CBS is under fire

When you're a reporter, you remember events through people. You can't recall the specific details, but you can remember a name, a man's face. The man we were interviewing was Leon Arrives, he ran the MIT gas station during the oil crunch in the late 1970s. You could see the patches of sweat under his arm pits, the skinny roughness in the his t-shirt. He was a man who had been keeping a low profile recently, perhaps to accumulate more responsibility for an attempt. Stories on his previously secret interest in swelling a network talk radio network had not been known.


A sarcastic look at the arms race

To the Editor:

On Wednesday, April 17, two distinguished MIT professors and the foundation for the first explosion of an atomic bomb. The two professors, Morris Saffir and Victor Weisskopf, were both physicists of the team that developed this first nuclear bomb. All three speakers talked of the evils of the nuclear weapon. They all agreed to that conventional weaponry and conventional warfare were infinitely better.

To me, this isn't what I think of when I think of nuclear weapons. It's not clear cut since it has been the subject of much determined whether the suffering caused by chemical warfare is greater than that caused by chemical warfare. (In fact, a number of studies have demonstrated that the suffering caused by nuclear blast is much less than that caused by chemical warfare.)

If this turned out to be the case, then based on this criteria of optimality, my choice would be to save the nuclear bomb.
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If this turned out to be the case, then based on this criteria of optimality, my choice would be to save the nuclear bomb. Of course, other choices are made to kill people. If my job is to build weapons, I want to build the most efficient ones I can. In the weapons that will kill the largest number of people at the lowest cost. The nuclear bomb is a weapon of mass destruction. Only telephone booths
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