

Second-class citizens?

Boston College professor's 'no males allowed' policy example of reverse discrimination



ROBERT HYNCEK/THE BATTALION

Many A&M students have taken a class where they were one of a few men or women in that class, but a Boston College professor has been teaching a class for the past 20 years in which only women are allowed.

Mary Daly, a feminist theology professor, has been given an ultimatum by Boston College officials to allow men into her feminist ethics class or be forced to stop teaching, according to an Associated Press report.

Daly has conveniently taken a leave of absence this semester in hopes that the problem will blow over, a move she has pulled many times in the past when her views have been challenged.

She recently denied admittance to her class to two Boston College males. Daly claims that "opening her classes to men would compromise her belief that women tend to defer to a man whenever one is in the room."

One of the male students is being represented by the Center for Individual Rights, a conservative Washington law firm that represented the *Hopwood* plaintiffs.

It is interesting to note that a conservative group has come to the aid of these male students.

Where is the American Civil Liberties Union? Where are the feminists who believe that men and women should be treated equally?

They were certainly present when the Citadel was forced to admit Shannon Faulkner five years ago into the, then, all-male military academy. They claimed a women could do a job as good as a man, and they sued the school on grounds of sexual discrimination.

It seems Daly and her feminist colleagues' agenda is one with a double standard. If the gender roles here were reversed and a male professor was only admitting males to his class, the feminist and every left-wing, equality-to-all-creatures organization would be crying sexism, misogyny and



ZACH HALL

all out bloody murder in an effort to nail that "male chauvinist."

Boston College spokesperson Jack Dunn concurred. "We'd be run out of town."

The same Associated Press report stated that early on in her career, Daly noticed that co-ed classes created problems between men and women.

"Even if there were only one or two men with 20 women, the young women would be constantly on an overt or a subliminal level giving their attention to the men because they've been socialized to nurse men," she said.

Daly, in her power to women thinking, does not give credit to her own kind. It really appears to be no more than an elitist, anti-male view that is being espoused by this extremist.

However misdirected Daly's views on men are, her statement that there are benefits to single sex learning is not without merit. Single sex learning or training, whether it be in the classroom, military, fraternity or sorority, can be beneficial.

But the recent trend of equal access to everything by everyone has made this thinking a thing of the past; just look at the forced integration of Corps of Cadet units and the decision by Dartmouth to de-genderize fraternities and sororities.

Perhaps Daly would have a better chance of keeping her class all female if she did not have a "men vs. women" mentality. More importantly, if this is a common view held by feminist groups and civil rights organizations, then they need to think twice before they bring down organizations they disagree with such as the Citadel and Virginia Military Institute.

Daly and her feminist brethren (need to realize that men are not the enemy and are not trying to "keep women down.") Most men and women are capable of interacting, conversing and being respectful of the opposite gender; it is time that Daly and feminists who share her views learn to do the same.

Zach Hall is a senior philosophy major.

Worship without sacrifice equals no worship at all

In August 1998, the *San Antonio Express-News* conducted a survey about the spirituality of area teenagers.



CALEB MCDANIEL

the past received some surprising responses.

Denise Gomez, 18, said having a religion does not mean having to practice it. "In a way," she said, "I do have my religion, but it is my own."

Nadia Lopez, 17, said she came to grips with questions about God when she went through a suicidal depression. The teenager said she now believes God is a woman who is her friend. "I talk to God and tell her my problems," Lopez said.

Jenny Dial, 16, said in a self-congratulatory way, "Believing in [God] has made me the confident and loving person that I am."

The impression given by such responses is that God is not much more than a motivational speaker. For these teens, worship was mainly a route to self-esteem and personal improvement.

It was largely a salve for their stress. Religion was not even God's to claim, thought Gomez: it was her "own."

The headline of the *Express-News* story perhaps said it best: "Teens interested in faith, but not rules, religion."

In too many ways, such is the twisted theology of our time. For the "me" generation, finding God means looking for fun for number one. It means keeping the faith without keeping the rules.

Pop religion replaces the Ten Commandments with the *Ten Habits of Highly Effective People*. Or as Gandhi disapprovingly would have said, it amounts to "worship without sacrifice."

People of faith should regard such worship as hardly worship at all.

One faith in particular could definitely use constant reminders of this fact.

In a world where fishes can be fadish and crosses can be commercialized, Christians must work especially hard to avoid a worship without sacrifice. Christianity must constantly re-align itself to its first principles.

Followers of Jesus cannot think the sort of answers offered by the surveyed teens were satisfactory.

The religion Jesus preached, after all, has never been about faith without rules. On the contrary, Christ does not tell Christians to recline on couches and take up crosses.

And Jesus' own example proves the

cost could be high.

One does not have to know much about him to realize his life was not exactly a Sunday stroll in the park.

He did not live a life of luxury or even one of ease. He endured indecency and indignity, rejection and ridicule.

Every slander imaginable was hurled in his direction, and he was satisfied with turning the other cheek. Finally, he died on a stake in the ground by drowning in his own blood.

His life, in short, was one big sacrifice. It was a shocking sacrifice, and faith in him must be no less shocking. Christians must offer their bodies as "living sacrifices." This is their "spiritual act of worship" (Romans 12:1). To take the sacrifice out of worship would take the Christ out of Christianity.

This is so important precisely because it is often not the first thing some people think about being a Christian.

The world at large often criticizes Christians for their supposed failure to practice what they preach, to sing God's praises without sacrificing for God's priorities.

However, the best and only way to escape this criticism is to not be guilty of it. With all the sin and sorrow in the world, believers cannot think it is enough to put on a "Jesus Whoop" T-shirt and stride on down the glory-land way.

Instead, the work of the spirit can only be done with a spirit of sacrifice. This means Aggies who follow Jesus must be as willing to roll up their sleeves as they are to open their Bibles.

They must hold out a helping hand as readily as they hold up a sign of protest. They must wear Christ's suffering attitude as much as they wear his name on their clothes.

For worship is more than Sunday clothes and a wooden pew. Worship means daily, complete and total sacrifice.

Given the prevalence of the kinds of ideas found in the San Antonio teen survey, worshippers must constantly remind themselves of the dangers of "worship without sacrifice."

God cannot become just a 911 hot line to be called upon only in times of distress or depression. To the Christian, coming to God means dying to the world, and his plan for his followers has as much to do with the cross we must carry as the splintered cross he bore.

Christians cannot afford to forget it.

Caleb McDaniel is a sophomore history major.

America should not enter Kosovo conflict

In response to Luke Saugier's Mar. 5 opinion column.

The mission in Kosovo, like the ongoing mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina, is a peacekeeping mission, not a war. Two years ago, we sent several "kill people/break things" Marines to a little town called Redford, Texas.

These well-meaning Marines shot an eighteen-year-old boy who was walking around his own property. Once they realized their error, the Marines were not equipped or trained with the proper medical tools to keep the boy alive. Why

did our troops kill him?

Because that is what Marines and all Active-duty troops are trained to do. They are not trained in the nuances of operations other than war.

It will take years of training to properly change that - it's not as easy as just "making it abundantly clear."

And thank you for pointing out that "casualties would be fairly light." Those are my friends whose lives you are so casually throwing away so you can sleep well at night knowing the almighty USA has made a difference in a developing country.

But it is all worth it, right? After all, if our way of life is the best, we should force it on other nations. They will be sure to thank us by providing plenty of

MAIL CALL

cheap child labor so we can all wear Gap jeans for lower prices.

Chris Bolliger, Class of '01

The Battalion encourages letters to the editor. Letters must be 300 words or less and include the author's name, class and phone number.

The opinion editor reserves the right to edit letters for length, style, and accuracy. Letters may be submitted in person at 013 Reed McDonald with a valid student ID. Letters may also be mailed to:

The Battalion - Mail Call
013 Reed McDonald
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX
77843-1111

Campus Mail: 1111
Fax: (409) 845-2647
E-mail: batt@tamvml.tamu.edu

Home-schooled students should be held to same standards as other students

It is that time of year when high school seniors begin to decide where they will go to further their educations.



BRANDON MULLEN

Many are worrying about whether they will be accepted to Texas A&M. But for those students who have been home-schooled or have non-traditional high school credentials the worry is not as great.

This lack of anxiety is because the admissions requirements for these prospective students are not as strict as they are for students who obtained a traditional education. Regardless of whether home-schooled students are required to take the SAT I and II, the admissions criteria for these students are not fair because they are allowed into A&M with lower SAT and ACT scores than most students who went to traditional schools.

The Texas A&M Undergraduate Catalog lists the following admission criteria: for those students in the top 10 percent of their graduating class there is no minimum test score required for admission; for those in the top quarter of their class a SAT total of 920 or ACT composite of 19 is required; those students in the second quarter need a 1050 or a 23; and anyone in the second half of their graduating class needs a 1180 or a 26.

But, someone who was home-schooled, in addition to taking the SAT II, is only required to have a 1000 point total on the SAT I or an ACT composite of 20. This discrepancy is absurd for a number of reasons.

First, the practice of home-schooling

does not give these students the same statistical attributes that students from high school have. Students who have been home schooled and lack a class rank.

They also lack the scholastic reputation of a traditional high school. Where with other students the admissions department can consider the quality of the high school, both good and bad, they attended.

Home-schooled students also do not have a standardized method of grading. Thus, the people reviewing their applications are required to place an awkward amount of weight on home graded test scores.

The ironic thing about this practice is that these students, who have ignored such traditional education measures as rank and grade point, are admitted with lower standards than students who have a rank and a grade point.

By giving home-schooled students this advantage, the admissions department is penalizing a large number of students. Anyone who graduated in the second quarter of their high school is required to do better on their test than a home-schooled student.

It does not matter how competitive this student's high school was or what his grade point average is, they are placed below home-schooled students.

This does not mean that home-schooled students are not qualified to attend A&M, but they should at least be held to more competitive standards. A reasonable solution would be to hold these students to the same standard as applicants who are not from Texas. These students need a total SAT of 1080 or ACT composite of 23.

This would be logical because both

non-residents and home-schooled students are applying without a diploma from a Texas high school. Both home schooled and non-residents have high-school educations which cannot be compared to students who graduated from a Texas high school.

Just as important as ranking and test scores is the way a young person can interact with their peers. This reason has caused Michael Shearer, who was home-schooled as a child, to become a major opponent to home schooling.

Shearer points to the social skills he could not develop in home schools.

"I can't tell you how terrible it is to be an adult and unable to communicate to home-school parents how these children not only suffer from their isolation, but are shortchanged for life."

The book, *Children's Social Networks and Social Supports*, argues that "Children's social networks with peers is vitally important social skills development home schooled rarely have opportunity to experience the same as they would if they attended classroom schools."

This should be important to the admission of these students, because of the importance this university puts on "the other education."

Home-schooled students apparently will come to school without the necessary prerequisites for "the other education."

The admissions department should reevaluate their criteria for home-schooled students, because they are allowing giving student with less to offer on paper a better chance than students who may be well rounded but do not do well on big tests.

Brandon Mullen is a senior history and English major.