

editorial opinion



Housing dream materializes

A few years back, senior citizen housing was a far-away dream in the Farmington area. Today, it's nearly a reality—and that's good.

Oh, some folks, a very vocal gang, still look upon the mid-rise senior citizen development as a threat to the rural character of their community. But that's hogwash.

As is seen by recent developments, saner heads have had their way, and a number of plans have popped up which put to rest the fears of urban blight and asphyxiation of the community by Southfield-type skyscrapers.

The first proposal is Bud Cline's development up on Orchard Lake Road, just south of Fourteen Mile. It has to be classified as the Cadillac of senior citizen housing, with rents of \$350 a month plus a \$200-per-resident service charge.

Now, I'll have to admit this isn't a development designed for the poorer folks in town, and it really isn't in keeping with the intent of the senior citizen zoning. But you can be damn sure that with those rents, it's not going to be any slum.

The second proposal in the works is wrapped around the acreage donated to Farmington Hills down on Drake and Freedom roads. Presently, the Hills council is investigating the possibility of floating bonds to finance the project.

This, of course, is being done in the hopes that the project can be financed sans interference of federal regulations and the bogey man reputation that goes along with the feds' backs.

But if the Hills can swing a self-financing program and provide senior citizens low-rent housing, more power to it. Some financial experts say it can't be done. But it's worth a try.

The third proposal is quietly being carried out in the City of Farmington. For some reason, while the Hills bellows, their sister city gets the job done.

If all goes well, this housing will be constructed on 3.24 acres of the old Farmington Junior High School site on Thomas. The development firm involved, Forest City Dillon, Inc., already has received a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development rent subsidy grant, subject to site approval.

So my advice to the folks who are wasting their time by running to court, ranting for recall elections and signing a petition for a special election on senior citizen zoning: Stop wasting your time. Give these proposals a chance.

Winter loosens its grip

The signs have been unmistakable in the last week or two.

The temperature crept, however briefly, about 32 degrees for a few hours. The camper and recreational vehicle show in the west side armory was mobbed as people began planning for spring and summer vacations.

Seed catalogs are out, and zealous green-thumbs are poring over them. Looking at new model homes in the suburbs is becoming a Sunday afternoon pastime.

On all the highways, mile roads and many of the side streets, you can see bare pavement. The two biggest auto companies are reporting better sales. The signs are unmistakable. Winter is loosening its grip.

It's too early to say spring is on the way. Side-walks are still snow-covered, and lakes are ice-coated.

The male red-winged blackbird still hasn't staked out his territory on the marshes, although he may arrive any day now. And while rabbit hunting season is wrapped up, we're still weeks away from the opening of trout season.

All we can say is that the bad part of winter is over. There will be some more cold, but it's not likely we'll get any spell of sub-zero blasts. There will be more snow, but not enough to cripple society for two days at a crack.

Winter nevertheless is coming to an end. Let us be thankful for small favors.



One side pays the piper, the other calls the tune

Government finance is a two-sided coin. You would think two chaps as sophisticated as James M. Roche and Lynn Townsend would understand that.

You recognize these two distinguished retirees as former board chairmen of General Motors and Chrysler Corp., respectively. They were gracious enough to serve on the Economic Growth Council of Detroit, Inc.

In that capacity, they came up with some excellent "heads" but some exceedingly poor "tails."

HEADS FIRST.

"Detroit has generously, but perhaps beyond its means, provided some services for people who live largely outside the city," Roche recently told the Economic Club of Detroit.

He cited the Detroit Institute of Arts (75 per cent of its visitors being non-residents), the beloved zoo (75-85 per cent non-residents), the Main Library and the two historical museums.

Gov. Milliken has been listening to these worthies and has put his monetary recommendations where his ears are. He recommends \$7.1 million for the art institute (up \$2.75 million from the current year), \$6.5 million for the Detroit library, \$742,000 for the Detroit Historical Museum . . . and so on.

TAILS NEXT.

Nowhere do Roche, Townsend and the other high-powered minds on the growth council address the other side of the coin—who runs the show?

Gloating about Milliken's budget recommendation, the Detroit Institute of Arts sent out a press release which, near the bottom, includes this fascinating bit of intelligence: "The 101-gallery, 11-acre Detroit Institute of Arts is owned and operated by the City of Detroit. It is also substantially funded, particularly in the acquisition of works of art, by a private philanthropy, Founders Society."

In other words, it's entirely fair that the state and region help fund institutions that serve far more than the City of Detroit, but the other side of



Tim Richard

the coin is that there needs to be a modification of the political arrangements whereby they are operated.

The idea that everybody else pays and Detroit's provincial government controls the pursestrings is a lot of (thrumph!) fertilizer, Mr. Roche and Mr. Townsend.

THERE ARE SOME rather important reasons why it's dead wrong for the state to pour money into Detroit institutions without changing the operation of those facilities.

As Roche put it, "The results of our surveys showed that city (of Detroit) workers were generally paid more in the performance of their duties than are their counterparts in the private sector, other major U.S. cities and other levels of government within the state."

Thus, Detroit's problem is only partly due to that euphemism, "the urban crisis." It's also due to the fact that Detroit chooses to pay too high.

If Detroit is going to tax its own residents to pay high wages, it's none of our business, if Detroit is going to draw \$32 million and more from the state exchequer each year, then the rest of us are justified in demanding a piece of the action as to how that money is spent.

Government finance is a two-sided coin. You would think two chaps as sophisticated as James M. Roche and Lynn Townsend would understand that. Unfortunately, they never even talked about the political control side of the coin. Perhaps our friendly local state legislators will repair their lemon.

Big Renee makes tournament a circus

I was down at Cobo Hall last week watching the Virginia Slims Tennis Tournament. Professional women's tennis seems to be more enjoyable to watch than professional men's tennis because the points last longer. In men's tennis, the big serve seems to decide so many points.

Another reason is that the type of tennis the gal pros play is more identifiable with middle-aged men tennis players than the overwhelming power of the men pros' game.

One evening, there was a doubles match on Court I which featured Martina Navratilova, the eventual winner of the tournament, and Billie Jean King, always a favorite to watch.

In the middle of the match, a good percentage of the spectators got up and moved to Court II to watch a match involving some lesser lights of the Virginia Slims tour.

The reason was that Renee Richards was playing on Court II.

IT HAD TO BE curiosity that brought them to Court II because the better tennis was on Court I.

I had seen pictures of Richards but had never seen her in action.

On the court, she is big, apparently 6-feet-1. She is not as attractive in person as she appears in pictures.

She has a man's build, thick from shoulders to feet. She has short curly hair and wore large glasses.

She played with the power of a man, but the inconsistency of her game contributed to her losing the match.

She looked like a large duck as she moved around the court.

She brought to the tournament a circus atmosphere. Everyone wanted to see this "different" person.

IT WAS A Thursday night, and the tournament was sold out, so she must have helped the gate. But does she really help the reputation of professional women's tennis?

She plays on the Slims tour because a court in New York said the Slims couldn't exclude her.

The other players don't seem comfortable playing against her, but few are saying anything because they don't want to make waves.

Personally, I think it's a bad precedent to let her play. Because she is age 43, she is not taking the tour by storm. I suppose this is the real reason they are letting her play.

They say a good man tennis player is better than a great woman tennis player, so a "converted" male has an advantage that is unfair.

I'm not suggesting Renee shouldn't have had her transformation. That's her business—her personal business.

BUT HER DECISION to become a "woman" shouldn't give her the right to participate where



Eccentricities

by HANA HOGAN

she might have such an advantage.

Suppose a young, great male player decided to do the same thing. The prizes in women's tennis are now to the point where it might be economically a boon "to have the operation."

The precedent set by allowing Renee to play would make it hard to exclude any other transsexual.

If there is a reason to have men's tennis and women's tennis, then there is a reason to make sure men play men's tennis and women play women's tennis.

The Slims should phase out Renee because the circus atmosphere detracts from the quality reputation the players on the Slims tour have built up over the last several years.



Renee Richards has a man's build and plays with the power of a man. (Staff photo)

Editor's Notebook

Living in Finnegan's wake

Living life is not easy.

Moreover, being free in a basically unfree society is even more difficult.

No doubt, it may inspire the wrath of less crumpled blocks of our atomists, but being free is more difficult for men than it is for women.

And being free is not as easy as it sounds.

Being free in society means being free of the right role stereotypes that are the building blocks of our institutions. None of this is to suggest that these institutions are not worthy. Rather, the de-individualization process they demand is not so worthy.

There is no way to change society. Individuals must change before the larger structure can change. However, a large number of individuals are now changing as is witnessed by an increasing number of divorces and separations, and it augurs a vast social change in the 1980s.

In that case, all that is left for individuals not in tune with the underlying currents of individual growth is to survive the '70s.

And for men, it is not as easy as it sounds.

It is easier for women, "the mere chattels of a man's world," because a woman's break from the stereotype can mean nothing but taking a more active role in her own development, rather than living life vicariously, through a husband.

BUT FOR A man, it is not all that simple. From childhood, men are taught to accept their roles and career. They are not to show any emotion regarding dissatisfaction with career or marriage, especially if children are involved.

Hence, men are often not in touch with the parallel emotional life that beneath the surface is coexisting with (and often contradicting) their conscious existence.

Women, on the other hand, are allowed to be emotional. This is healthy. And as a result, when a woman makes a significant change in her life she is much more in tune with what makes her happy and what does not, and is better able to make sound decisions.

It is not so with men.

Unlike women, friendships between men seldom develop beyond the locker room stage. It is not because men prefer talking among themselves only about professional and amateur sports and "the way to improve one's backhand." Rather, the socializing process has demanded this kind of behavior from men.

As a result, when a man goes through a growth stage, he often grows alone, without benefit of meaningful friendships for support.

OF COURSE, none of this has to be this way, which is precisely why

society is changing. Individuals are beginning to recognize that one cannot serve one's mate, one's children, one's friends or even larger social institutions, without first being able to serve oneself.

And there is the rub. It is the socialization process that has allowed women to be more positively self-serving, while it has been the men who have fought and died for "ideals," who have given themselves over to a corporate or organizational identity, who have allowed themselves to be caught in the bind between working harder for career advancement and spending more time with the family.

Society is changing, and because of the present institution that is made up equally of men and women, it is women who are better prepared to accept, live with and deal with this change.

This is not a matter of women's liberation paving the way for male liberation—women's liberation is passe and was from the day of its birth.

Rather it is human liberation, the last stage of development for these living in the wake of an industrial revolution that impacted more heavily on social structures and individuals than had ever been imagined.

W. MICHAEL MILLER

Mike Miller is editor of our sister publication, the Southfield Eccentric.

A Division of
Suburban Communications Corporation

Philip H. Power
Chairman of the Board

Richard D. Agnifoglio
President
Chief Executive Officer

Farmington Observer

"Successor of the Farmington Enterprise"

Steve Barnaby
Editor

22170 West Nine Mile
Southfield, MI 48075
(313) 352-5400

John Reddy, General Mgr.

Thomas A. Riordan, Executive Editor
George J. Hagan, Advertising Director, Fred Wright, Circulation Mgr.