

6/1/79

THE STANFORD DAILY OPINIONS

Letters to the editor

Is winning all?

I've heard the phrases "winner takes all," "everyone loves a winner," "it's win or nothing," and others in a similar vein so many times that I thought I had surely become deadened to them. Not so. Last Saturday I was jolted back into realizing the unhappy truth of what they were saying.

The locale: Stanford's varsity tennis courts.

The occasion: Stanford vs. UCLA in tennis.

The attendance: Predominantly Stanford supporters.

The scenario: Bondurant (S) beats Metz (UCLA): crowd becomes ecstatic. Arons (S) edges Freeman (UCLA): crowd goes wild with joy and praises. Hodges (S) loses to Brescia (UCLA) in a close match: crowd silent, they even look away from Hodges.

Second locale Maples Pavilion, later the same day.

The occasion: Stanford and UCLA player introductions.

The attendance: Essentially the same as above.

The scenario: Bondurant introduced; crowd roars its approval. Arons introduced;

crowd in pandemonium, Arons — Bondurant hug each other. Hodges introduced; crowd again silent, and players, too, ignore him.

Has Hodges acquired leper status? Was he always unpopular? Or has America let this "Cult of Winning" attitude get too far?

Rahul Sood
Graduate Student
Communication

Conflict of interest

Space forbids a full answer to John Paval (*Daily*, May 29) on the firing of English Assoc. Prof. Bruce Franklin, but a few points should be addressed.

Paval, who apparently draws his information on the case from "eyewitness reports (that) indicated that he (Franklin) more or less helped to incite a riot" — a beguiling legal concept and mind-boggling font of possibilities for being severed from the University's employ — says, with more faith than facts, that "heaven knows the University did not seek out the opportunity to remove Franklin."

They did, though, freeze his

salary for several years, deny him the promotion his department had unanimously recommended for him. They also produced hundreds of photographs of him taken at a speech by diplomat Henry Cabot Lodge, also attended by some 700 other people, to sustain their charge (not even upheld by the Advisory Board) that he had disrupted the event.

All of the photos, incidentally, showed Franklin sitting with his little boy on his lap. It seems heaven needs a bit of education.

"Friends of the University are attacked for helping out in its defense," says Paval. The "friends" are Morris Doyle and Robert Brown, who, as Stanford trustees, are defendants in the suit the American Civil Liberties Union brought against the University on Franklin's behalf.

They are also partners in the firm of McCutchen, Doyle, Brown and Enerson, the attorneys paid — out of University funds — for "helping out in its defense," that is helping out themselves, among others.

According to public Internal

Revenue Service figures (*Daily*, Dec. 2, 1976), McCutchen, Doyle, Brown and Enerson received \$199,585 from University funds in 1972, when the Franklin suit was first brought. It made them the third-highest paid "persons compensated by the University for professional services."

In 1973, with the suit fairly active in the courts, they moved up to second highest, with \$228,411.

In just those two years, trustees Doyle and Brown must have collected their share, as partners, of close to \$430,000 paid for legal work (of which the Franklin suit was doubtless a substantial part) to their firm by the University whose funds are in their trust.

Such costs, like everything else, have surely risen considerably in the years since then.

Paval says piously the "issues transcend the expense." I say the expense is an issue, and so is the trustees' role in the case. Offhand, it doesn't seem all that holy.

Lise Giraud
Librarian
Cecil H. Green Library