# from our readers

To the editor:

I am writing this letter as a concerned parent and a responsible community member, to clarify all seme presented by the North Farmington High School-Campus Life controversy. The issue is not for or against Campus Life as your paper has so wrongly characterized. Rather, the issue is whether any sectarian-religious organization, association or group should be allowed to organize, promote, solicit, and otherwise operate in a public school system.

The Constitution of the United States and the highest courts of this land have consistently and clearly recognized that there shall be separation of church and state. The lay interpretation in practical application, dictates that the public schools, school property, school equipment, school employees, personel and volunteers shall not be used to introduce or espouse religion. ce or espouse religion.

The organization, Campus Life, a publicly admitted sectarian-religious group, has been recently demonstrated

Reader objects to have been actively operating within the Farmington School system on to Coverage actively operating within the Farmington School system on th

Ilgious principals.

Without any comment or value judgment whatsoever as, to the relative
merits or worth of such an organization, it should, nevertheless, clearly be
taken out and otherwise excluded from
the public schools as a sectarian-religlous group. The public schools are no
place for the practice and promotion of
religion — anyone's religion.

I personally take great offense to
your paper's characterization of those
of us who lawfully follow the doctrine
that separates church and state as "detractors of Campus Life." This is misleading and sensationally labe at best.
This is not a referendum on Campus
Life, nor should it be. Walle it is admittedly better copy and would sell more

Life, nor should it be. While it is admit-tedly better copy and would sell more papers if such claims were made, this would only serve to polarize the com-munity along religious preferences. No one stood up at the school board meeting and "detracted" from Campus Life, nor was there a single negative comment directed towards its religious tenants or philosophy. Campus Life's moral and social val-ues were not and are not the issue.

Those of us who read your paper should be alerted to that paramount fact. The issue is to keep religion out of school and left to one's personal preferences. Alan Vosko,

Alan Vosko, Farmington Hills Amendment misinterpreted

To the editor:

I just read your Monday, November 14, articles about Campus Life at North Farmington High School. I am astonished by the widespread misunderstanding of the First Amendment, as displayed by your 'Oral Quarret' respondents and the interviewes in the Tom Baer article. You would do us a service to publish the Amendment verbatim:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiling the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the properties of the red of the people of the control of the people of the peop

Apparently, by these words, the founding fathers simply meant to prevent the government's meddling in the

people's freedom to practice their re-ligion, to say or publish their thoughts, to assemble peaceably, or to sue the government. It would be informative if you were to research for us how the doctrine of the "separation of church and state" evolved into the misusage you have quoted.

## Constitution bans group

Dans group
To the editor:
Whether or not Campus Life is a
good organization is not the issue at
stake. Rather does Campus Life's presence in public schools violate the Constitution of the United States.
Article VI. Section 3 states: "... no
religious test shall ever be required as
a qualification to any office or public
trust under the United States." And the
First Amendment states: "Congress
shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.
Both excerpts clearly declare a separation of religions are run by the givernment, and Campus Life is a Christian
you'n group, partially funded by
Churches across the country. By law,

the two cannot intermingle; yet some-how they have. Secondly, there have been legal pre-cedents set regarding the banning of religion from schools. First and fore-most, the Supreme Court banned pray-er from school. Secondly, Birmingham Groves recently banned Campus Life from its grounds. Campus Life is fine, providing that it stays out of the public school system.

Farmington Hills

#### Responses must be well-rounded

To the editor:

I doo't know if you are responsible for clotching which "excerpts" to spheliab from or a first of the confer. Out of the probability of the confer. Out of 35 separate opinions you published — you or whoever responsible — and firm assuming it to be you, chose to include only four anti-Campus Life opinions. There is no way I'll ever believe that there weren't many many more beliefs and opinions on the recorder expressing negative feelings to Campus Life in or around North Farmington High School. Is this fair journal-

ism? Your personal feelings shouldn't even enter into the selection. It seems to me a fair publication would have included more than four out of 35 anti-Campus Life opinions.

I'm very disappointed in you and this section of the paper today. Many of the opinions you chose to publish being pro-Campus Life don't even address themselves to whether Campus Life should be allowed to dperate in or around North Farmington High School. They are just expressions of Christian support for this Christian group. I have been a falliful reaser of your paper. The choice that was made by your to the Christian was made by your person the choice that was made by your person of the choice that was made by your person of the choice that was made by your paper. Even Tom Baer's article in today's paper (11-14) give almost one-half the article over to the opinion of Al Kuhnie, an official in Youth for Christ. That's a lot of column space.

space.

At seems to me the Issue isn't even being emphasized properly in your paper. Those of us opposed to Campus Life are just opposed to it in and around our schools. That is all. Not as a group in itself operating in private homes, churches, etc. D. Harris

Farmington Hi

### oral quarrel

Today's Oral Quarrel asked our readers how they felt about the made-for-TV-movie "The Day After," a what-li movie which aired on ABC yesterday about the aftermath of a nuclear war. Following are the respon

I am all for it. I think we definitely need it.

The program is a bunch of junk, Just plain garbage and it certainly is left-wing organized. Those are people who can only see the tree and not the forest. We definitely need good defense. You have got to be a bully or you are going to get stepped on, even if you have the threat of it doesn't mean you have to use it.

be handled outside of the classroom just like the Campus Life question should be handled outside of the class-room.

Excellent as long as the people about to push the button are watching it.

All we have to fear is fear itself so said President Roosevelt. ABC knows this all too well and will try to instill it in their viewers. I refuse to be intimi-dated. Goodby Bill Bonds, goodby Ted Koppel, goodby Peter Jennings, hello cable.

kind of hard to voice your opinion on something you haven't looked at.

Well it just proves tha ABC's liberal mind gets carried away. They should be conservative like all the readers of this newspaper.

I think war in itself is the pits but freedom is never cheap. Someone has to pay the price and if I must die in a nuclear war, let in ed ie free. Also the people who will keep this world free are those that will be prepared to light, not those who are afraid and just cry.

At least two teachers at Harrison ligh School have recommended that students view this film and a student such that this group is being started at Harrison High School. I don't think that this subject should subject. I think that this subject should were known from the saw from

RiteGRPA—

How can anyone who has not seen the movie "The Day After" voice their opinion about the program or for that matter comment on the controversary it has generated. There is enough pre-judging nowadays without initiating still more. You kind of disappoint me, I gave you more credit than that.

Over the last 30 years we have tried not to think about nuclear war because the possible outcome is just so unthinkable. The purpose of "The Day After" will be accomplished if it helps shake people out of that attitude. If people think about it again. There must be something that we can do to prevent that outcome.

My family will definitely not watch People who object are blind to the this program. There is far too much

Blizzard S

In a nuclear world there is no second real issues, continuance of life on chance.

Well I think it is important that we Well I think it is important that we realize that the bombs that caused all this destruction in this country are in fact Russlan or Soviet or from some other Eastern Bloc country, Cuba per-haps. What we have to be aware of is that we need an effective deterrent.

The bottom line of the \$7 million ABC made for television movie "The Day After" is ratings and profit. Extensive media coverage should help accomplish their goals. This network tactic seems as irresponsible as Orson Wells "War of the Worlds". This production is intended to reach an international audience.

death and violence now on TV especially during the holiday season.

ABC is going to milk this production for all it is worth with their followups etc. Money and ratings are their unpublized and underlined motive for this terrorizing event. They are attempting to make this a political issue and a factor in international relations. For example a special preview of this movie in Germany for the German legislators on the eve of a major arms decision.

I really wish that this movie would be shown in Russia and in the Middle Eastern countries because that is where the scare of nuclear war really has to be put. American already knows of the devastation of nuclear war but these countries are the ones who really should learn about this. Why isn't this shown there?

On what date is the picture to be shown in Moscow.

Ski School

# MYOMASSOLOGIST

Legitimate Private Practice
HELP YOURSELF TO **HEALTH & WELLNESS** 

A REGULAR APPOINTMENT WITH OUR LICENSED CERTIFIED MASSAGE THERAPIST SHARON COLEMAN, B.S.W. APPOINTMENTS SHOULD BE MADE AT LEAST 24 HOURS IN ADVANCE THROUGH SOUTHFIELD PROQUETIME. 358-2040



DR. WEISS

SLENDALE, 534-8010

DR. WEISS

DOES ARTHRITIS AFFECT PREGNANCY?
Arthritis often atrices women in their child bearing years and the question arises it having arthritis will affect a pregnancy.
The first concern is whether the medicine the woman is taking will cause damage to the letus. The answer is no, if the drug is aspirin. This medicine has been used repeatedly by pregnant women for 50 years and no damage to the baby has been connected with its use.

Another source of worry is if the baby will inherit the mother's arthritis. Again the answer is no. While herselfly may cause a child to have predelection for the condition, there are other influences not as yet identified that must be present to bring on arthritis.

A major question for the woman with arthritis concerns her ability to care for the baby, in general, within two to three months after deletining the baby. The mother's thus the woman's present ability to tunction is indicative of her future capacity to care for her child.





NO Sewing Machine Wash & Dry

15% DISCOUNT

WITH THIS AD

*ૹ૽ૢ૽ૡૡૢૡઌૢૡઌૢૡઌૣઌઌૣઌઌૣઌઌૣઌઌૣઌઌ*ૢઌ



