

Do We Need I. D. Cards?

Do Salem students need I. D. cards? This question was brought up at the Stee Gee meeting in assembly Monday and various ideas were batted around. The one company already contacted will furnish the bill-fold size card with a picture for 40c apiece. This card is planned to have a space where the dates of college attendance may be restamped each year, in order that one card may serve a student four years. For this reason, each student would buy her own card and the price would not be included in each year's student budget fee.

But what would students be able to use the cards for? It seems that the girls who travel, to New York for instance, need some sort of identification to get student rates at hotels. When a student is trying to cash a check, an I. D. card would take the place of Lecture Series tickets, old receipts, and perhaps the driver's license which most stores request. There was even speculation that Winston-Salem movies, to say nothing of the home-town ones, would honor these cards for special rates.

But "perhaps" is a potent word. We need assurance that these I. D. cards can be used. Two girls of the Legislative Board, Sally Wood and Jane Givens, are in charge of investigating these uses. We suggest that other students aid in this project by asking store managers and home-town movies, as well as students from other colleges, if I. D. cards are honored.

If they prove to be of value, then by all means we should order I. D. cards. But if they will just be more pieces of paper cluttering up billfolds, we see no point in going through the process of getting pictures made and all the rest of the red tape involved.

S. L. F.

Honor Tradition Gives Security And Relief

Riding back from Thanksgiving vacation sitting in the dining car of the train, we watched three male students from a neighboring institution gradually forget the cares of the world as their collection of cans grew larger. And we thought, not about the question of drinking "alcoholic beverages", but of the security which Salem gives us.

For at Salem the Honor Tradition is not ridiculed by the student body. This is not to say that the six major violations are not broken. But there is a great difference between Salem's concept of its Honor Tradition and the concept students from most other colleges have of their own honor systems. We know that the majority, the great majority, of students at Salem do not break these rules.

For instance, many students from other colleges cannot believe that we have no trouble with cheating during tests. And yet, it's just not done. Therefore, because it is working we do not laugh at the Honor Tradition.

We are sure that members of the Salem community other than students often look with skepticism on the set-up of the Honor Tradition, the fact that no student is required to turn another in for a violation. We too wonder how long this system will be effective. There is a great relief in knowing that you do not have to serve as an accuser in a public inquiry, whether it be before a board of ten or the whole student body. This relief could very well lead to laxity in upholding the Honor Tradition oneself.

And yet, it is upon this feeling of relief, coupled with a realization of the security which is offered, that the continuing existence of the Honor Tradition depends.

... You are sitting in the dining car of a train traveling back to Winston watching three boys have a beer. You have a sense of relief because none of the other Salemites are watching you carefully, waiting to turn you in, and because you don't have to watch anyone else. You feel a comforting sense of affection for Salem because its founders and the Salemites before you have been concerned enough for your welfare to tell you what to do, on that train swaying quickly back to Salem. You are a Salem girl, and you are proud of it.

S. L. F.



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

DITOR	Susan Foard	BUSINESS MANAGER	Betsey Guerrant
News Editor	Mary Lu Nuckols	Asst. Business Mgr.	Sara Lou Richardson
Feature Editor	Harriet Herring	Advertising Manager	Jo Ann Wade
Asst. Feature Editor	Susan Hughes	Circulation Manager	Becky Smith
Headline Editors	Alta Lu Townes Joanne Doremus	Managing Editor	Elizabeth Lynch
Copy Editor	Barbara Altman	Managing Staff	Carole King Sandra Gilbert
Faculty Advisor	Miss Jess Byrd		

Salem Practice Teachers Give Conflicting Opinions On "Full Day" Schedule

By Susan Hughes

This year the education department initiated a new system for practice teaching. For the first time the girls who are working toward a teacher's certificate are spending two weeks teaching all day in the schools in this area. The new system is an accelerated program including observation as well as the actual practice teaching. This new plan has had much criticism and some praise from many quarters. The Salem staff thought the feelings of some of the students who are participating in the new program would make a good article—with a follow-up of faculty opinion.

In talking to the girls we found that the largest majority felt that the new system put them under too much pressure as far as continuing their education in other areas. Caroline Easley said that she felt it was wrong to have made the girls "full-time teachers and part-time students" while they are still in the student situation, and still trying to take advantage of formal education. The student teachers must teach all day, missing all classes for those days they teach, yet they are expected to make up completely all the work missed.

Barbara Payne, who is getting her primary teaching certificate, says that the schedules ought to be set up with practice teaching only—no other classes during that semester unless half-semester classes can be given to coincide with the methods course. She says, "As it is now, I just can't keep up." However, she likes the half-day and whole day practice teaching plan, rather than teaching one or two hours a day the whole semester because it does let her accomplish something in the classroom. Another said that a comparison of grades under the two systems should prove that the new system is hurting the academic life of the student teacher.

One who will be teaching next semester said that she was worried about comprehensives since her practice teaching would come right when she should be preparing for these important examinations. Many girls refused to comment because they felt that anything they said would be held against them when grades were being issued.

Other girls expressed their disappointment in Salem because they said that Salem is not really a liberal arts school, but a teachers' college geared to the needs, feelings, whims and requirements of the education department, thus creating conflicts for those who do not enter the student teaching program. There were several girls who did not feel that the whole system is bad.

Norwood Dennis said that the academic pressure is making it hard, but she thinks that, on the whole, the new system is working well. Her advice to girls planning to practice teach was that they should try to get all the required courses off, and take as many hours as possible before their senior year.

Sarah Tesch seemed to be greatly in favor of the new system. She said that the two weeks full time in the classroom is a much more realistic situation than the former system. She also commented that she thinks that "the accelerated seven weeks will be a good review and will challenge us to get serious about this teaching—and lead directly into the classroom—much more so than a semester of 224 last year would have done."

Of course we could not interview every student on campus, so we tried to get a cross-section of student opinion. On the whole, the girls who have participated or who are participating in the new system say that they feel the pressure is too great. Most of them cannot say that they prefer the old system because they did not participate in it to any great degree, but they seem to agree that there were fewer complaints, conflicts and complexities under the old system.

Are The Panama Riots Only "Incidents"?

By Louise Adams

As President Eisenhower embarks on an unprecedented 20,000 mile pilgrimage this week to eleven countries in Europe, the Near and Far East, small explosions are occurring in the American Hemisphere. The latest disturbance comes from the Panama Canal Zone.

In 1898 the U. S. emerged from the Cuban-Spanish American War as the mistress of the Caribbean. In 1903 the treaty under which the U. S. acquired the 10-mile wide Canal Zone bisecting Panama was negotiated. Theodore Roosevelt was President—he wanted a canal, so he took it. The canal has proved valuable. It has enabled us to combine our Pacific and Atlantic naval fleets and has been of tremendous value to the merchant seamen of the world. However, our behavior in the Caribbean during the early part of this century is the reason for the great anti-American feeling now expressed, "south of the border." The U. S. "Good Neighbor Policy" is at a low ebb. Another Cordell Hull is needed. The Latin and South American relations with the U. S. demand attention.

The Cubans have been shouting at the U. S. for such a long time that the public of the United States is no longer alarmed. Now the Panamanian presidential candidate is trying to promote the nationalization of the Panama Canal Zone in an imitation of Nasser and Egypt.

The treaty signed by the U. S. and Panama in 1903 concerning the canal states:

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power and authority within the zone . . . which the (United States) would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign . . .

This phrasing was designed to avoid offending Panamanian nationalists. Panamanians are now demanding that the flag of Panama be flown in the zone to symbolize Panamanian sovereignty.

On Nov. 3 Panamanian extremists tried to raise their flag in the zone. Repulsed by U. S. soldiers, the mob rioted and returned to Panama City to storm the U. S. Embassy. The Panamanian government was not active in the demonstration, but was aware, in advance, of its existence. In fact, this kind of violence was approved by the Panamanian "bluebloods" who control the government and business of the country.

Greater hatred was easily and deliberately stirred up after the riots ended. The "bluebloods" wanted more U. S. business and found the situation ripe for forcing the issue. The threats brought Livingston Merchant, top U. S. troubleshooter, from Washington. He reaffirmed Panama's "titular sovereignty" over the zone and promised that as soon as order was restored, a policy for buying only U. S. or Panamanian products in the Canal Zone would be adopted. This satisfied the "bluebloods", but not the ignorant, ragged masses of the lower class.

Last weekend, the occasion of Panama's 138th anniversary of independence from Spain, more riots were staged. The President of the U. S. called it "only an incident". The President of Panama, Ernesto de la Guardia, urged that "the Panamanian flag not be carried to the Canal Zone by blows."

The people cried, "Viva Russia!" "Viva Fidel Castro!" "To the Zone!" It seems that the "incident", encouraged by many who now beg for tranquility, is not under control. In light of the Suez, Nasser, and Great Britain situation, can the U. S. afford President Eisenhower's "only an incident" reaction?