

## Politicians PAC your pocketbooks

The Supreme Court's decision to allow political action committees to spend unlimited amounts of money on presidential candidates could turn elections into publicity contests. The court ruled Monday, by a vote of 7-2, that federal law limiting the PAC spending to \$1,000 per candidate violated freedom of speech.

In an article in Monday's Lincoln Journal, the court's reasoning, written by Justice William H. Rehnquist, was:

"The fact that candidates and elected officials may alter or reaffirm their own positions on issues in response to political messages paid for by the PACs can hardly be called corruption, for one of the essential features of democracy is the presentation to the electorate of varying points of view."

In one sense, the court is right: varying points of view are essential to a democracy.

But without equal access to the political arena and to the press, those varying points of view will not be voiced. With no limits on PAC spending, the candidates with the most money will receive the most publicity. Only the views of candidates with high PAC contributions will be known to voters.

In a democratic election, all candidates theoretically should have the same financial resources. They should be on equal ground, so voters can make choices based on all candidates' positions, rather than just the views of those with large PAC contributions.

The \$1,000 limit on PACs was one of many reforms enacted in the mid-1970s after widespread rumors of campaign fund-raising abuses.

Although the limit may have been slightly low, it would have been better for the court to advocate a higher limit, rather than no limit at all.

Like it or not, PACs can buy votes — some politicians can be corrupted.

The court's decision left only one reprieve for voters. Congress could pass a less-restrictive campaign spending law that would be constitutionally acceptable.

Now it's up to voters to encourage their Congressmen to regulate campaign spending.

Candidates should base their campaigns on issues, not on the exposure they get through PAC money.

### Editorial Policy

Unsigned editorials represent official policy of the spring 1985 Daily Nebraskan. Policy is set by the Daily Nebraskan Editorial Board. Its members are Chris Welsch, editor in chief; Chris Burbach, editorial page editor; Michela Thuman, news editor; Vicki Buhga, copy desk chief and editorial writer; and Kelly Mangan, assistant advertising manager.

Editorials do not necessarily reflect the views of the university, its employees, the students or the NU Board of Regents.

The Daily Nebraskan's publishers are the regents, who established the UNL Publications Board to supervise the daily production of the paper.

According to policy set by the regents, responsibility for the editorial content of the newspaper lies solely in the hands of its student editors.

## Daily Nebraskan

EDITOR	Chris Welsch, 472-1705
GENERAL MANAGER	Daniel Shattil
PRODUCTION MANAGER	Katherine Policky
ADVERTISING MANAGER	Tom Byrns
ASSISTANT	
ADVERTISING MANAGER	Kelly Mangan
CIRCULATION MANAGER	Steve Meyer
NEWS EDITOR	Michela Thuman
CAMPUS EDITOR	Lauri Hoppe
WIRE EDITOR	Judi Nygren
COPY DESK CHIEF	Vicki Buhga
EDITORIAL PAGE EDITOR	Christopher Burbach
SPORTS EDITOR	Ward W. Triplett III
ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT EDITOR	Stacie Thomas
NIGHT NEWS EDITORS	Julie Jordan Hendricks
	Ad Hudler
	Gah Y. Huay
	Steve Mill
GRAPHICS EDITOR	
ASSISTANT	
GRAPHICS EDITOR	Tony Schappagh
PHOTO CHIEF	Joel Sartore
ASSISTANT PHOTO CHIEF	Mark Davis
PUBLICATIONS BOARD	
CHAIRPERSON	Chris Choate 472-8788
PROFESSIONAL ADVISER	Don Walton, 472-7301

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 472-1763 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. The public also has access to the Publications Board. For information, call Chris Choate 472-8788.

Postmaster: Send address changes to the Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, 1400 R St., Lincoln, Neb. 68583-0448. Second class postage paid at Lincoln, NE 68510. ALL MATERIAL COPYRIGHT 1985 DAILY NEBRASKAN

## Editorial



United Feature Syndicate

## Christian challenge deserved

Politicians must realize validity of theistic opinions

Like a breath of fresh air, last year's furor over the Christian Right's involvement in American politics seems to have subsided — at least for the time being. Those of us on both sides of the dispute should take firm grasp of the breathing space: The lull provides us with an opportunity for reflection on the events that occurred during the last election year, and for reasoned political maturation based upon such reflection.



Jim Rogers

I find myself in general association with the loose-knit movement called "the Christian Rights." Yet I am sometimes embarrassed and even frightened by some of the positions proceeding forth under the rubric. At the same time, however, opponents of the movement are at times paranoiacally reactive.

Both extremes are wrong.

Although a certain amount of acrimony in political debate is endemic to democracy, for the political health of our nation the conflict over the Christian Right and its policy objectives needs to grow beyond its present stage. I have several suggestions that may help toward this end.

Constructive social criticism must begin with one's own house; clearly there is lots of room for improvement in the Christian Right. First, we simply must eradicate every shred of self-righteousness from our attitude. I wish more than anything that humility would characterize the movement — as it should naturally. But all too often self-righteousness seems to be the pervasive characteristic of the movement.

## Contraceptives absent from media love

I know people do not normally read teen-age sexual fantasies in a family newspaper. But I will take the risk of being forever X-rated in order to offer you — not to mention Hollywood — my kinkiest media fantasies for 1985.



Ellen Goodman

Goodman Fantasy Take One: The set is, of course, a bedroom. The couple have been transported to this set on wings of

We clothe our political organizations with labels including terms like "decency" and "moral." We consequently seem to forget the lesson of Christ, recorded in several of the Gospels: "And a certain ruler questioned Him, saying, 'Good teacher, what shall I do to obtain eternal life?' And Jesus said to him, 'Why do you call Me good? No one is good except God alone'" (Luke 18:18-19). In this passage, Jesus was not denying the fact that He is God, but rather, he was rebuking the (unbelieving) ruler for predicating the moral sense of the term "good" of someone the ruler thought was a mere mortal. Since we are in fact merely human, we also ought to avoid predicating such terms of ourselves.

Second, we must understand that sophistication is not antithetical to correct Christian policy formulation. After a fashion, the Christian Right has bitten off more than it can chew. It is widely recognized that the broad evangelical sociopolitical consciousness we now are experiencing has been essentially asleep for the past 50 years or so. Perhaps even more importantly the Christian mind, which flourished in centuries past, more or less received its death blows as a result of the second Great Awakening in the early- to mid-1800s. In a phrase, we have a lot of studying and catching up to do in order to engage in respectable policy advocacy on a broad number of topics.

For policy opponents of the Christian Right, I also have several suggestions. First, I would urge reflection as to the focus of the critique. In many instances critics of the Christian Right appear to be motivated simply by religious bigotry, i.e., they claim that the (conservative) Christian simply has no business interjecting any opinion into the political forum. It seems to escape their notice that theistic

speech is in actuality no more a threat to rational public discourse than is any secular interjection. Additionally, all thought, whether it be theistic or secular, is fundamentally religious inasmuch as all knowledge is based upon humanly nondemonstrable presuppositions.

Finally, critics of the Christian right must avoid believing that the movement is a monolith. In many instances the label of "Religious Right" is mindlessly attached to anyone working from an explicitly Christian point of view in order to smear the communicator and suppress political dialogue. The Christian Right, as with any large political movement, includes under its terminological umbrella a host of quite distinct beliefs and attitudes. It is rather dishonest to generalize the most unpleasant attributes of some fringe group found under the Christian Right rubric across the entire population.

Democracy is inherently a messy production. Policy disagreement is to be expected and in fact is evidence of a thriving political culture. Yet maturity and responsibility on the part of the political actors also is required for the production to succeed. Every now and then a new actor appears on the political stage and upsets the traditional and comfortable relationships. The infantile minds desire to push the new actor back into the wings in the vain hope that the discomfort will be alleviated. However, the mature mind will recognize that room simply must be made for the newcomer, and a new dialogue will have to be established. The new actor, on the other hand, also will have to realize that growth is required if helpful dialogues are to be established and the actor's initial brashness must give way to a reasonably expected sophistication and maturity.

passion and prose of purple. The camera comes in for a fuzzy close-up within the limits of PG-13. John Travolta and Olivia Newton-John are kissing madly. John looks at Olivia and croons the hit tune, "Your contraceptive or mine?"

Goodman Fantasy Take Two: This scene is a Manhattan apartment. Daryl Hannah, a legendary figure who is a centaur by day and a woman by night, has come out of the field and into the arms of her more conventional lover, Tom Hanks. Flicking her blonde mane, uh, hair, out of her eyes, she looks longingly at him. As they trot into bed, the camera pans delicately over the

birth-control dial pack on the night table, reassuring us they will produce no small centaurettes.

Goodman Fantasy Take Three: The set this time is a TV soap-opera living room. The thrice-married Linda Evans, recently widowed from a doctor who committed suicide after discovering that he performed a sex-change operation on his illegitimate son, is packing to embark on an affair. Her girlfriend says with concern, "Whatever else, Miranda, remember your diaphragm."

Continued on Page 5