

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DE ROCHI, Editor
 ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor JEFF HIDAY, Associate Editor
 LISA PULLEN, University Editor JOHN CONWAY, City Editor
 CHRISTINE MANUEL, State and National Editor KAREN FISHER, Features Editor
 MIKE DESISTI, Sports Editor JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
 BILL RIEDY, News Editor CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Legal losers

For criminal trials, the state will bear the expense of legal counsel for those who cannot afford a private attorney. But for noncriminal court proceedings, the government's only assistance exists in the form of the Legal Services Corp. Last week, however, that floundering agency issued new, more stringent guidelines which sadly demonstrate the toll President Reagan's frugal policies have taken on the poor.

The Legal Services, a federally-funded agency which makes lawyers available to low-income persons, has three times withstood the Reagan administration's attempts to abolish it. With the backing of Congress, the agency has managed to survive, but its strength has been exhausted. It suffered a 25 percent budget cut in 1982. At present, the maximum annual income allowed a family of three requesting assistance stands at \$10,275 — a figure which has clearly denied assistance to people who cannot afford private legal representation.

The new guidelines established by the agency last week are especially disturbing. An amendment to former policy states that "an otherwise eligible individual" may be denied legal assistance if he or she has more than \$15,000 equity in a home. This stipulation would hit especially hard on the elderly, who bought homes years ago but may have little present income.

The other major alteration to Legal Services policy states that the agency must include government financial assistance, such as welfare and Social Security, when tabulating the income of a potential recipient of legal assistance. Not only will this change penalize those individuals the government is aiding in other areas, but it also will short-change the elderly and the handicapped.

These last-resort amendments are not the fault of the Legal Services Corp.; the agency is merely attempting to make certain that its severely limited funds go to the neediest recipients. But these changes in policy are nonetheless unacceptable. They target some individuals more than others, and they deny the benefit of noncriminal legal representation to many who require it.

The policy changes are not scheduled to go into effect until Sept. 28. There is time for both the voicing of public concern and appeals to Congress to alter the rules through legislation. But the real problem lies in the insufficient funds of Legal Services. Congress has kept the agency alive, but it must allocate additional funds to make the organization's work worthwhile. The lifeblood has been drained from Legal Services, which has been forced to respond with unjust, partisan guidelines. If the United States is truly a land where justice for all — and not simply justice for those who can afford it — prevails, the Legal Services Corp. must be restored to a position of greater consequence.

Don't cry wolf

What does James Watt have against gray wolves? They are not like American Indians, who Watt described as an example of the "failures of socialism." They have yet to be compared with Nazis, as Watt has done various environmental groups. Perhaps, like the Beach Boys, they attract the "wrong element"?

No, the wolves' crime lies in their struggle to survive. Watt's department has decided to allow the trapping of gray wolves even though there are only 1,200 left in the lower 48 states. Watt and his cronies claim the wolves have shown they can survive whether or not they are protected.

But wildlife experts disagree. Members of 14 conservation groups have called the government's reasoning "the most fallacious argument we have ever encountered," and have filed suit to block the new rules, which are to take effect Oct. 11. "The secretary has gone bonkers," Gaylord Nelson, chairman of the Wilderness Society, said. "It's time the white-coat people took him away."

Watt's new rules will allow trappers to kill any wolf, including a cub. One of Watt's henchmen justified the action saying that "the species size is to some extent self-regulating," and that up to 50 percent of the wolves in Minnesota could be "harvested" without adversely affecting their population.

Wilderness fans, sun worshippers, and nature and animal lovers really shouldn't be surprised by such decisions. After all, this is coming from a man who used similar reasoning to divide his countrymen into "liberals and Americans." As a spokesman for the National Congress of American Indians put it earlier this year, "Mr. Watt has offended everybody." Unfortunately, it appears Watt wants to arbitrarily eliminate the wolves just as he wants to arbitrarily eliminate wilderness areas from federal protection — and the Beach Boys from July 4th celebrations.

THE WEEK IN REVIEW

Reagan uses restraint, Soviets blame U.S.

By KELLY SIMMONS

President Reagan has shocked many Republicans and pleased most congressional Democrats with his restraint in imposing sanctions against the Soviet Union for shooting down a Korean airliner last week. At least 269 people died in the incident.

Instead of canceling arms negotiations and nullifying grain agreements with the Russians, Reagan stressed the need for additional air safety precautions in order to prevent further disasters. He also called strongly for a Soviet apology.

Reagan's language was tough. He called the Soviets "barbaric" and the attack a "Korean Air Massacre," but the president's actions were soft. Republicans, including Sen. Jesse Helms, labeled Reagan's response much too lenient. Richard A. Viguier, publisher of *Conservative Digest*, said Reagan was like Teddy Roosevelt in reverse: "He speaks softly and carries a big twig."

Maybe so, but Reagan delighted members of the "enemy" Democratic party with his response. Sen. Gary Hart, D-Colo., praised the reaction as the best thing for the American people.

The Soviets finally admitted Tuesday to shooting down the plane, an action they had denied since last week when the incident occurred. But their claim now is that they were convinced the Korean plane was a U.S. spy plane, and they are placing the

responsibility of the tragedy on the United States.

Soviet Ambassador Oleg A. Troyanovsky told the United Nations Security Council this week that it was "a lengthy, gross and obviously pre-planned violation of the airspace of the Soviet Union."

More Marines killed

Two U.S. Marines were killed and three wounded in Lebanon this week during general fighting between the Christians and Druse militias. In the 34 hours before that, 148 people were killed.

The casualty toll now stands at 247 killed and 628 wounded since the Israelis left the area Sunday.

The Marines at the Beirut airport reportedly spent much of the day under condition one — the heaviest alert — and returned fire at one point.

Major Robert Jordan said the Marine camp was hit both from the South and from near Bourj el-Barajneh to the North-east. The shells were directed in such a way that it was clear the target was the American camp.

About 1,200 Marines are in Lebanon as a part of the multinational peacekeeping force, and 2,000 more are expected to arrive later this week.

Larry Speakes, President Reagan's spokesman, said he thinks the Syrians should know that the United States has enough power offshore and they should be careful in instigating violence.

Also this week, U.S. presidential envoy

By FRANK BRUNI

According to Gandhi, the willing sacrifice of the innocent is the most powerful answer to insolent tyranny...

— Benigno Aquino in a pre-written statement he had planned to read upon his August arrival in the Philippines.

The insolent tyranny assumed the form of martial law under the regime of Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos; the innocent man was Aquino himself; the willing sacrifice was his return from self-imposed exile to his native islands with full knowledge of the threat posed to his life.

Benigno Aquino always stood for democracy, the eccentric but exemplary brand of democracy which not too long ago flourished in the Philippines. His commitment to human rights never faltered and always attracted followers among his fellow citizens. That is why, after imposing martial law upon the Philippines in 1972, President Marcos accused Aquino of numerous outlandish crimes and silenced him with imprisonment. That is why, after being allowed to travel to the United States three years ago for heart surgery, Aquino chose to remain here temporarily in exile.

But why, when President Marcos so flagrantly violated the rights of Filipinos 11 years ago, did the United States remain relatively reticent? Why did Vice-President George Bush, upon his visit to Manila two years ago, toast President Marcos' "adherence to democratic principles"? And why did President Reagan so graciously entertain Marcos' visit to Washington last September, only one month after Marcos had begun arresting labor leaders in an attempt to silence political dissidents?

The answers lie in the anti-communist attitudes and militarism of the United States. Our ideological war against communism, which has precipitated a frightening attention to military strength, pays no attention to the vast distinctions between communist parties in different countries. Yes, the Soviet Union's particular brand of aggressive communism must be monitored closely. And, yes, a certain degree of military strength is integral to the defense of our country's democratic principles. But where should our government draw the line when its ideological and military concerns ignore the injustice inflicted upon the citizens of one of its strongest allies?

In relation to the Philippines, the line was not — indeed, has not been — drawn soon enough. The horrifying results include the much wasted life of Benigno Aquino and the current turmoil and internal dissent which threaten the stability of the Philippines.

Funeral for a forgotten friend



Tale of two leaders

Benigno Aquino was born a politician. His ebullient, charismatic character served him well in his ascent to political prominence in the Philippines, where he had served as mayor, governor and senator by the age of 34.

But his contributions to Philippine politics were to be short-lived. Rivaling Aquino's political pursuits was Ferdinand Marcos, a man whose lust for power and shrewd methods ultimately disgraced Philippine democracy.

In 1965, Marcos was elected president, and he repeated this victory in 1969. But as 1973 approached, he sought constitutional changes that would allow him at least one more term as president. He succeeded in securing an indefinite term as president by declaring martial law in September, 1972. He then threw Aquino into a military prison.

Marcos' authoritarian government drastically altered the face of Philippine society. The military was transformed into a crucial guardian of Marcos' political power, the press was rendered impotent, and the economy was crippled severely by blatantly partisan government intervention.

During his eight years of imprisonment, Aquino was able to observe none of this. But after his exile to the United States in 1980, Aquino became acutely aware of the situation in the Philippines. Months ago he decided it was time to return to his homeland, where he would attempt to redeem Philippine democracy.

Despite warnings from Philippine leaders and pleas from his family to remain safely in the United States, he was determined to return.

He told the reporters who accompanied him on his flight to Manila that he was aware of the threat posed by his political foes in the Philippines. He conceded that this flight might ultimately be the last opportunity for journalists to interview him.

His prophecy of doom was fulfilled.

Within minutes after the plane's landing in Manila, Benigno Aquino lay on the tarmac in a pool of blood flowing from three bullet wounds in the back of his head.

The aftermath of U.S. self-interest

Shrouded in speculations about a possible execution order from someone within the Marcos regime, the assassination of Benigno Aquino has cast shadows of suspicion upon the already waning credibility of Marcos' government. Aquino's martyrdom has been the impetus for worldwide reflections concerning the plight of Philippine society. With leftist Philippine coalitions like the New People's Army continually growing stronger and human rights at their nadir, Marcos' military dictatorship is being scrutinized more harshly than ever. Appalled observers throughout the world are wondering how the degeneration of Philippine democracy occurred so swiftly and escaped the notice or concerned efforts of other countries.

Much of the responsibility rests with the United States. Since we made the Philippines a U.S. colony in 1898, we have fancied ourselves guardians of the islands' well-being. When we suffered 88,487 casualties in protecting the islands from Japan during World War II, we waved the banner of democracy. And when we granted the Philippines independence in 1946, we took pride in the emerging democracy of our former colony.

But U.S. interest in the Philippines is now motivated by forces much greater than mere nostalgia for a former colony. Both Clark Field Air Base and Subic Bay Naval Base, the United States' largest military installations in Asia and integral passageways to the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf, lie northwest of Manila. The United States

perceives its military investment in the Philippines so important that its planned military and economic aid to the Marcos government over the next five years neared \$10 million.

Yet the American press and public have given little attention in the past years to the Filipino people's struggle for the restoration of democracy. The United States often seemed too busy paying attention to the issue of human rights in countries like Poland and El Salvador, where the source of the threat ostensibly wore the color red. In light of our ignorance concerning the plight of the Philippines, where an indigenous brand of communism may be the most likely alternative to the injustices under Marcos, our country's involvements in Central America seem little more than anti-communist hysteria.

Perhaps it is military prominence, not human rights, with which the United States primarily concerns itself. Perhaps our government is willing to tolerate the rape of human rights just so long as our military investments remain safe. And perhaps our self-proclaimed altruism toward the citizens of Central America is only a well-veiled attempt to protect the home turf.

Washington has not disrupted its relations with the Marcos regime since Aquino's assassination, nor has President Reagan cancelled his scheduled November visit to the Philippines. While such an immediate response to still unproven allegations of Marcos' involvement in the slaying of Aquino is prudently unassuming, Reagan and his predecessors in the White House can and should be blamed for the degenerate Philippine society which allowed Aquino's death.

The bitter lesson

One of the many motivations behind Aquino's decision to end his exile was his perception of United States insensitivity toward the plight of the Philippines. He had hoped that some support from the U.S. government might give him the diplomatic leverage to forcefully represent the views of his oppressed people. His hope proved futile.

The United States does indeed need to concern itself with its military defense and the threat of the Soviet Union. But more importantly, we must recognize both the rights of human beings throughout the world and the various applications of communism. Our embarrassing failure in the Philippines, a failure which threatens to make all our efforts toward democracy elsewhere in the world seem hypocritical, has resulted in tragedy for a great leader and the people he might have helped.

Frank Bruni, a sophomore political science major from Avon, Conn., is an editorial writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Gender Gap can't be ignored

To the editor:

Dante was right. The root of all politics is power. And the ultimate weapon is using appearances to ingratiate yourself through false promises and hypocrisy. In the '80s it is President Reagan who is the master seducer. After conceding to his top aides and advisers that there is another sex out there (and they do have the right to vote), he has been actively courting them. Ken Mingis' editorial column of last week, "Reagan's re-election nemesis," (*DTH*, Sept. 2) brilliantly showed several examples of Reagan's recent and embarrassing

failures (Barbara Honigger, the international women's group).

Women, like an increasing number of blacks, have seen that the only way to wield any authority is through their right to vote. The fact that in 1984 women will probably exercise this right (and for the most part against Reagan) must surely be sending shivers through the White House. Yet every time Reagan tries to rectify himself, it results only in blundering insincerity. More shivers.

The importance of this evolving role has received a lot of press, and the fun has just

begun. The showdown will be next year's election. Or, it may well be a contributing factor in deciding not to run again.

I am certainly not suggesting the ridiculous idea that men are intrinsically chauvinistic or that all registered women will vote against Reagan, (for conservative Republican women are also a strong political force), but feminists and closet feminists alike are gleefully acknowledging that, should more women vote, the tide may be turned against Reagan.

I have certainly noticed, and, fortunately, so have many men, how a huge percent-

tage of women (the overwhelming majority of whom are on the lower end of the pay scale) have been painfully affected by Reaganomics and its unrealistic notions and assumptions. Reagan has been dreaming contentedly, and many (aides and certainly the press) have tried to prod him before his nightmare starts. Wake up, Ronny, the gender gap can't be ignored.

Jennifer Keller
 Hinton-James

Night flight

Robert C. McFarlane went to Syria to try to convince the president there to get the Druse to accept a cease-fire.

Successful six-day orbit

The first-ever night landing of the space shuttle Challenger went smoothly early Monday morning, ending a highly suc-

cessful six-day orbit.

The crew included the first black American in space, Guion Bluford, and the oldest person ever to fly in space, Dr. William Thornton, 54. Thornton, a North Carolina native, conducted tests on space air sickness during the flight.

Lt. Gen. James A. Abrahamson, director of the shuttle program, called this mission the cleanest one yet, and the Challenger is expected to head back to the

launch pad soon.

The mission was not only to test the Challenger's performance during a night take-off and landing, but also to deploy a communications-weather satellite for India.

Besides Bluford and Thornton, astronauts on the flight were Dale A. Gardner, Daniel C. Brandenstein and Richard H. Truly, commander of the mission.

Mandatory clamps

Most students don't have to worry about the lawn and garden watering restrictions (only between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m.), but a few other water conservation rules are going to affect on-campus residents as well as other inhabitants of Orange County.

The Orange County Water and Sewer Authority Tuesday requested mandatory restrictions on water use. Both Chapel Hill Mayor Joe Nassif and Carrboro Mayor Robert Drakeford approved the conservation effort.

OWASA can request the restrictions when the water level at University Lake falls to 48 inches below full. Tuesday the lake was 49½ inches below full.

Besides having limited watering times, residents are forbidden to wash their cars with OWASA-provided water, to use water-cooled air conditioners except for

health or safety purposes, or to add water to swimming pools beyond the level needed to operate the facility. Water will not be served in Orange County restaurants except by request.

Students are expected to comply with the restrictions, and OWASA said it expects to have no problems with the University.

Too hot to handle

Besides causing serious water problems in the area, the dry weather and heat are generating other inconveniences.

Children at one Chapel Hill school, as well as others around the state, have been getting afternoon vacations from school this week because of the extremely high temperatures. Some Chapel Hill students have been spotted around town and campus as early as 1 p.m. — that's when they've been dismissed four days this week.

Temperatures, which have been in the upper 90s, are expected to remain in the 90s through the weekend.

The heat has been an annoyance to University students living in dormitories, also. Thank goodness we're having classes — they're the only cool spots on campus.

Kelly Simmons, a junior journalism major from Reidsville, is an editorial writer for The Daily Tar Heel.

