiting in the winds of prudence for the unfurling of the sail of the favorable moment--with the cities as their vectors.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

"I'm not anti-spirit. I just hate people."
--Beau Fleming

"There is a major problem with sarcasm on this campus, and everybody is afraid to talk about it."
--Unknown

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
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The Adventures of Jacques

By William Sarousso

Today's Episode: Snickeroon

Hey Jacques!

Hello Pedro, do you have my doughnut?

How were your holidays?

I lost all my money betting on football games.

What teams did you bet on?

I bet on the Gorillas in every game.

Try telling that to my bookie!

Jacques, how are we going to fill this extra dialogue square?

Looks like we just did!

The Moral Is:

Don't Take Candy From Strangers!