

Progress Is Our Most Important Product?

Last week Nikita Khrushchev announced to the world that the Soviet Union would be second to no country economically and productively in 1970. The Soviet Premier continued that in 1965 Russia will have raised her production by 80%.

Although the changes in Russia during the next six years will not raise the economic status of Russia to that of the United States, and regardless of the fact that this threat to the Western free powers may not be realized, we have now and have had an obligation to ourselves to see that stagnation does not pollute progress. By having made this announcement Khrushchev only reminds the Western powers that continual growth in countries of free economic systems must be evident to poverty-stricken, backward countries.

These people will grasp at anything that offers a solution to their starvation, not realizing that their hunger for food may soon turn to hunger for freedom. These same people are not only in foreign lands, for there are many among us.

Children are hungry everywhere. How well did we contribute to the relief of some of these children? UNICEF will give us our answer . . . \$13.42. CARE would answer if we would ask. Is this how we will make it possible for other countries to move out of the reaches of Communism?

In the Soviet Union there are no strikes, feather-bedding, recessions or depressions, for their type of society does not allow for such occurrences. We are, therefore, hindered by these factors. We see then that this challenge by the Soviet Union is not only one to accelerate progress but one to settle difficulties before they arise. Are people keeping their money in circulation so as to allow employers the financial means to content their employees?

The Soviet Union may fail in its attempts to raise its economic status. It is a known fact that their natural resources are greater than those of the United States; however, these resources have been found in thinly populated areas of the Ural. Only methods similar to those of Stalin will compel workers to migrate to these areas. Khrushchev has revealed his concern for lack of workers by setting up an act stating that all children reaching the age of 16 must seek work, unless they are especially gifted. However, the generation now of age to work is small in number since birth rates were low during the Second World War.

Another Soviet liability is the lack of capital in the U. S. S. R. They are in the midst of raising the standards of living, sponsoring housing projects and carrying on outside activities, and it is not known whether or not they can continue these projects and improve the economic status simultaneously. Their previous plans for economic progress failed because of lack of capital.

However, if the Soviet Union does continue its present progress, and in forty years it has made amazing advances, what will be the fate of the United States in the year 1970, when its economic status is no longer the greatest of all nations?

Editor's Note

I wish to thank Mary Jo Wynne, associate editor of the *Salemite* for taking complete charge of the publication of this issue.

On The Abolishing Of Academic Work



Advisory Committee Urges Further Study Of Judicial Board And A Point System

The Student Government Association met with the Faculty Advisory Board Monday to acquaint the Board with the working of the various study groups on campus. These four study groups at work on campus are concerned with the establishing of a Judicial Board, evaluating Rat Week, establishing a points system for extra curricular activities, and improving the intellectual climate on Salem campus.

The study done on the possibilities of setting up a Judicial Board and a point system was discussed in detail with members of the Faculty Advisory Board contributing their ideas on the advantages and disadvantages of these possible additions.

The points brought out on the establishment of these two systems were:

1. Judicial Board
 - A. It would handle all cases other than those automatic penalties handled by the House Council and the major offenses handled by the Advisory Board.
 - B. Council would consist of a permanent board and a revolving board.
 - 1) Permanent board: elected chairman, President of Stee Gee, four Vice Presidents of classes.
 - 2) Revolving board: Five different members each week chosen from a list of volunteers compiled at beginning of school year.
 - C. Jurors and council would meet at beginning of school year to acquaint themselves with policies to follow.
 - D. A Board of Appeals would be set up to which a girl could protest if she objected to the five revolving members sitting in on her case or if she considered her punishment unfair. This Board would consist of six permanent members and the Advisory Board.
 - E. Advantages: would give student body more responsibility in learning and upholding rules; Student Government Association would have more time to work on other important matters.
 - F. Weakness: Jurors might not be effective enough since they would only serve on jury duty once a year.
 - G. Students would report their violations to the Judicial Board.
2. Point System
 - A. For extra curricular activities
 - B. Would be on year plan
 - C. Points for an office would range according to the importance and responsibility of the office.
 - D. Advantages: greater efficiency in office since more time could be devoted to the office; divides offices among more students.

One other point discussed in this meeting was the possibility of installing a food center in the Student Union. No definite plans for this have been made.

The Salemite



Published every Friday of the College year by the Student Body of Salem College

OFFICES—Lower Floor Main Hall
Downtown Office—414 Bank St., S.W.

Printed by the Sun Printing Company

Subscription Price—\$3.50 a year

Editor-in-chief _____ Jean Smitherman
Associate Editor _____ Mary Jo Wynne
News Editor _____ Nancy Jane Carroll
Feature Editor _____ Erwin Robbins
Managing Editor _____ Susan Foard
Copy Editor _____ Sallie Hickok
Headline Editor _____ Sarah Ann Price
Business Manager _____ Corky Scruggs
Advertising Manager _____ Rosemary Laney
Circulation Manager _____ Becky Smith
Asst. Business Manager _____ Betsy Gilmour
Columnists: Sandy Shaver, Mary Jane Mayhew.
Faculty Advisor _____ Miss Jess Byrd
Typists _____ Irene Noel, Joanne Doremus
Asst. Advertising Manager _____ Lynn Ligon

Khrushchev's Plans For Germany Are Not What They Seem

Last week at a reception honoring a Polish delegation to Moscow Khrushchev demanded the end of the Big Four occupation of Berlin. This announcement came rather suddenly and raises some speculation as to what brought it about . . .

The Potsdam Declaration at the close of the war in 1945 divided Germany among France, Britain, Russia and the U. S. making these countries responsible for the rehabilitation and eventual uniting of Germany. Berlin fell into the Eastern (Russian) part of Germany, but it was agreed to have four sectors giving each country a part. In 1948 the three zones under the Western power united to form the West German Federal Republic, and shortly thereafter the Eastern part became the German Democratic Republic. Since this time the Communists have been trying to bring about a united Germany, but a deadlock always develops over West Germany's insistence on having a government formed by the freely expressed will of the people.

Khrushchev's recent announcement states that the Western powers must negotiate the right of access to Berlin with the east German government. To enforce this the Communists may impose a blockade of the highways and waterways as they did in 1948. An effective blockade would require control of the air and attempts to do this would undoubtedly lead to war. It is obvious that Russia's tremendous economic plan announced last week leaves no room for war, so this move in Berlin must have been made for another reason. It may be a way to revive the issue of a summit conference, to exert pressure for the unification of Germany, or to test West German and allied unity. I think the most important possibility is that Khrushchev may be acting as a decoy to take pressure out of the Quemoy area. The Chinese Communist aims have been accomplished to some extent. They have gotten their people agitated in harder production (doubled iron and steel output) and have succeeded in discrediting the U. S. and getting the sympathy of nations in Southeast Asia. Now a policy of patience and long range expectation may bring about the Communists aim to dominate the off shore islands. Red China may have exerted pressure on Khrushchev to divert the world's attention to another area. This possibility that Khrushchev is moving in the interest of Red China has far reaching implications. Russia wants to hold on to this powerful ally and she may limit her own actions to do this. This would ease the direct pressure between the U. S. and Russia and possibly give us more freedom to act. On the other hand Red China is more impulsive and likely to go to war. No doubt this liaison will be watching . . . where will the decoy bob next?