Central Board Minutes
January 29, 1957

The meeting was called to order by President Fowler. The minutes were read and approved.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL:
Fowler said that many discussions were held the last week at joint meetings of Central Board and Judicial Council members. A list of proposals was finally drawn up and submitted to the dean and associate dean of students concerning the functions of Judicial Council in the future. This list of proposals, however, was not met with approval mainly due to the fact that it would act as an appeal board with the power to over-ride decisions of the dean of students' office. Fowler then read 5 points for the continuance of Judicial Council brought out in earlier discussions and 5 against it.

Points for Judicial Council:
1. J. Council has done some good since there is less drinking at parties and less drinking by individuals under 21 years of age; the students are therefore more conscious of the drinking rules.
2. It was understood from the beginning that some changes would have to be made as the organization grew.
3. The taking of more responsibility by individual members will be a gradual process. Eventually it will not be considered as spying.
4. Having an organization such as J. Council calls attention to the problem better than the dean's office could. It keeps the idea of standards before the student body.
5. The individuals on the board have proven that students are capable of mature action.

Points against Judicial Council:
1. J. Council, as it is set up, is based on an honor system.
2. An honor system is unworkable on the MSU campus because it has to come from below (the students) or there will be no unity and it is an idea different from the rest of present day society.
3. The only other alternative is to give the members of J. Council more responsibility with police functions; this is distasteful to the students.
4. Primarily this is so because it makes the students responsible for something they don't believe in.
5. Cases can be handled quicker and sometimes better by the dean's office.

Cook moved that Judicial Council be continued with improvements and that the changes are to be made by J. Council itself. Fox seconded the motion.

Fowler called for discussion from the floor suggesting that there be one speaker for the motion and then one against; speakers should limit themselves to 3 min. At the end or 30 or 60 minutes discussion will be closed and the motion will be voted on by Central Board.

Clint Grimes: The problem doesn't lie in letting J. Council continue and make its own improvements; if J. Council is continued at all it should be in the position of an appellate body because members of J. Council are not qualified to make all the decisions concerning cases and they themselves do not feel qualified. The problem should evolve back to the administration since it is their job, duty, and responsibility. Until the organization can be completely a student organization there is no reason for its existence. As it now exists it is only carrying out the laws of the state and it is the University's job to see that the laws of the University are being carried out by the students. The administration itself must not feel that J. Council is very capable or it wouldn't over-rule their decisions.
Don Mosher: Judicial Council has served a worthwhile function during the past year. An appellate body isn't favorable to the dean of students' since the dean was given the responsibility by the president of the University - how could the council then over-ride decisions of the dean of students? Students are mature enough to handle their own problems - they cannot help but be mature when faced with the problem of whether a fellow student should remain in school. They benefit also by being able to pool their knowledge and judgement when deciding a case. On what do you base your opinion that J. Council is bad?

Denton VanderPoel: We can't give any facts since we don't know what happens in J. Council; therefore it is not given enough publicity. Courts of law protect by the publicity.

Petitit: Since the negative admits not knowing of a specific example are they basing their opinion on the fact that they don't know what is going on?

Grimes: There were two cases that were turned over to J. Council recently. One of the students was maintained in school and the other expelled. The case against the student who was maintained in school was much stronger than the case against the student who was expelled. There is no logic in the way the cases are handled if there are no pre-determined rules - how can J. Council reverse itself in cases such as these? Judicial Council acted appropriately when the rules were first set up. Now students are aware of the rules and the administration's feeling toward these rules and there's no further need for J. Council.

Mosher: Judicial Council is not a court of law; it feels a deeper responsibility toward the students. Decisions are based on the individual case and there is always room for different opinions. Decisions are based on many factors: grades, previous infraction of rules and etc. It would lose something if it acted as a court of law. It also has a type of counseling function, not strictly law, and therefore there is no need to defend the decisions of specific cases.

VanderPoel: It is true that we need a student group to govern the students since it is more effective and the administration is too busy to do it. Judicial Council had a poor start in the beginning. Expulsion from school by fellow students carried a lot of power and can ruin a person for life. Privacy in making the decisions is all right in some cases but a person should be allowed to bring in some friends to help defend his case; how can you judge a person's moral conduct by his grades? Judicial Council should be done away with as it now stands and start anew and benefit from past mistakes.

Shope: The students took the problem in their own hands when the rules were first set up two years ago. It would be a mistake to throw it away and start all over. We can benefit by past mistakes and with the help of the administration to improve it without starting all over.

Audra Browman: Judicial Council doesn't judge a person by grades, they are only considered in the sense of what will be the best for him in the future. Also, if any student is himself truly mature how could he ever commit a transgression against society and therefore be brought up before J. Council?

Grimes: Agree with Shope; there should be a student J. Council and if it works as a counseling service (since the administration dislikes the idea of an appellate body) that would be fine. It shouldn't, however, be put in the position of a judicial body and determine a person's future career - the dean's office is more capable of doing this.

Cook: If J. Council is not capable of judging how can it be capable of counseling when that is a harder and more important job? It present J. Council decides a case and advises counseling by other qualified persons if need be. When J. Council was set up it was done so as an evolving concept - it was not then felt that J. Council was the "last word" or necessarily the best way - students were to change it until it was most effective. It has already been proposed that faculty members be added.

Burton: Basically the problem isn't whether J. Council should stand as it now is. The administration doesn't feel that J. Council is qualified to handle the present cases and it therefore must by changed, but how? The idea of having older students
on the Council is good. At first all 12 of the members heard every case. Later only 5 members who were best qualified to hear that individual case were called in. J. Council won't work as an appellate board. In law such a board is used only to find error in a decision. Who can tell the deans that they are wrong? J.Council will never get to the point of having absolute power and if it could have it would still now work. The students may not be best qualified but we are doing what we as students feel right; the dean of students has given a lot of power so that this can be done. We must therefore work out a relationship with the administration and change J. Council accordingly.

VanderPoel: J. Council should be done away with and started over because it is sometimes easier to start fresh than to change over.

Mosher: Requests that Dean Cogswell speak.

Cogswell: The students should talk more about where J. Council is weak and not as to what the administration will accept. There has never been an attempt from the deans' office to over-rule any decision made by J. Council; although there has not necessarily been agreement with all the decisions made, the idea of J. Council itself is favorable to the dean of students. Nothing is built in a day - the concept of J. Council must evolve and it is up to the students to decide what is to be done.

Mosher: Therefore J. Council as it now exists can change and improve itself.

Crimes: Since some students obviously don't think J. Council is good and since it was never brought before a vote of the student body this should be done. Request that the existence of J. Council and its function as a judicial board or counseling service be brought to a student vote since it is working for them.

Riddle: The students gained a principle in J. Council (the formation of), that if action is to be taken, the students themselves should have a hand in it. The students should be able to voice their opinion on rules concerning them. The evolving concept of J. Council is a good thing and it would be bad to start all over. The negative said that J. Council is inadequate in certain phases, therefore J. Council should continue and the improvements should come from J. Council itself. The discussion ended; Cook's motion passed 13-0.

BUDGET & FINANCE:

Cook recommended that the band be permitted to spend $90 from the band instrument and equipment fund to purchase a Conn baritone saxophone. Beiswanger Seconded. Passed 15-0.

PUB-TRAVEL: Fowler said that Scriven had requested that Sally Harris be appointed to Pub-Travel committee. Riddle moved that she be appointed. Williamson seconded. Passed 15-0.

ACTIVITIES BOARD:

Shone moved that Kay Wallinder, Carla Moore, and Marty Leverett be appointed to Arts & Exhibits committee. Pettit seconded the motion. Passed 15-0.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxie Perrior
Secretary, ASMSU