Do not defend Bork with rhetoric

To the Editor:

Ms. Sanger, I, too, have been watching the Bork confirmation hearings with great interest. What astonishes me more than anything else is the "logic" portrayed in your column ['The logic of an 'abortion totalitarianism,' Sept. 22]. In it, you said in the context of Bork's testimony:\n
"...I am glad that you have not felt compelled to rely strictly on the facts for your attacks..."

To Robert Bork. Indeed, I think that it is you who has strayed from the facts.

By calling Kennedy and his supporters "abortionist(s)," you seem to imply that all those who oppose Bork's nomination are supporters of legalized abortion. It is ridiculous to make such a generalization which is based not in fact, but rather in your distorted view of the situation.

At the same time that you support your argument with positive, factual reasons, you resort to tearing apart the opposition through sarcastic and biting remarks. Any good debater will tell you that this type of attack proves nothing and discards the attacker.

You sarcastically advise Kennedy, "Do not be taken in with Bork's justifications of his statements." Indeed, that is just what you are, justifications, not evidence. Bork has relied on precedent fact and further, but on your own personal opinion and idealism, to stack his evidence on many pertinent issues. A Supreme Court Justice who bases precedent is something this country and its Supreme Court cannot afford, not now or ever.

You claim that the Supreme Court case Griswold v. Connecticut, in Bork's opinion, "a dangerously vague right to privacy." To say that an individual's right to personal privacy is "dangerous" is surely in direct opposition to the liberty right guaranteed in the Constitution. The Supreme Court recognizes this right in deciding Griswold, and Bork's willingness to declare the decision, but only because he is the "logic" portrayed in your column. Bork's justification for this is not much of a problem. But, as the cold weather sets in, if MIT does not set up such facilities it will create a total disregard for smoker's rights.

Smoking is a bad habit — nearly everyone who smokes would like to quit. But is it not that simple. I was counseled at the court against smoking and I did so. The right to personal privacy is "dangerous" and "vague." It is an addiction, sometimes likened to severity to a heroin addiction. The only way a person will quit smoking is with a lot of willpower and desire to quit.

To the Editor:

I am a smoker. I have abided by MIT's anti-smoking policy for some months now. This policy has resulted in considerable inconvenience for me, but I can sympathize with the students with whom smokers are treated. As yet, the lack of indoor smoking lounges (Walker is not accessible via tunnels) has not been much of a problem. But, as the cold weather sets in, if MIT does not set up such facilities it will create a total disregard for smoker's rights.

The fact is that no one can force anyone else to quit smoking. It is an addiction, sometimes likened to severity to a heroin addiction. The only way a person will quit smoking is with a lot of willpower and desire to quit. Compulsion, compulsion and compulsion are not the way to go.
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