

Letters To The Editor

The Chapel Hill Weekly

Founded in 1923 by Louis Graves

"If the matter is important and you are sure of your ground, never fear to be in the minority."

ORVILLE CAMPBELL, Publisher

JAMES SHUMAKER, Editor

Published every Sunday and Wednesday by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc. 501 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C. P. O. Box 271 - Telephone 667-7046

Subscription rates (payable in advance and including N. C. sales tax)—in North Carolina: One year, \$3.15; six months, \$1.65; three months, \$0.90. Elsewhere in the United States: One year, \$3.00; six months, \$1.50; three months, \$0.80. Outside United States: One year, \$10.00.

Mrs. Eva Kay Bullard Burks: Her Main Stocks Were Aid And Comfort

Mrs. Eva Kay Bullard Burks died recently, in a way that nobody would have wanted her to, and a lot of people cared about Mrs. Burks.

She ran a boarding house behind the Post Office for years, and students lived there or worked there for meals. Mrs. Burks was invaluable. She provided people with a home. She also inspired and comforted a lot of young men who subsequently did quite well. They "gained a part of the manliness they exhibit in their respective professions today from this vivacious woman who followed and encouraged them in their respective endeavors," was the way one of her friends described her effects on the young men who passed through her boarding house.

One Chapel Hillian who knew her while a student during the Depression said he worked for Mrs. Burks for meals occasionally. "In those days if you could get a meal somewhere, that would carry you through the day," he said. "A lot of boys went on like that. If you wanted to do some work she'd make a job for you."

"She was certainly a lovable person who will always be remembered by the students to whom she was so kind," said Governor Terry Sanford, who waited on tables for Mrs. Burks and ate at her house often. "She certainly added much to the pleasantness of my life in Chapel Hill."

All-American basketball player John Dillon was one of Ma Burks' boys, and so were basketball players Bob Paxton and Norm Kohler. All-American football player Art Weiner passed through

her hands. As a matter of fact, Ma Burks acted as mother of the groom at Mr. Weiner's wedding. Mr. Weiner's own mother having died when he was about four. He and his wife lived at Ma Burks', and came to Chapel Hill for her funeral last week. "She was a great lady," he said. "She helped more boys get through school than anybody in Chapel Hill, to my knowledge."

She seemed to make a specialty of athletes, housing and feeding them and helping them in various ways. Probably she saw more athletes than any other kind of student because most athletes were either on partial scholarships or had no scholarships. There were even some boys to whom she gave meals, asking no work from them in return. She was that kind of lady.

The morning of Wednesday, December 4, Mrs. Burks lost control of her car on the Raleigh Road and ran into a tree. She called a wrecker. The motor company sent a man to take her home. As they passed Glen Lennox the driver suggested that she stop off and see a doctor. She said she was all right. At home, her maid put her to bed. That was at about 11 in the morning. She asked the maid to close the door because she wanted to rest. When the maid went back shortly after noon, Mrs. Burks was dead.

It is a sad and unwanted irony that Ma Burks died of the violence of an automobile accident, after spending much of her life saving young people from the agonizing inner violence of loneliness and desperation.

All We Want Is A Word Edgewise

The job of securing equal legislative representation for all citizens in the State is no simple matter; witness the extra session of the General Assembly it took to accomplish Senate re-districting.

The Senate re-districting itself, now that it has been done on a reasonable basis, is still unsatisfactory in certain quarters and no one pretended to think it would be otherwise. Orange County, as a case in point, was under-represented in the State Senate for years. Its standing has been enhanced by the new Senatorial District in which it has been placed, together with Person and Durham Counties. Under a rotation agreement, the District's two Senators would be divided, one Senator permanently to come from Durham, the other to be rotated between Orange and Person, with Orange electing a Senator three times to Person's two.

Understandably, Person County would prefer a different method of selection, and has said as much through its Senator Richard Long. Senator Long remarked the other day in Raleigh he thought both the District's Senators should run at large. He added that he

thought a Senator from either of the two smaller counties could run successfully, even though Durham County could out-vote Orange and Person combined.

As a simple matter of opinion, we disagree with Senator Long. An at-large race would probably mean the end of representation in the State Senate for Orange and Person altogether. Durham, as any ambitious city, is hungry to have its representation increased, and we seriously doubt that it could resist the temptation to double the number of Senators it could send to Raleigh. Even if it could, we question the ability of a candidate from Orange or Person successfully to identify himself with Durham's interests in the eyes of Durham voters any more than residents of the smaller counties could feel confident of the concern of a Durham Senator for them.

This is one of the unfortunate little realities of politics against which the proposed rotation system would guard. Neither Orange nor Person may feel completely happy about it, but it means the difference between being legislatively mute and being able at least to get a word in edgewise.

A Late Thanksgiving At Wake Forest

THE DAILY TAR HEEL

It looks as if Wake Forest got around to celebrating Thanksgiving a little late this year, and the only turkeys left around to axe were Head Football Coach Billy Hildebrand and Athletic Director William Gibson.

But it seems that the only one really doing any gobbling about the whole matter is college president Harold Tribble.

After crawling through the verbal thickets for a full fifteen minutes, we finally came up with a rough translation of what President Tribble had to say about the hatchet job, announced yesterday:

Statement: "An advisory committee

has recommended that a reorganization of the Athletic Department and football coaching staff be made at once."

Translation: "They told me to get rid of Hildebrand and Gibson . . . QUICK."

Statement: "It is the intention of the college to make athletics more effective and competitive in relation to the Atlantic Coast Conference and to promote a more vital relationship between athletics and the life and work of the college in keeping with high academic standards."

Translation: "Every team in the ACC has beat hell out of us for two years, and the alums have been screaming in my ear that THAT has got to CEASE!"

A Texan Says A Word For Dallas

To the Editor:

My home is in Irving, Texas, a suburb of Dallas, a town similar to Chapel Hill in many ways. My wife was born, raised, and educated in Chapel Hill; and I have enjoyed the hospitality of your town enough to want to retire there some day. Both of us read and enjoy your newspaper very much, but the letter you published in the December first issue from Harry Coutlakis is more disturbing than informative. I must assume that his views are in the minority, and do not represent the thinking prevalent among your readers.

I would say to this minority: When you are absolutely certain that your town harbors no one capable of murder, tell us again of our shame.

When you can feel certain that the Chapel Hill Police Force can protect any citizen from the ravages of a psychopath, tell us again of our Police Force's behavior.

When you, personally, have taken the time to vote in all public elections for one year, tell us again of our apathy.

When the fourth graders of Chapel Hill do not feel elated at a day out of school, or hysteria at the news of such a tragic event, tell us again of our "sickness."

When there are no radical or apathetic persons in Chapel Hill, tell us again of our guilt. When you can say "I support any action taken by any responsible and influential citizen in my town 100 per cent"—judge us "guilty by association" again. And, when you are without sin, throw stones at us.

Respectfully yours, Marlin Winn

To the Editor:

When That Horrible Year, 1963 draws dramatically to a close a few days hence, it will leave at least one awesome realization in its wake:

When neither the life of the First Citizen nor that of the least citizen is safe in America, neither can the lives of the citizens in between be safe.

Historians of tomorrow may record of today that it was a time in American history during which the symptoms of a fatal breakdown of law and order had already manifested themselves.

Whether this is written of us tomorrow is up to all of us today.

God help all of us to shoulder our responsibilities to law and order responsibility NOW.

Lew Barton

To the Editor:

I wonder how many of us realize that we are encouraging our children to make a game of war? Games are not only meant to develop skills, imagination, resourcefulness; they are also for pure fun and recreation. Is war fun, a creative pastime, a satisfying sense of achievement? Achievement, yes; but what is

the nature of this achievement? Should the taking of life be fun, recreation, satisfying?

Those of us who have been brought up to believe, and who still believe, even in the nuclear age, that war is a grim necessity at times, do not perhaps stop to realize the vast inconsistency of this conviction with that of the Christian ideal of love for our fellow man—which also we have been brought up to believe and still believe. How can a child reconcile, consciously or unconsciously, this inconsistency?

If his parents make a game of war with him, the small child absorbs this attitude—great fun, excitement, thrills! Then as he gets older the conflict within him increases. His parents must be right, but his own natural instinct for good tells him something is wrong. This can lead to serious psychological problems.

Of one thing we parents and grandparents are certain. Toys and games of constructive, creative nature which do not involve "killing," are psychologically safe, fun, exciting, develop skills of various sorts, increase the child's confidence in his parents' way of life. These toys are available everywhere. Why not stand on solid ground, on non-controversial ground, and bring into our children's lives this Christmas a greater sense of joy and security?

As a footnote I might add that after World War II Germany banned the sale of war toys, in order not to contribute to the indoctrination of the youngest generation in the art of war. Russia, also, has taken this stand and carefully chooses the toys for her children. Why cannot we, too, recognize the close relationship between a child's play and the development of his life attitudes?

(The evening of Sunday, December 8, Drew Pearson was on the air and he spoke on this subject with great emphasis. He mentioned how all too frequently we read the tragic news of the death or mutilation of a child from the gun of a playmate who by chance has had a loaded weapon in his hands. No wonder children become trigger-happy when their parents encourage such play. What we need is for parents to take a concerted stand and disarm the children.)

Jan S. Harper

Dear Sir:

As I was walking home the other day the Christmas Parade passed by, going the other way. My impression of the parade was: plenty of noise, a couple of toys, very little of Christmas. The only thing of real significance in the entire display was a group of "freedom" marchers, probably uninvited, passing out literature.

Somewhere in the rather thin crowds of spectators was my three-year-old daughter. She thoroughly enjoyed, and was very much impressed by the show. I would have been happier if she had stayed at home. She will

be taught that the true significance of Christmas is something of far greater value than the impression left in her mind by that parade.

Some say, as others say in defense of similar parades in other cities, that the parade was mostly for the children. If so, what was the purpose of the scantily-clad majorettes? Do beauty queens, toys, Santa Claus and Christmas carols in march time represent the Christmas spirit that the people of this community want to instill in their children?

Sincerely yours, H. D. Wagener

To the Editor:

On behalf of the more than two hundred foreign students and their families in our University Community this year, I should like to express at this Christmas-tide sincere thanks for the many gestures of hospitality and kindness the families of Chapel Hill have extended to these visitors in our midst from all over the world.

Especially they are grateful, they tell me, for the opportunities offered them, through the host family plan and your generous hospitality, to visit in our American homes, to get acquainted with our children, see how we live, taste our foods, and share our festivals. From my experience abroad I can tell you that these opportunities are appreciated. In the capitals of South America wherever we went we met people who had been students in Chapel Hill in former years; and their most vivid memories of this community were of the friends who entertained them, the visits and the festive occasions they shared with us in our homes here in Chapel Hill. No better way for fostering goodwill in this divided world has been found than the development of personal friendships. These people will long remember the experiences they shared with you; and because of your efforts, they will always in their hearts carry a bright and warm image of Chapel Hill.

During the coming Christmas holidays many of the foreign students will be making trips, but a few will remain here. They will be lonely, no doubt. Lenoir dining hall will be closed; and on Christmas day, if the usual policies are followed, it may even be difficult for students in the dormitories to find places to eat.

We are concerned about this problem; and therefore, if any family in the community would be interested in sharing some of the Christmas or New Year's festivities with our students from abroad, we would like to have you let us know. If you know a foreign student, you can make your own arrangements. If you do not, but are interested in helping entertain one or more, you need only call me either at the Office of Adviser

to Foreign Students or at my home, and we will try to put you in touch with a student who would enjoy being in your home.

Sincerely yours, A. C. Howell, Adviser to Foreign Students

To The Editor:

I wonder if one man alone could have created within himself sufficient hatred to allow him to ruthlessly take the life of the President of the United States—or the life of any other human being, for that matter? Senators Morton (R-Ky.) and Gore (D-Tenn.) can lay the full burden of the blame on Lee Harvey Oswald and pass the tragedy off as the "act of a madman," but must we, the people of the United States, accept the view of the honorable Senators as gospel, or even take it at face value? We must keep in mind that they are members of Congress, which comprises the legislative branch of the federal government of the United States, which is the nation whose moral and mental integrity is being questioned at this time by both natives and foreigners. Could the Senators be expected to do less than praise the stability and greatness of their country and seek to instill confidence in its people?

Just as we share in the glory of the United States, past and present, we must also share in its shame. The blame for the terrible tragedy that shook the very reasons and purposes of our nation only three short weeks ago falls not on one madman, but on each of us, the people, who, either by action or apathy, allowed this nation to progress (if indeed it can be so called) to a state of affairs where such an atrocity could occur.

The extremists, both left and right, are guilty, for their hatred suggested the unspeakable horror to the warped mind of misguided Lee Harvey Oswald. For these groups, John F. Kennedy served as an ideal target for criticism, an individual image upon whom minorities could vent their hatreds and seek to alleviate their frustrations. He was a man who did things and in so doing stepped on many toes. It is difficult to overlook the deep irony of the speech he had prepared to be given in Dallas, in which he would have begged the people to ignore the doctrines of hate and violence.

We, the non-extremists, in the middle-of-the-roads, neither strongly conservative nor liberal, a nation of spineless blobs who sit on our broad and tired posteriors and hope—as long as it requires no strenuous physical, mental, or moral effort on our part—that the crises of the world will work themselves out for the best; we, too, are guilty and must shoulder the weight of blame, for our inactivity, for our support of freedom and justice in theory, but not in action.

I fear that we, the American people, have already lulled ourselves into a dangerous complacency concerning the stability of our nation and its position in international affairs. The assassination of our President was neither the first nor the last of the unspeakably horrible acts that have taken place within this supposedly great nation in the span of a single year—1963.

Let us recall (as if we can ever forget) the brutal slaying of Negro leader Medgar Evers, or the heartless bombing of little children in Birmingham, or the attempted assassination of General Walker, or the vulgar abuse of United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson in Dallas, which

prompted concern about the President's proposed tour to that city. That concern John F. Kennedy could not accept as sufficient reason for cancelling the tour, for he knew that, above all, a leader must have—and display—a faith in the people he leads. John F. Kennedy displayed his faith and was shot down as he waved to the cheering, highly receptive crowds along the Dallas streets.

Our President was dead, but not even then did the acts of violence cease, not even with the completion of a tragedy so great in magnitude that the world was unable to believe it. Approximately forty-eight hours after the death of the President, his alleged assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, now himself the victim of an assassin's bullet, died in Parkland Hospital ironically, just across the hall from the emergency room in which President Kennedy had been treated in vain just two days earlier. The national horror and shock was complete and transcended the level of human comprehension.

Jack Ruby's murder of Oswald was far more detrimental to the image of the United States and its prestige in international affairs than the assassination of the Chief Executive, for the slaying of the alleged assassin indicated to the outside world (as had the endless racial strife earlier) the depths of hate and disorder to which the people of the great United States had fallen—when law and justice die along with our leaders, and the implement of hate is cheered like a conquering hero. For this death, too, we, the American society, must shoulder the blame—a society that through movies, books, and other entertainment media indicate that we condone the free pursuit of swift justice, by any means whatsoever, be they legal or in direct violation of the law.

Perhaps of even greater significance in determining the state of our nation than either of the aforementioned tragedies are two vaguely related incidents displaying the American virtues of hatred and prejudice. The first incident occurred in Woodland, Georgia. Joseph Parham, teacher, was dismissed by the local P.T.A. because he refused to formally apologize for writing a letter denouncing the behavior of his students who had cheered at the news of the assassination of the President. Mr. Parham blamed the parents for instilling disrespect in their children.

The second incident occurred in Dallas, Texas, which, despite the possible unfairness of the title, will exist in the hearts of many, both in the United States and abroad, as the "city of hate." On November 25, only two hours after the burial of the President, when Dallas and her citizens should have been leaning over backwards to re-establish their sensitivity and humanity, another man, another human being was buried—Lee Harvey Oswald. Pallbearers could not be found for him, and eventually seven newsmen were drafted to perform the task. No member of the clergy in Dallas would perform the final rites over the alleged assassin. When kindness and understanding could in part have redeemed the deep, dark sins of Dallas, both were noticeably absent.

Small incidents, these, when compared to the great tragedies that preceded them this year, but incidents charged with a deep message concerning the shadows of hatred and ignorance that fall over our beloved land. The blame falls on all of us—we must not relax, but rather intensify our struggle against the forces of hate and violence.

Wayne R. Hardy

Reporters' Seminar

Public Service At UNC

The Richmond News Leader

One appreciates the public service nature of the seminar for courtroom news reporters which has been conducted at Chapel Hill by the North Carolina Institute of Government.

As Judge Hamilton H. Hobgood told the reporters they often misinform the public in civil cases on account of their ignorance of what is actually taking place in the trial.

And Judge Hobgood might have enlarged on the subject and included criminal cases, and the various procedures leading up to the trials of both criminal and civil matters: Warrants, preliminary hearings, bonds, complaints, writs, etc.

We hardly expect the news reporters attending the seminar for a few days at the most, to learn from it alone basics which take lawyers months in college to acquire.

Frankly most of the court re-

porters in the past have learned what was really going on by the trial-and-error method, from instruction by kindly lawyers and from getting hauled out by hard-boiled city editors.

But today we are getting a "new breed" of reporters. They are bright young men who have been to journalism school to learn the techniques of their trade.

Since any journalism school worthy to bear that name should require courses in court reporting and the basic law knowledge needed in said reporting, we must feel sure that Judge Hobgood's remarks—and the purpose of the seminar—were directed at those stupid old line reporters, who broke into the game before schools of journalism were invented.

It is utterly inconceivable to us that any college or university should offer a degree in journalism to any student who has not successfully completed such a course.

