

Working for a good cause

All greeks should not be judged for actions of a few



LENTI SMITH

The Texas A&M Corps of Cadets and A&M fraternities and sororities make up a large percent of the student population, and both are a large part of life in Aggieland.

Texas A&M is made up of 45,000 students. Some of these students are hard workers, some are not. Some come from big towns while others come from towns with two traffic lights. And some students do not follow rules, even though the majority do. If one looks hard enough, one will find flaws in any organization — but larger organizations seem to stand out.

A&M greeks encounter problems every now and then, as do the Corps of Cadets, but in no way does that mean these organizations give A&M a bad reputation.

Critics of student organizations should consider the benefits the groups bring to the community instead of simply focusing on bad press.

There are 4,000 students involved with fraternities and sororities on this campus, and one person's actions do not reflect the lifestyle of all 4,000 people, and certainly do not reflect the actions of all 45,000 A&M students.

When negative incidents occur in Greek organizations, they do not go ignored.

Leaders take action to see that proper punishments are handed out. Fraternities and sororities not only have an obligation to the University to conduct themselves properly, but they also have to answer to their national headquarters.

The office of Greek Life works continuously to cut down on the negative outlook on Greeks by promoting a more unified front with events such as Greek Week.

"The fraternity and sorority community is working toward a common goal ... to become the best Greek community in the nation. Our Greeks can't earn 'the best' status without the support of our fellow Aggies," said Brian Tenclinger, Director of Greek Life.

Unfortunately, Greeks do not have this support. For



RUBEN DELUNA • THE BATTALION events as well.

"To criticize a part of the Aggie family as large as the Greek community doesn't align well with A&M's long-range goals and objectives, such as Vision 2020 in terms of outreach and community development," Keegan said.

To become the university Vision 2020 aims for, A&M needs to be the best in everything.

One organization cannot single-handedly be at fault for giving a university the size of Texas A&M a bad name. As long as proper actions are taken in any situation no matter what the incident or who was involved, the university's good name will still be intact. Isolated incidents are just that.

Lenti Smith is a junior political science and journalism major.

example, people constantly reinforce how "No Greeks" has been a tradition at A&M by wearing anti-sorority and fraternity T-shirts with phrases such as "Rent a friend, join a frat" and "No Frats" emblazoned on them.

But although A&M is not a "Greek school" as some other schools in Texas may be categorized, the Greek system is an intricate part of the Aggie community. March 31 will mark the 30th anniversary of the Aggie Greek community. "While the Greeks are not the oldest Texas A&M tradition, they are certainly part of the Aggie traditions," said Tenclinger.

Greeks are automatically connected with all-night parties and wild keg parties, but this is a misconception that has continued for too long. The Greek community is filled with men and women who hold the same

goals of law school, medical school and family life as other college students. The Greek system provides an opportunity for service, leadership experience and connections for career opportunities later in life.

Greek organizations also give back to the community.

"Aggie Greeks provide the Brazos Valley with thousands of community service and volunteer hours, as well as thousands of dollars to both the local community and national charities," said Patrick Keegan, a junior Economics major, and member of Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity.

During the 2001-2002 academic year, the Aggie Greeks raised an estimated \$50,000 for various charities and philanthropies. Not only does each chapter participate in its own philanthropic event, but many chapters take part in several other Greek philanthropy

ies confirm that juveniles, when compared with adults, have a less refined ability to comprehend the ramifications of their actions.

This is not to exculpate adolescent killers, but rather differentiate their liability with that of adults like John Muhammad.

It is a distinction our government has been more than willing to make in matters resting outside of the criminal arena. There is a good reason individuals under 18 are not allowed to serve on juries, vote or marry without parental permission — they lack the foresight and maturity of adults. The logic is seldom questioned.

However, when adolescents commit pernicious crimes, there is an inexplicable rush to try them as adults, and in many cases pursue the death penalty.

Justice Stevens argues that this pursuit is "a relic of the past, inconsistent with the evolving standards of decency in a civilized society."

And indeed, Stevens is right. The execution of juvenile offenders is a throwback to a more primitive, less estimable brand of justice. While teen offenders like Malvo should pay a heavy price, decency should preclude them from paying the ultimate price.

Ian Eisner is a columnist at the University of California at Los Angeles

MAIL CALL

Recent article presents inaccurate picture of study on coaches' ethics

The recent article published in *The Battalion* related to my dissertation research, (Study Claims Coaches' High Salaries Unethical, Oct. 31) was vastly inaccurate. As the individual responsible for the research, I am not interested in assigning blame for the article as published; rather I would like to make clear the focus and results of the research.

My dissertation, entitled *Ethical Values and Behavioral Intentions of Head Coaches in NCAA Division I and Division III Collegiate Athletic Departments* examined the effects of three variables on the ethical values and behavioral intentions of collegiate head coaches. These three variables were: gender, occupational tenure and NCAA divisional status. This research effort in no way addressed the salaries of coaches.

Although the study did find differences in ethical values between Division I and Division III Head Coaches, the results neither indicated that Division I coaches are unethical, nor did the study indicate that their salaries were in any way antecedent to their ethical values. Briefly, it was found that coaches in Division I begin and end their careers at approximately the same levels in terms of ethical values, while the ethical values of Division III coaches seem to increase during their time in the profession. This in no way an indictment of Division I coaches, rather these results indicate that some factor or variable within the culture or environment of Division III athletics may cause an increase in ethical values. Again, this does not mean that Division I coaches are unethical.

After an extensive interview with the *Battalion* reporter, I was asked why I thought these results were found. I stated that although this study did not address this aspect of the issue, there were various hypotheses related to the issue. I mentioned several differences between the NCAA divisions in question such as; increased media coverage, pressure to win and recruit, and greater monetary stakes in Division I. In addition, I stated that the difference could be due to an inclination for individuals to gravitate towards environments which are in congruence with their values.

It is my sincere hope that the above statements make clear the intent and results of my research at Texas A&M. I thank the *Battalion* staff for allowing me to respond to criticism I have received as a result of the article. I also offer my personal apologies to anyone offended by the article.

Brian J. Wigley
Shenandoah University
Winchester, Virginia

NOW represents needs of modern women better than other groups

In response to Matthew Maddox's Nov. 14 column:

The implication that IWF represents the interests of women more accurately than NOW is a misinformed argument at best. In fact, it's suspect that the two would even be compared, since IWF will admit itself that it is an anti-feminist organization and actually advocates many anti-woman policies. IWF also downplays statistics on domestic violence and rape, pay inequity between the sexes, and sexual harassment in order to push its agenda.

Maddox poorly researched his piece, made glaringly clear by his misunderstanding of the UNFPA and why Bush withheld \$34 million from it.

The money was withheld because of claims from the Population Research Institute, which is headed by anti-family planning Steven Mosher, and was continued to be withheld after Bush's own team of investigators concluded that there was no evidence to support such claims. The UNFPA estimates these lost monies may translate to 800,000 more abortions, 4,700 more dead mothers and 77,000 deaths of children under five.

Maddox also took a potshot at NOW for supporting Andrea Yates, a woman who suffered from severe postpartum psychosis when she took the lives of her children. He didn't even mention her condition, or why NOW would support such a person, which would lead one to believe this was simply a smear piece on feminism, intent on spreading propaganda instead of educating TAMU students. In fact, Maddox doesn't bother with the many other facets of the NOW Web site, choosing to only include the pieces that would look radical out of context. He also includes many arguments that are not even included in NOW agenda, but are simply conjecture.

Maddox also seemed to overlook the fact that the A&M version of NOW isn't the laudable Women's Center, but the TAMU Chapter of NOW. It appears that Maddox did not pay much attention to fairness, fact or research in his piece and should put more time into his conjecture in the future.

Katherine Harder
Class of 2006

I find it ironic that it is a man who is vouching for what women are interested in. It is not surprising though because men still think they know what is best for women. This is evidently shown through their control over what jobs women can get to the amount of money they make. Men still view themselves as the ones who decide what is appropriate for women to do.

Second, NOW is inclusive for all women. And yes some women are lesbians, some do have abortions, some do support the right for a woman to control her body, some refuse to be the subservient housewife, and of course not all women are of the same denomination. This shows that the Women's Center does indeed need to be at A&M if people still perceive feminists as being all lesbians, pro-abortion, anti-family etc. If Maddox actually went to the Women's Center maybe such an ignorant statement would not have been made. The Women's Center is here to raise awareness about issues that not only affect women but men as well. We should all take the advantage of the immense amount of resources the Women's Center provides. Last of all, Maddox should try to contact NOW to see why they are raising fund for a campaign instead of using a male's reason not to. To get to the truth you have to represent both sides of the issue even if one is opposed to its ideal.

Shannon Stricker
Class of 2004

Death penalty advocates must not use Malvo to encourage capital punishment for minors

(U-WIRE) LOS ANGELES — Alleged Washington area snipers John Lee Malvo and John Muhammad may have unwittingly claimed yet another victim: the movement against juvenile execution.

The archaic practice of putting juveniles to death was falling out of fashion prior to the shooting spree but has unfortunately been revitalized following the apprehension of 17-year-old Malvo.

Death-penalty advocates, seizing the sensational nature of the killings, have made Malvo the new poster-boy for juvenile execution.

They argue that any juvenile "adult enough" to help perpetrate the beltway killings is "adult enough" to face capital punishment. Malvo — currently the most loathed juvenile in America — is held up as proof of this principle.

It is a line of thinking embraced by the U.S. Justice Department, made evident when it gave first crack at prosecution to Virginia, a state with a rich history of executing juveniles, rather than Maryland, a state which forbids adolescent executions. It is in a Virginia courtroom that Malvo's status will be upgraded from juvenile to adult, largely because a segment of society misinterprets overtly heinous juvenile crime as evidence of maturity.

Malvo is a callous killer well-past rehabilitation. He deserves a life behind bars, and probably more — but execution is a

"While teen offenders like Malvo should pay a heavy price, decency should preclude them from paying the ultimate price."

step too far. Malvo has a cruel heart but not an adult mind. He was an impressionable foot-soldier in John Muhammad's command, a disciple in crime rather than a partner.

The *New York Times* reports that Muhammad functioned as Malvo's surrogate father, controlling every aspect of Malvo's existence, including "...what to eat, when to speak, and investigators believe, how to shoot a gun."

Sharon Douglas, a receptionist at the Maryland YMCA frequented by the alleged killers, was quoted by the *Times* as stating, "It was like he (Muhammad) was ruling him (Malvo). ... If that man told him to stop breathing, the boy would have stopped breathing."

Though Malvo could and should have extricated himself from Muhammad, his juvenile status only antagonized a dire situation.

As Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens has pointed out, neurological stud-