

The Daily Nebraskan

Member
Intercollegiate Press
FORTY-SEVENTH YEAR

The Daily Nebraskan is published by the students of the University of Nebraska as an expression of student news and opinions only. According to article II of the by laws governing student publications and administered by the Board of Publications: "It is the declared policy of the Board that publications under its jurisdiction shall be free from editorial censorship on the part of the Board, or on the part of any member of the faculty of the university; but members of the staff of The Daily Nebraskan are personally responsible for what they say or do or cause to be printed."

Subscription rates are \$2.00 per semester, \$2.50 per semester mailed, or \$3.00 for the college year. \$4.00 mailed. Single copy 5c. Published daily during the school year except Mondays and Saturdays, vacations and examination periods, by the University of Nebraska under the supervision of the Publication Board. Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under Act of Congress, March 3, 1879, and at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized September 10, 1922.

EDITORIAL

Editor: Frits Simpson, Susie Reed
Managing Editors: Frits Simpson, Susie Reed
News Editor: Gene Berg, Bruce Kennedy, Norma Chubbuck, Jerry Ewing, Fochie Rediger
Sports Editor: Jerry Warren
Ag Editor: Arion Bean
Society Editor: Jean Fenster
Photographer: Hank Lammers

BUSINESS

Business Manager: Keith O'Bannon
Assistant Business Managers: Ted Randolph, Jack Cohen, Chuck Burmeister
Circulation Manager: Wendy Ganger
Nite News Editor: Gene Berg

A Course of Action . . .

A considerable number of students whom we have talked to have expressed some little wonder about the Council's proposed Student Court.

Some of these have thought that the court plan was too impractical to operate. Some have the whole idea was silly. Just how right these students were remains to be seen.

Personally, we think it is a jolly idea. A student court could conceivably bring many desirable reforms to the campus.

But we can't help but think that the Council is confusing itself with a thing of relative unimportance at this time. We wish the Council would concern itself more with its constitution, at this stage a highly-confusing and ambiguous document. We wish it would prepare one, final constitution that would stop the interminable squabbling about its validity and jurisdiction.

We know the Council is making some steps toward the drafting of a constitution. But we think these steps could be taken more quickly and effectively. As it now stands, there is little possibility that the new constitution will not go into effect before next fall at the earliest.

We can't help but think that if the Council had from the first concerned itself primarily with a new constitution, the thing could now be close to ratification.

The only way this end can be accomplished is by the Council itself taking action now on a constitution, instead of bothering itself with so many projects which, while worthy, are not nearly so important.

Cub Clem.

Athletic Ticket Price Scale

STUDENT TICKETS.			
	Est. Price	Gov't. Tax	Total
Football (season)	4.17	.83	5.00
Other sports (season)	2.50	.50	3.00
FACULTY TICKETS.			
Football (season)	5.00	1.00	6.00
Other sports (season)	3.33	.67	4.00
PUBLIC TICKETS.			
Reserved	2.92	.58	3.50
Box	3.33	.67	4.00
Football (season)	14.60	2.90	17.50
Box (season)	16.75	3.25	20.00
OTHER TICKETS.			
General admission	1.67	.33	2.00
Knithole	.42	.08	.50

Frosh 'Display Promise' In Experimental Recital

BY PAUL WEICK.

A sixteen member freshmen acting group showed great promise as future University theatre performers in their first acting recital of the year, given Friday evening in the Temple.

A group of nine skits from well known plays made up the production. Outstanding was the first portrayal of the scene between Queen Elizabeth and Mary of Scotland, from the Broadway play "Mary of Scotland." Marjorie Line as Elizabeth showed a great deal of stage presence and moved comfortably about the stage. The same is to be said of Diane Wornig as Mary. In the second showing of this scene, Virginia Koehler as Elizabeth and Mary Kay Toller as Mary pleased the audience with convincing portrayals. The skit itself is well suited to a production of this sort.

Beatta Schlueter, in the opening performance of the "cell scene" from Maxwell Anderson's "Joan of Lorraine," succeeded in creating the atmosphere desired and left the audience pleased. This cut was followed by one from the comedy "The Pirate," in which Jack Moore handled the part of the pirate with ease and good presence and Vernell Lewis was convincing as the lady he lost his heart to. A rapidly moving script added to the performance.

The rendezvous between two young lovers of the last generation in "Ah! Wilderness" was played by Alice Meyer and Wesley Jensen, both of whom moved easily from moments of tenderness to anger. "Stage Door," the story of young hopefuls living together in a New York rooming house, found Dorothy Elliot as Terry and Ramona Van Wyngarden as Jean. They fit themselves well into a quickly moving and dramatic scene.

Gertrude Carey as Mrs. Phillips and Lucy Lawrence as Christine gave the scene from "The Silver Cord" in which Mrs. Phillips meets her daughter-in-law for the first time, making a last desperate attempt to tie securely her apron strings to her son. Betty Stratton gave a good performance of Regina and David Sissles as her husband in a scene from Lillian Hellman's Broadway success, "The Little Foxes." Making use of good lighting effects, Ward Lindley was convincing in his portrayal of Death in a scene from "Death Takes A Holiday."

The stagecraft class of William Ellis contributed effective lighting where needed, especially in "Joan of Lorraine" and the last mentioned. Make-up was on the whole very good, adding much to the characterization of Death and Elizabeth in "Mary of Scotland."

On Proposed Court . . .

Two Students Show Opinions

PRO

FOR THE STUDENT COURT

Student courts have been successful in other schools, such as Stanford and Michigan. It is felt that a student court would work at Nebraska as well. The proposal is not a criticism of the present capable handling of disciplinary matters by the university administration.

THE NEED.

(1) to put in effect the conviction that university students are old enough to handle their own problems of discipline. Student discipline is a student matter and should be handled by students.

(2) to emphasize the fact that accepted student conduct is a concern of students and not merely the faculty.

(3) to ease the feeling that students are being oppressed by the faculty.

(4) to eliminate the exaggerated accounts of disciplinary actions against students.

(5) to provide further safeguards to protect students being disciplined.

(6) as to **advisory opinions**, the court would also be available to students and faculty to hear grievances and suggestions. It would investigate and carefully consider such problems as the Kosmet Klub show, senior week, timing of exams and vacations, etc. No organization is now equipped to do this.

WILL THE PROPOSED COURT PLAN DO THE JOB?

1. As to "constitutional rights." Some criticize the proposed plan in its provisions for secrecy of trials, no right of facing one's accusers, and no jury trial, etc. To these criticisms the answer is threefold:

(a) These "constitutional rights" do not exist under the present handling by the administration—a system of which most students approve. Probably this is necessary, for student discipline requires a different type of handling than matters before courts of law.

(b) Such provisions are necessary to make both a strong court and to protect student rights.

Those appearing before the court would generally desire secret trial as is now done. The "no-right-of-confrontation" is necessary to encourage students to report violations. Violations probably would not be reported if those making the report had to appear before the court. Again, this follows the present system.

A seven-judge court would in effect constitute a student jury, in contrast to our present one-man court.

(c) If these or other provisions appear to be undesirable, they can be easily changed.

2. As to other defects.

There are criticisms that the present plan has defects. It doubtless does have—every new organization has to iron out its flaws as they appear.

Some say the proposed plan will make too strong a court—while others say it will make too weak a court. Who knows? The present proposal is but a starter. As it grows in prestige and practice its weaknesses will be worked out.

3. As to protection of student rights.

The new court would not set up new offenses or a "police force."

Students need not fear a harsh court. Students better understand their own problems, and the court would be kept in bounds by a code to be later drawn up. And there are further safeguards, which readily appear on reading the Constitution of the Student Court.

In addition, there is always the right of appeal. Students would get two chances under the new court, whereas they now get only one.

CONCLUSION

The establishment of a student court rests with the students. It is not being forced on them.

There is little to lose from establishment of a student court and perhaps much to gain. The court can be put on trial and if it does not work, it can be dropped.

Let's at least give it a try.

Respectfully submitted,
The Judiciary Sub-committee
of the Student Council.

CON

For the past several weeks The Daily Nebraskan has printed the proposed articles of the constitution of a Student Court, now under tentative discussion by the Council and possibly to be submitted to the student body. Before any action is taken, each student should examine two issues:

(1) **Is there any reason to have any student court?** Have there ever been any demands by the student body for such a student court? It is fundamental that no authority can prosecute and try others except for offenses committed against that authority. But what offenses does a student commit against the student body? What right do any students have to judge the activities of other students off the University campus? What kind of punishment can it mete out?

How can anyone support this court when he does not know what is the "accepted discipline" for which he will be liable? And the only reason given for the "advisory opinion" function is that the student council, which should handle such controversies, is not doing it. Why not? If this is just to be a traffic court, or a mock court for the enjoyment of all, that is one thing; but that is not what has been proposed.

Lacks Basic Rights.

(2) **Do we want this kind of court?** Every single basic right, guaranteed by our federal constitution because of the tyranny which is possible without them, has been left out of this court. A student could be indicted without ever knowing what offense he committed and without ever being told in advance that such action was punishable. He could be tried in secret without ever knowing who his accuser is and without the right to confront the witnesses testifying against him, cross-examine the complainant, or insure the presence in court of witnesses for his defense.

He is not promised the right to have someone speak for him and defend his rights, should he feel he is not as well versed in the "local law" as his judges, who also happen to be his prosecutors. He is not even given a trial by jury—just a court established by the student council with half of its members picked by the student council from the student council. His only right of appeal is to the authority which originally decided an offense had been committed. In other words, he is given absolutely no rights and protection such as are necessary to any court worth establishing.

Little Assurance.

It may well be, as is often promised, that we need not worry—all of these things will be taken care of by amendments, some sort of future code or by-laws, or in the actual proceedings. But that is very little assurance to the history students who have read of the Star Chamber, the political science students who have studied loyalty purges, or literature students acquainted with Kafka's "The Trial." It may well be that Nebraska students are not concerned whether these rights are protected or not. But before the student council risks its prestige upon such a proposal or any student votes for it, he should consider whether or not such a court is necessary and desirable.

TED SORENSON



Ted Sorenson

(Editor's note: Ted Sorenson, a law college student, appeared before the Student Council recently to present his impression of the proposed Court.)



Fred Chael

(Editor's note: Fred Chael is chairman of the Student Council Judiciary committee, where the idea of a Student Court has been developed.)

Foreign Students Honor Gustavson

A program of an international flavor was presented at the annual faculty reception held by the Cosmopolitan club Saturday night, Jan. 7.

The reception, which is held annually as a semi-formal banquet, helps acquaint foreign students attending the University with faculty and administration.

The program included Bjorn Karlson, singing, Norwegian; Robert Webster, piano, South American; Mohammed Shajoozy, violin, Iran; Luis Star, accordion, Hungary; Lawrence Lee, piano, China.

Chancellor R. G. Gustavson, Dr. Floyd Hoover and other faculty members were present.

Gus Reza, student from Iran, was in charge of the banquet.

Play Cast . . .

(Continued from Page 1)

Williams, Milton Hoffman will understudy the part of Tom, Cedric Hartman the part of Jim, Maxine Elliot the character of Amanda, and Mary Lou Thompson, the part of Laura.

"The play is unquestionably, according to critics, one of the most powerful and beautiful stories in the history of the American theater," according to Williams.

"The Glass Menagerie," has been awarded the Pulitzer prize, and received the Drama Critics Award for 1945.

Memory Play

Theatre director Dallas Williams explained that the play is a memory play, with Tom as a narrator as well as a character in the play. The action in his recollection of the event. The time is the early 1930's, and flashback scenes are used throughout the play.

The play is extremely difficult from the view of characterization, and staging, in the opinion of Williams. There are actually three settings on the stage at the same time—the front of the house, the living room, and the dining room—and action alternates between the three sections.

The play has been in rehearsal since Christmas vacation, and rehearsals will continue with a short

NU Bulletin Board

NUWA Publicity committee will meet Tuesday, 5 p.m. in Room 316, Union.

Association of Red Guidon, Field Artillery Honorary will meet and initiate Tuesday at 7:30 p.m. in the motor truck lab on Ag campus. This will be the first initiation since '43. Pre-war members will conduct the initiation.

People who have lost their Student Directory receipts may call for their directories on Wednesday 5 to 6 p.m. in the Builder's office, 308 Union.

time out for cast members to take final examinations.