Nuclear-free act author answers its opponents

To the Editor:

As one of the attorneys who helped draft the Nuclear Free Cambridge measure, I was aston-
ished to learn of the First Amendment objections that have been raised by some opponents of
this law.

All a person needs to do is read the text of the measure to conclude that the opponents' ac-
tions are no different from any other constitutional issues. Section 6 spec-
ifically provides as follows: "Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit or regulate ... basic research, the primary purpose of which is not to work
ward the development of nuclear weapon." Thus, the act ex-
pli
cally protects all research other
than that directed toward the building of nuclear weapons. In
the face of such clear language, how anyone can imagine that a
person's freedom of expression would be curtailed is nothing
short of preposterous. In effect the opponents are asserting the
streamlined notion that a person has a First Amendment right to
build nuclear weapons.

The arguments raised by the opponents of the Nuclear Free Cambridge measure are so spurious
that one must see them for what they are: desperate, bad faith attempts to deter the voters of
Cambridge from addressing the true issues. If the opponents
want to develop nuclear weapons in Cambridge, let them say so,
not cast their arguments in phony First Amendment or aca-
demic freedom language.

I am confident that Cambridge voters will not be fooled by any smoke-screen raised by the op-
ponents of Ballot Measure 2.

Mark C. Cogan
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MIT cheers helped this runner

To the Editor:

I was one of the 7700 or so
women who ran by MIT during the Columbus Day Bonne Bell 10-kilometer race this year. I'd like to see thanks to whoever set up the booming stereo system—it really perked me up when I heard some good, loud music. Thanks, too, to the fraternity which was out cheering in force, and to all the other MIT people who lined the route. To a 9.30-a.m. runner, hearing an encouraging crowd was a very special experi-
ence.

Sharon Gartenberg