

What About the Split Finals Week?

Two administrative bodies, the Student Affairs committee and the Board of Deans, have taken an unrealistic approach in their scheduling of finals week this term. The Board of Deans has come up with another "split finals week"; and the Student Affairs committee has thrown two closed weekends at the women: one, five days before finals begin, and the other two days before they are completed.

Although both moves are related to each other, let us discuss each one separately, taking the Board of Deans first. The President of the University has delegated to them the responsibility of setting the dates for finals week. Although all state institutions work together in their academic scheduling in order to maintain a degree of uniformity in the system of education, it is the University of Oregon board which directly controls this scheduling at Eugene.

Normally, final tests start on Monday and end on Friday. Last year and this year the schedule has been changed, however, with exams starting on Wednesday and continuing until the following Tuesday. The board's primary reason for starting the finals on Wednesday and ending them on the succeeding Tuesday is to take advantage of as many class days as possible during the school year. Because the calendar over the years always puts Christmas at a different day in relation to the end of the previous week, the board finds it necessary to schedule finals week so that there are roughly two weeks of Christmas vacation time.

(For instance: This year Christmas falls on a Tuesday. If finals were to be held the previous week, they would end four days before Christmas, which would cut vacation to just 11 days. If finals were to be given the week before that, they would end 11 days before Christmas, which would allow an 18 day vacation, which the Board of Deans considers too much). In order to reach a compromise, the board decided to split finals week, holding the last test seven days before Dec. 25, allowing a 14 day rest.

This means that classes will be held through Tuesday, the day before finals start; and there will be no time between the last day of class and the first day of tests in which to study. Such an abrupt start can do no good for the student; and, in fact, may lower his grade, due to the little time for study.

All We Ask Is a Little Realism

Scholarship without activities, say the administrators, is death. Scholarship with activities, say the academicians, is death. And the two schools of thought have their respective followings on this campus, although it would appear that the first has the greater number of supporters. This first group, by nature, also appears to be consistently more active in pursuit of its ideal.

Today we have more action on the part of the activity promoters. "The creation of these committees is to give women who do not participate in many activities an opportunity to work for the Associated Women Students for the benefit of the entire school," says the statement of purpose behind eight new AWS committees.

Now on first glance, one of the anti-activity people, or even one of the non-partisans in this conflict, is likely to react with a strong "if there's anything we need on this campus, it's MORE activities!"

And such a reaction doesn't get much argument any more. Even the pro-activity group uses "activity duplication" as an issue in campus elections. But in this latest move by the AWS, we can see only an addition to the activity duplication and overlap.

Noble it may be, yes. It is noble of the AWS to provide a "benefit for the entire school" in creating committees for "wom-

The move on the part of the Student Affairs committee to close the two weekends preceding and during finals week came about as the result of some unfortunate scheduling last year which allowed a women's tea to be held on the Sunday afternoon, three days before the first tests. (We point out here, by the way, that it was Sunday afternoon, not Friday or Saturday night.) Because of the committee work involved, many of the girls complained of a lack of study time, and on this consideration, SAC voted to close that weekend, as well as the one which falls in the middle of final exams.)

Closed weekend means women's closing hours are set at 10:30 p.m. on Friday and midnight on Saturday, with the option of taking one, but not both, nights out.

It must be pointed out here that SAC has made an exception to this rule in the present situation, however, in order that women can attend both basketball games which are being held in McArthur court on Friday and Saturday night, preceding finals week. Our question is this: What's the difference between going to a basketball game and going out on a date? We don't mean to infer that the basketball privilege should be taken away; we mean that the restriction on other types of activity should be removed. Any smart woman who wants to take both nights out is going to go to the game on Friday, and a date on Saturday. Why restrict the girl who wants to do something else Friday night?

The best solution to the problem, of course, is to not have a split finals week. This would provide one closed weekend, between the end of classes and the start of tests during which the students have plenty of time to get organized and start studying for their exams. Finals start on Monday and end on Friday. There is no bargaining right into final exams, and there is no waiting around over the weekend for that last exam on Tuesday.

If the Board of Deans sticks to the split week, however, and will not consent to a "Monday through Friday" finals schedule, the second best solution is to have the Student Affairs committee open up the weekend preceding finals week. If some women want to study during that period, let them study. But don't restrict the other women, who, with finals more than five days away, would rather go out. (S.V.)

en who do not participate in many activities."

But we did not come to bury the AWS, all we ask of it is a little realism. Just where is the line between women who do and women who "do not participate in many activities"? Certainly, this line may be drawn, but who will respond to this call to work for the benefit of the entire school? The same, already over-burdened, but still naive women who now carry the activity load of the University. We wish we could be wrong in this, but the repetition of this result in instance after instance aimed at "giving the 'non-active' students a break," leads us to outright pessimism.

The AWS has been a question mark organization. Students have asked who it is, what it is and why it is for too long. And in finally realizing this, the AWS leaders have responded with a plan which will give the group some purpose. But we fear that the final direction of the action will destroy the original good intent of the move.

We're tired of additions to overlap and duplication. The greatest good AWS could do "for the benefit of the entire school" would be to consolidate and coordinate women's activities — not add more overlap for those who "do not participate in many activities." (C.H.M.)

Shades of Final Week



"IT'S YOUR TIME TO WIND THE ALARMS TONITE."

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

Since the Emerald has taken the position that write-in votes in the recent election should not be counted it may be worthwhile to take this means of informing the graduate students and other interested persons of another point of view. Wednesday's Emerald says editorially, "Although we support write-in voting in principle, we do not believe such votes in the recent graduate student representative election should be counted."

We wholeheartedly accept this principle, but we emphatically reject the Emerald's position that an exception may be made in this principle by the fiat of some individuals. Perhaps it would be useful to review the situation from the point of view of those who have taken the trouble to contest the election.

A little after noon on November 14 Vishnu Wassiamal, George Boyet, and I followed the sign which said, "ASUO Election," into the Co-Op. After producing our studentbody cards we were given a ballot with just one name on it. We felt cheated.

Our votes were worthless—we could neither elect this man nor prevent his election. What sort of democracy was this? With men dying in Hungary for the right to have more than one candidate for offices surely there was something we to do.

"Let's write in Koburger," suggested Vishnu, and it was immediately agreed. We knew that Koburger would make a very capable graduate representative. Having thus committed ourselves we had to follow through. If we didn't let people know that Koburger's name was being written in our gesture would have been ridiculous (and as destructive of the democratic process as refusing to vote at all).

So we proceeded to tell our friends (and some complete strangers) that Koburger's name was being written in and that we knew he would make an excellent representative. We really didn't think that Koburger could possibly win against a candidate who had his name printed on the ballot, but we were satisfied with the knowledge that we had created a free democratic contest.

The next day the Emerald advised that the name printed on

the ballot had been elected. Well, that was that, at least we had activated the democratic process. But later that afternoon a rumor reached us that Koburger had actually received almost twice as many votes as the name printed on the ballot.

The following day the Emerald explained that someone had decided not to count the write-in votes. This amazing decision was made, we were told, because there is no mention of write-in voting in the ASUO Constitution. This is when our temperature went up.

There is no mention of write-in voting in either the state or the federal Constitutions but write-in voting is recognized at all levels. Positions at the local, state, and national levels have been filled by the write-in procedure in recent years. There is a provision in the ASUO Constitution setting forth the procedure by which a candidate may secure the advantage of having his name printed on the ballot but this in no way effects the validity of write-in votes.

We were not able to determine who was responsible for the decision to throw out the write-in votes. Nevertheless, having gone so far it appeared that it was up to us to finish the job. We, therefore, formally contested the election.

In our petition which is now before the Constitution committee we have asked the committee to reaffirm our longstanding right to use the write-in procedure. If the committee should have any doubt as to the validity of our position we will be glad to present it before the committee at a formal hearing.

Sincerely,
Bill Alexander
Graduate Student
in Political Science

Oregon Daily
EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations and vacation periods, by the Student Publication Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year, \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

BILL MAINWARING, Editor
LORETTA MEYER, Business Manager