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Reagan reduces the role of government

When Ronald Reagan ran for President in 1980, he promised to get government off the backs of the people and restore America to its former greatness. Reagan also promised to decentralize government and to return some of the national government's accrued responsibilities back to states and municipalities. Several recent news events, however, show that Reagan's Administration has decentralized federal government control, not reduced government intervention in the lives of its citizens, but set in fact increasing values upon them.

- Reagan's Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has announced that after April 1, all persons of women under the age of eighteen will be notified when their daughters try to obtain contraceptives. And foist some of the national government's accrued responsibilities for the regulation takes effect. An Administration interested in imposing its values on its citizens would. Their ideological decisions, which they contend take government off the backs of people, in fact do just the opposite.

- Every President pays lip service to the Bill of Rights. Reagan's Administration has prepared an executive order that would give the Federal government authority to redact information it has previously declassified and released. The action follows the Department's effort to redact documents concerning the National Security Agency. An Administration interested in imposing its values on its citizens would.

- Reagan also promised to decentralize government. Because it conflicts with the First Amendment. The government, however, claims the documents were mistakenly released and threatened to a national security. What is probably true is that HHS's book is embarrassing and some Federal officials want it suppressed. Unfortunately, this desire contradicts the First Amendment. No one should forget Richard Nixon's claim that national security considerations and the Keninesaw City Council claim to serve the interests of their constituents. Their ideological decisions, which they contend take government off the backs of people, in fact do just the opposite.

- An Administration committed to reducing government intervention in citizens' lives should not want to expand government authority to reclassify information it has previously declassified and released. The action follows the Department's effort to redact documents concerning the National Security Agency. An Administration interested in imposing its values on its citizens would.

- An Administration committed to reducing government intervention in citizens' lives should not want to expand government authority to reclassify information it has previously declassified and released. The action follows the Department's effort to redact documents concerning the National Security Agency. An Administration interested in imposing its values on its citizens would.

- An Administration committed to reducing government intervention in citizens' lives should not want to expand government authority to reclassify information it has previously declassified and released. The action follows the Department's effort to redact documents concerning the National Security Agency. An Administration interested in imposing its values on its citizens would.

Feedback

Von Rosenborg's criticism disturbing

To the Editor:

Tuesday's response by Susanne von Rosenborg to the Makhol column disturbed me greatly. Let's face it, schools are not democracies, and MIT is no exception. They are run by people who are paid to do so, and while one may question the motives of the administration, when it comes right down to it, these people have the power, and the students do not. Student government is limited in power to what the administration chooses to allow. Consequently, many of us see the whole process of student government as little more than a facade...

Unfortunately, those in student government seem to view us as apathetic, or some equally ludicrous and subversive, and traditionally have treated those of us who aren't interested in "rhetorical feasible projects" as though we were anarchistic pathetic scum in need of extermination. I am not attacking the projects per se, nor the students, but the fact that many of us value other activities more should not per se earn us the contempt with which we are treated.

In a plating example, Malchman bammers the victory of new opinions in government over the sacred truths of the past (Please turn to page 5).