SUB To Hold First ‘Follies’
On March 16

Plans are being made for University first ‘Follies’ next week. At Saturday, March 16 at 8:00 p.m., in 105 Benton Hall, The Follies will present a variety of student entertainment, including folk-singing, dancing, skits, poetry reading, and playing musical instruments. Admission will be free.

Any student or group of students interested in performing in the Follies should contact Dr. Oakes, PA 5-3021, and give her the necessary information concerning the kind of act needed, the person in charge, and how long the act will take.

Also, there will be an open international meeting on Wed., March 13 at 2:30.

SA president, Miss Killenberg, will present a variety of student reading, and playing musical instruments. Admission will be free.

Student Court Loses Powers
Move Is Provisional Only

The Student Court has lost its powers in disciplinary matters under the Provisional Rules of Procedure adopted by the Board of Curators on February 23.

These Rules are in effect until September 20 only. Any student or faculty member can submit suggestions and comments on the Provisional Rules before July 1.

The Board of Curators will consider all suggestions before finalizing procedures.

As the Rules now stand, punishment of a student court is made. However, neither are student courts expressly forbidden. Power to hear cases is vested in the Student Court.

There is provision for the operation of student ‘forums’ for investigating facts, holding hearings and recommending impositions. These forums must exist under established student honor systems with written codes approved by the Chancellor. The honor system exists in the School of Law at Columbia. According to Dr. Harold Eickhoff, Dean of Student Affairs, the student court system could be made operational on this campus if incorporated into such an honor system. The Student Court now constitutes the Judiciary branch of the Student Association and is provided for in the SA Constitution. However, there is no written honor code on this campus.

The principal change effected by the document is the increased power for the Student Court. The new document appoints the Chancellor for all cases of law to students. The new president or chancellor of an institution may no longer displace a student solely on the recommendation of a committee or other body.

The Rules refer to procedures only. Standards of conduct are contained in Article IV of the By-laws of the Board of Curators. Complete tests of the procedures are available for use and review by all interested parties. They may be picked up at the Office of Public Information, Room 224, Benton Hall.
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Galosy Denies Power Play

Rich Galosy, an originator of the present constitutional revision movement, denied last week that the revision drive was inspired by a desire to take away the power of the student government. At the meeting of the Chancellor's Advisory Council Thursday, February 29, he denied "the feeling that the students involved were for power."

"I don't particularly want to be associated with a movement for power," he remarked. "This isn't a revolution—it's a revision."

Galosy attributed the power struggle to two factors: misunderstanding of the criticism the revisionists have aimed at the present student government, and misapprehension of the criticism of those involved in the constitutional movement.

Some students have interpreted the criticism of the student government as criticism of those involved in the government, he said. Calling this a misinterpretation, Galosy argued that "Our main objection is that student government isn't representative. There is no attempt to overthrow the present structure and no animosity to anybody within the present structure."

"It was a fear of this 'power-play' reaction which caused Galosy, Gary Lewis, and former Student Association president, Michael Hughes, all organizers of the revision drive, to agree not to take an active part in the constitutional convention."

"Our position is an advisory position," Galosy stated. "The actual decisions in the hands of the students who will be affected by student government." (Galosy, Hughes and Lewis are all seniors.)

The second factor contributing to the "power-play" notion may be more serious, Galosy inferred. Statements by some revisionists concerning student-administration relations have tended to alienate faculty and administration, he said.

Galosy blamed part of this on misunderstanding, but he also warned "Valedans certain people keep their mouths shut, it's going to get worse."

He maintained that the purpose of constitutional revision is to replace a "pseudo-representative" student government structure with a popularly-elected government. "The only kind of a quota system student power I advocate," he added, "is that students have a say-so—that the student be represented to the persons who are going to decide what's going on around here."
Why Student Government?

We have devoted considerable news and editorial space to the recent excitement over student government. Is there a student power movement at UMSL? Is there a need for student power at UMSL? Does the Administration have too great a part in student affairs? Are popular elections the answer? Does the constitution need rewriting? Are the people determined to rewrite it qualified? Etc. etc. ad nauseam.

We are all dissatisfied with the present student government. Everyone is screaming for changes. But to what end? What do we want from student government? What did UMSL's recent student government lack to cause such an uproar--and is a structural change in the constitution that will permit popular elections going to make everything all right?

The officers, whether popularly elected or despotically appointed, still have to officiate, they still have to do something. What? This, basically, is the problem with UMSL student government. It does nothing--it doesn't even know what it should do.

The few flags that the SA has engaged in, Viet Nam Week and a few debates about triggering an intellectual revolution here on our campus, could have been handled by a group of committees for equal speakers. The SA has passed some legislation. Does anybody know what or why? Of course not--for the most part it was "busy" work. And when it wasn't, nothing was done to make the legislative decisions effective.

To discover what our student government is now doing, that it should be doing, we must first decide what student government is supposed to do, which brings us to another very basic question.

What is the function of student government, particularly on this campus?

We feel that the primary function of student government is to involve the students in a direct -in some cases, the only- way to create a sense of identity and purpose for the students with their school. Has UMSL's student government done this? Just looking at a few representative comments by students that UMSL's "SA is too busy," and "that high school on Natural Bridge" we can see that it has not. UMSL is a place to go to school--but still few students are proud that they go here. We feel that part of the blame for this ho-hum attitude lies in our ineffective student government, which has done nothing to foster any loyalty for itself or the campus.

Do we need homecomings and Viet Nam weeks? They're nice, and they help create a big-university atmosphere, but aren't there other things we need as well? What about forums and panels and discussions, held during the day, without the fanfare of big name speakers, and the drama of international topics, but with faculty members, administration members, and students all meeting and having an opportunity to discuss things. We need to have more of these meetings. It will interest them and draw them together. What about class meetings with only the little organization and purpose to them, so that the few sterilizing souls who show up are not discouraged from ever showing up again. What about a better attempt to involve UMSL students in covering something that it deserves in news media other than the Current, so students can be proud that they go to UMSL instead of explaining what it is, where it is, and that it definitely is not a junior college.

What about the SA involving itself? Is the real problems of this campus, even if they aren't very glamorous? Why don't they set up committees to study behind the scenes--create some plans, make the need for study room, and cafeteria grievances. Maybe student groups could come up with solutions, where there can be solutions, which incorporate student action in solving the problems.

A secondary function of student government is to keep the three main groups in the University working smoothly together, and to make each aware of the other's needs and problems. We have always been under the impression that all three were working for the same goal: the education of the students. The students go to school to learn, and the students doing too little of it, is legitimate.

But for now, regarding the question of student power on this campus, what could be more ridiculous? First we need a good student government, requiring organized student action, which does something, and then the question of whether the administration is doing too much of it, and the students doing too little of it, is legitimate.

Court of Student Affairs

The Board of Curators is soliciting comments and suggestions on the procedures recently adopted concerning student legal rights, until July 1, 1969.

Chancellor Bugg made the following statement concerning the procedures:

"The Board of Curators has approved a set of procedures concerning student discipline review and appeal, which sets forth procedures required by recent Federal Court decisions. These procedures are intended to be the legal parameters within which a university must operate and are not intended to impinge upon proper interest of the faculty and the students in student discipline, substantive or procedural.

"It is my intention to refer these procedures to various committees and organizations for study so that they can and will make recommendations to the Board. I would like to emphasize that these are procedures as they now exist and are open to amendment. They insure legal right and are effective only when a student is charged with a violation of some student conduct rule.

"The document in question is clearly designed to ensure that the interests of the faculty and the students are the same as the starting point of legal requirements. It is anticipated that these procedures will incorporate educational philosophy, policy and procedure.

"In light of the need for documentation of the proceedings, in a manner which will permit popular elections going to make everything all right?"
The Draft: A Study of the History of Conscription

by Don Schwalbe

March 7, 1968
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FIRST OF A SERIES

The origin of the draft is not in the halls of the U.S. Congress. Depending on your position, the blame or the credit belongs to the Macedonians, who improved on the Greek and early Roman concept of the citizen-soldier.

Greek required every young man to undergo military training for a year or more (usually two years) in most free cities. This supplied a trained army of citizen-soldiers, but later developed a more professional armed force. Early Rome also used the citizen-soldier to undergo military training as well as a standing army.

At the end of the Franco-Prussian War, the "nation at arms" principle was firmly embedded in the military structure of France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Russia and partially developed in the lesser nations of Europe. In theory, every man was a trained, combat ready soldier. The general principle was a training period of two or three years for all young men. Until middle age, these men would be reservists subject to calling any emergency. Equipment and uniforms were stored in the barracks of each district.

This system of mobilization offered once an immediate increase of troops for the regular army, a standby pool of reinforcements, and a group capable of training new reserves. Using such a program, a European state could drastically increase its military in a very short time.

During the European military evolution, the United States did not develop her forces in such a manner. The first front of national conscription legislation was enacted during the Civil War by the Confederate government in 1862. The Northern Militia Act of 1862 relied on the states to perform of enough men 19 to 25 years of age to maintain an Army of 837,000 Navy and Marine Corps of 668,485, and an Air Force of 505,000 Draft Act June 19, 1953, extended draft to July 1, 1953 and increased service to twenty-four months; and the Selective Service Act June 10, 1955 extending the draft four years and doctor's draft two years.

Each succeeding four years from 1955 to 1967 Congress has passed a proposal to extend the draft. That is how it got here. The questions today are, "Will it stay?" and "Is there a better way?". These are questions this author will investigate in his next article.

If you would care to express your personal opinion on the draft or related topics, it will be gratefully accepted and used in a future article dealing with the affect of the draft on the college student. Send your written opinion to "The Current" office in the Administration Building.

FOR SALE
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Call VO. 2-1166 or Write Introductions Unlimited For Your Compatibility Questionnaire
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UMSL's hopes for a spot in the NAIA national tournament ended with 18:35 remaining in the first half of the Rivermen's district play-off game with Rockhurst College on Wednesday February 28. At that point, with only 14.5 points in the game played at Central Methodist Gym in Fayette, Missouri, Rockhurst started a streak of 18 straight points that gave them a 20-10 lead and ended UMSL's dream.

After Jim Gott's basket had given the Rivermen their 2-1 lead, UMSL suddenly turned ice-cold and began throwing the ball away. At the same time the Hawks got hot and did not allow a UMSL basket until Christian Sutliff hit a free throw with 12:55 remaining in the first half. That was the closest the Rivermen could get until they came back to trail 63-54 with 7:40 remaining in the game. Rockhurst then took off again, and only UMSL's five points in the last 19 seconds of the game allowed them to lose only 84-74.

The Kansas City school completely dominated the game statistics. They hit .524 from the field and .742 from the foul line to UMSL's .390 and .700. The statistic that really told the story of the game was Rockhurst's 47-22 edge in rebounds. St. Louis Jim Healey led all scorers and rebounders with 25 points and 14 rebounds. Verle Sutton led Rivermen scorers with 21 points. Jack Stenner, who was guarded closely by the Hawks, hit only .314 from the field and scored only 18 points. Terry Reiter also hit double figures with 12 points.

Because of their victory, the Rockhurst Hawks earned the right to meet MCAV champion Drury College on a two-of-three play-off to determine District sixteen's representative in the NAIA tournament beginning March 11 in Kansas City.

Terry Reiter, who, along with Ron Clark, played in his last varsity game for UMSL, summed up the game when he commented, "It was kind of frustrating."

**JV Beats Sanford, Finish 8-1 Season**

The UMSL junior varsity ended its 1967-68 season on March 2 with a 97-51 triumph over the Jayhawks. The Bears were led by a career high of 29 points by Fredrick of Drury. Jim Healey of St. Louis, Riverman Joe Fagan was the game's high scorer with 22 points. John Fasenmoe scored 17 points and Jim Goff had 15 points and 14 rebounds. Verle Sutton led Rivermen scorers with 21 points. Jack Stenner, who, along with Ron Clark, played in his last varsity game for UMSL, summed up the game when he commented, "It was kind of frustrating."

**Stenner Named MVP**

UMSL's most valuable player and leading scorer this season was the two-year intercollegiate athletic history of the University is 6'3" junior Jack Stenner.

During this past season Stenner eclipsed two marks that Ron Woods had set during the 1966-67 campaign. He hit 40 points against Illinois College on February 23 to shatter the record of 37 points in one game. In the same game he broke Woods' record of 437 points in one season. Stenner finished the year with 478 points for a 22.8 average.

Jack is a 1965 graduate of University City High School. In his senior year at U City he averaged 23 points per game and was named to the All Suburban Big Ten team. He spent his freshman year at Northwest Junior College at Powell, Wyoming where he averaged 11 points per game. Another student at Northwest was the former Sandi Druvishanks who is now Mrs. Jack Stenner.

Stenner transferred to UMSL for the 1966-67 season, and ended up as the team's second leading scorer with an average of 17.7. His high game last year was 22 points against McKendree College. One of Jack's high spots last season was when he scored all six of UMSL's points in overtime against Nebraska at Homecoming. In his two-year UMSL career Stenner has scored 689 points for a 17.5 average. Jack has managed to work during the day, attend night school, and still play basketball. Five days a week he works from 8:30 a.m.-5:30 p.m. as a recreational therapist at Our Lady of Grace Child Center. He practices from 4:00-6:00 and attends night school classes from 6:30-9:30. He is majoring in psychology.

**Named All-District**

Jack ended this season by receiving two honors. He was recently elected by his team-mates as UMSL's most valuable player. He will receive an award from the Current signifying this.

He was also recently named to the second team of the all-district team of NAIA district 16. He received a plaque from the district at half-time of the Drury-Rockhurst play-off at Kansas City on March 2. Members of the district first team are Gall and Virgil Frederic of Drury, Jim Wesley of Rockhurst, Tony Robertson of Culver-Stockton and Tom Spontel of William Jewell. Named with Stenner to the second team are Terry and Jim Curry, Tom Dunn of William Jewell, Roland Schulte of Drury and Jay Moore of Culver-Stockton.