

Editorial

DeCamp's 'low blows' heat battle

John DeCamp talks big, is big, has big influence and in typical fashion, insults big.

His latest target is Gov. Bob Kerrey, or "King Bobby," as DeCamp calls him. Last week DeCamp suggested that LB 3 was designed to cover up wrong doings at State Security Savings. He implicated Kerrey, Banking Director Roger Beverage and Bill Wright, Kerrey's associate and an owner of the bank. The bank has filed for protection under Chapter 11 of the federal bankruptcy code.

Kerrey characterized DeCamp's remarks as "blabber" and said he didn't understand the Neligh senator's "personal insults."

The feud between the two powerful Nebraskans centers on the banking issue pending in the Legislature's special session. Each has a bill and hopes to see it passed.

Undeniably, some measure is needed to protect the citizens of Nebraska from the problems several banks are experiencing. It would be nice if some of those who lost their savings could see Commonwealth Savings Co. bought by an out-of-state bank. They might even get some money back.

But this feud is slowing the process. DeCamp's flamboyant style often gets results. However, a direct personal attack

on the governor accomplishes nothing but division.

Kerrey and DeCamp reportedly met Friday on H Street between the Governor's mansion and the Capitol and exchanged words. After the incident, Kerrey said he was angry, and that DeCamp takes insulting people "lightly." Kerrey says he doesn't.

If Kerrey and DeCamp were two men exchanging harsh words in a bar or even in a private office, the whole thing could be called an unfortunate conflict; people do fight.

But these two are public officials — probably the two most powerful men in Nebraska. Disagreement is fine, but DeCamp's personal attacks are uncivilized.

Memories of DeCamp complaints about unjustified charges and insults are fresh. Not long ago he was fighting charges concerning relations with his daughter and charges of wrongdoing in his political campaign.

He should know from experience that such charges can damage one's life. And if he knows something the rest of us don't, he should tell us what it is, instead of slandering a man he is supposed to be able to work with in a civilized manner, even if he does not agree with him.



Messages encourage invasion of privacy

Freedom is inherently risky. In a free society, some members will behave badly. That is inevitable.

Society can reduce the risk of bad behavior by forming laws and devising punishments for misbehavers. Those who break laws forfeit their freedom and subject themselves to the proscribed punishments.



Chris Burbach

Society is within its bounds when it reacts to a violation of law by imposing a punishment that fits the crime. Society is within its bounds when it openly and honestly attempts to deter crime and encourage good behavior. Society steps out of bounds

when it seeks to lessen the risks of freedom by taking away its members' freedom of choice.

Such a theft appears to occur with subliminal communication — messages aimed at influencing human behavior that are beamed below conscious perception into the subconscious.

In other words, messages can affect the way someone acts, but the person is unaware of it.

That constitutes a detestable invasion of privacy and, potentially, a dangerous weapon.

The way subliminal communication is employed today seems harmless. A few stores plant anti-shoplifting messages on their muzak tapes as a deterrent to would-be thieves.

We've also heard stories of advertisers slipping tidbits into our subconscious, such as curvaceous

ice cubes in television soft drinks and hot buttered popcorn into the frames of movies. The Federal Communications Commission has banned that type of advertising on radio and television, and rightly so. Harmless as it may seem, subliminal advertising is wrong because it denies freedom of choice.

That's the dilemma of subliminal communication as it stands today — a question of invasion of privacy. However, the dilemma of subliminal communication potential for tomorrow forms a much more serious scenario.

To see that dilemma you have to think big — ala Hal Becker, a subliminal communication magnate. Becker is quoted in a United Press International article in the Aug. 12 Omaha World-Herald as suggesting that government use

subliminal messages "to encourage safe driving and discourage crime and drug use."

On the surface, that proposal is attractive enough. It could save money and lives and reduce crime. It could make a more harmonious and productive society.

But the plan is like cheese in a loaded mouse trap. Before we pounce on the idea, we had better consider the consequences.

If the government adopted Becker's proposal, society could reap the aforementioned benefits. But at what price? Are we willing to barter our psychological freedom away? And if our government gives itself the power to program safe driving into our minds, can it not then gain the power to program positions on more complicated issues?

Maureen Phillips, a lawyer from

California, has "urged legislation requiring public disclosure when such (subliminal) messages are used," according to the World-Herald article. She did not go far enough. In fact, it's a ridiculous scenario — "Please fasten your seatbelts, ladies and gentlemen. The movie today is 'Jungle Book.' The movie contains subliminal messages against heroin use. Enjoy your flight."

Does telling people you're going to brainwash them make doing it OK?

Although a proposal such as Becker's promises some good, it forebodes much greater evil, and its price is too high. Congress should reject such proposals, and ban public use of subliminal communication. It is the only choice for a nation that values freedom above all else.

Daily Nebraskan

EDITOR	Chris Welsch, 472-1766
GENERAL MANAGER	Daniel Shattil
PRODUCTION MANAGER	Kitty Policky
ADVERTISING MANAGER	Tom Byrns
ASSISTANT	
ADVERTISING MANAGER	Kelly Mangan
CIRCULATION MANAGER	Steve Meyer
NEWS EDITOR	Michela Thuman
ASSOCIATE NEWS EDITORS	Thom Gabrukiewicz
	Brad Kuhn
	Stacie Thomas
	Vicki Ruhge
	Ward W. Triplett III
COPY DESK SUPERVISOR	Christopher Burbach
SPORTS EDITOR	Lauri Hopple
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT	Julie Jordan
EDITOR	Judi Nygren
NIGHT NEWS EDITORS	Lauri Hopple
	Teri Sperry
WIRE EDITORS	Billy Shaffer
	Joel Sertora
ART DIRECTOR	David Creamer
PHOTO CHIEF	
ASSISTANT PHOTO CHIEF	
PUBLICATIONS BOARD	
CHAIRPERSONS	Nick Foley, 476-0275
	Angela Nietfeld, 475-4981
	Don Walton, 473-7301
PROFESSIONAL ADVISER	

The Daily Nebraskan (USPS 144-080) is published by the UNL Publications Board Monday through Friday in the fall and spring semesters and Tuesdays and Fridays in the summer sessions, except during vacations.

Readers are encouraged to submit story ideas and comments to the Daily Nebraskan by phoning 472-2588 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. The public also has access to the Publications Board. For information, call Nick Foley, 476-0275 or Angela Nietfeld, 475-4981.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68588-0448.

ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1984 DAILY NEBRASKAN

Economic freedom of 'New Right' contradicts personal restraints

DALLAS — The Republican Party has a deal for you. Its dominant right wing, especially the New Right, is bristling with ideas, some of them hardly conservative at all. It is, they say, the beginning of a new



Richard Cohen

era of economic freedom. But what you don't pay in taxes, you will in personal freedom.

You don't have to look any further than Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) to see the bargain the Republican New Right is offering. Gingrich is the very personification of the GOP's New Right. He has just published a book, "Window of Opportunity," which is part political manifesto and part technological blueprint for the future. By the time Gingrich gets through with outer space, for instance, it will be an outpost of the American free-enterprise system — and we will all, he assures us, be better off as a result.

The layman reader (that's me, folks) is impressed. This is not the tome of a flat-earth conservative whose

idea of an economic program is to lower taxes, abolish welfare and blast the commies to kingdom come. It is, instead, a thoughtful — even daring — program for the future and there is not much in it that Gary Hart or a lot of Yuppies would argue with.

Yet its premise of virtually unbridled economic freedom is contradicted by a social program that is oppressive. Gingrich, like others on the New Right and like Ronald Reagan himself, believes in school prayer, denounces homosexual rights, thinks abortion ought to be outlawed and has nothing but contempt for the ERA. All this is proclaimed in the name of values, but pragmatic politics is at work as well. The Star Wars economic program will need the support of people who could not care less about outer space but care very much about school prayer.

Whatever the basis for these views, they represent nothing less than an attempt to restrict personal freedom. With all due respect for those who think that a fetus, no matter how young, is always a person and therefore abortion is murder, that is not the view of most Americans. And to tell a woman that a fetus in the first month is a person and she cannot abort it — even though, say she is 15 years old and maybe the fetus is deformed — is both a loss of personal freedom and heart-wrenching human tragedy.

Continued on Page 5