

“uniqueness” and past practice.

Based on such criteria as faculty salaries, variety of course offerings, comparative budgetary allotments, comparative size of faculty, etc., it is clear that women at Mary Washington are not receiving the same educational opportunities as are men at the University of Virginia. This is a fact. The essential problem facing the Board of Visitors in June will be how to alter this situation most quickly.

Perhaps the answer is complete coeducation at both the University and Mary Washington. Perhaps a better solution would be a co-ordinate women's college on the grounds at Charlottesville. Perhaps the most politically palatable answer is to initiate a crash program to equalize the opportunities for women at Mary Washington with those available at the University.

All of these proposals have their advantages and disadvantages. The only definite fact is that change in the status quo is essential and inevitable. Therefore, each of these proposals and various modifications of them needs to be carefully studied.

“Cultism” has no place in the study on coeducation which has been authorized by the Board of Visitors. Lengthy investigation and debate must replace the irrationality of “cultism” as factors in decision making.

The stakes are high. The future of higher education in Virginia's university system is being decided. We must free ourselves from the narrow vision of “cultism” if this vital decision is to be a correct one.

C.L.