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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 assisted to learn of the First Amendment objections that have been raised by some opponents of this law.

As a person needs to do is read the text of the measure to conclude that the opponents' assertions as to possibly unconstitutional applications of this law are pure fantasy. Section 6 specifically 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 toward the development of nuclear weapons." Thus, the act explicitly 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 untenable 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 specious 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, let them say so, not cast their arguments in phony First Amendment or academic freedom language.

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

Mark C. Cogan
Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

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 Bronn Bell 10-kilometer race this year. I'd like to say thanks to whoever set up the booming stereo system, as it really perked me up to hear 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 experience.

Sharon Gartenberg
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