Former Metzger aides seek to clarify role

BY RICHARD KAWANA, MICHAEL WOODWARD & STEPHEN KLINZMAN

Two former research assistants of Prof. Stanley D. Metzger said Sunday that they have prepared written "clarifications" from Metzger that they are not responsible for the inclusion of improperly attributed material in Metzger's latest book.

Their requests follow newspaper reports last week that the prestigious Brookings Institution, publisher of "Lowering Non-tariff Barriers," in an unprecedented action has recalled and will destroy all but a few copies of the book because "it contains material taken from other sources without permission and without proper attribution."

Metzger told the Washington Star-News that the apparent plagiarism resulted from his use, for the first time, of assistants to prepare a book.


Robert Bork to speak

Robert H. Bork, Solicitor General of the United States, and former Acting Attorney General at the height of the "Saturday Night Massacre" period of Watergate, will address the GULC community this Wednesday at 12:30 p.m. in the Mood Courtroom.

A former professor at Yale Law School, Bork will speak on "Current Reflections on the Vulnerability of the Law." A question and answer period will follow.

Bork's talk is being sponsored by the GULC chapter of Phi Delta Phi International Legal Fraternity. According to William G. Bayer, Eschequer, Scott Inn, Phi Delta Phi, the Bork talk marks the opening of the Spring 1975 speakers program of the fraternity chapter. Future speakers and other events will be announced in the Law Weekly and on the fraternity bulletin board in the lounge.

Search Committee ranks McCarthy over Bamberger

by SCOTT SPIEGEL

The Decanal Search Committee preferentially ranked Law Center Prof. David J. McCarthy, Jr. over Catholic Law School Dean E. Clinton Bamberger, Jr. according to a Committee document made available to the Law Weekly.

In an official letter submitted to University President Robert J. Henle in which the committee recommended both candidates for dean, committee chairman Judge Edward A. Tamm informed Prof. Henle that Professor McCarthy received eight committee votes and Dean Bamberger received four votes. It is believed that two of the five faculty members of the committee and the two student members supported Bamberger.

In related developments, University President Henle told the Law Weekly that personally interviewing the dean finalists is the "normal" thing to do and that he "will certainly do that.

Henle also noted that he has not imposed any time limit on his decision and added that he needed enough time to "reflect" on the choice. Henle did not express a preference for an inside or an outside candidate but did say that he would contact various individuals to get some advice before he makes a decision on the new dean.

Hilltop observers believe that among those who Fr. Henle will turn to for advice are Prof. Paul Dean of the Law Center, Board of Directors and Search Committee member A.G. McCarthy.
**Around GULC**

Colangelo gets help from fund

The Leo Kennedy Fund has awarded David Colangelo, '76, $400 to be used toward the furtherance of his legal education.

The Fund was established last year in memory of Leo B. Kennedy, '75, who died in 1973. Contributions to the Fund were made by his fellow students and the family and friends of the Kennedy family.

Trustees of the Fund hope to establish an annual award for excellence in legal writing to be limited to upper division day and evening students. Students will write on the topic of "Constitutional Problems in Criminal Law: Civilian and Military".

**Webb Presents Check to Malley**

James Webb, '75, a trustee of the Fund, presented a check in the amount of the award to Father James Malley, S.J., who will present the check to Colangelo, who was seriously injured last fall in an automobile accident and is now home of a fellow law student. David hopes to return to his studies of law when he recovers.

**SBA delegates are elected**

Following are the results of last week's election to the SBA House of Delegates. Vote totals are in parentheses. One asterisk indicates a winner, two a runoff.

**First year**
- See, 1 Freda *(23)
- Miller *(22)
- Others (9)
- See, 1 Edmond *(14)
- James, Kruse, Robertson (18 cousins)
- Wheeler *(16)
- Others (19)
- See, 1 Hayn *(9)
- Taylor *(9)
- Stutz, Others (23)
- See, 4 Callison *(32)
- Cellino *(16)
- Niedermeier *(31)
- Schlafly *(25)
- Others (4)
- See, 7 Dewhurst *(21)
- Miller *(26)

**Second year**
- See, 1 Freda *(25)
- Evans *(43)
- Johnson *(46)
- Lerner *(35)
- Richardson *(49)
- Warner *(51)
- Wells *(52)
- Wolf *(40)
- Worthen *(44)
- Others (35)

**Third year**
- See, 1 Freda *(31)
- Atkinson *(15)
- Savio *(12)
- Others (1)

According to informed observers, Zartisky at press time was not planning to demand a runoff.

**Father Malley has informed the Law Weekly** that David has progressed in his recovery from recent plastic surgery to the point where he can spend some time on his back. He is now able to spend three one-hour periods per day in a highly mechanized wheelchair which can be controlled by chin levers and/or blowing tubes. This will permit him to begin further types of rehabilitation which depend on his mobility.

Father Malley also reports that David remains paralyzed from the neck down. Yet some "traces of life" have been found in the bicep muscles of each arm. If these muscles can be redeveloped it may permit some upper arm activity. David already has shoulder control.

"Dave still needs all the encouragement we can give him by cards, prayers and visits of those in the area," Malley concluded.

Also present at the award ceremony were Paul Kennedy '76, Lori's brother, Bruce Pearson '75, Janice Chocowski '76, Stephen Kratzke '76 and Clay Phillips '76.

**FAHY reading area re-dedicated**

The central reading area on the third floor of the library was re-dedicated Friday in honor of Charles Fahy, Senior Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit. Fahy re-dedicated the area "to the young men and women who study here."

Among those at the re-dedication ceremony Friday was David L. Bazelon, Chief Judge, D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. Fahy received his L.L.B. in 1941 and LL.D. in 1942 from Georgetown. He has served as counsel to the N.R.B., Solicitor General, legal advisor for the Department of State, as well as a federal judge.

Moore *(28), Others (3)

**Second year at large**

- Acosta *(50)
- Evans *(45)
- Johnson *(46)
- Lerner *(35)
- Richardson *(49)
- Warner *(51)
- Wells *(52)
- Wolf *(40)
- Worthen *(44)
- Others (35)

**Second year eve:**

- Grey *(9)
- Shaw *(10)

**Third year eve:**

- Atkinson *(14)
- Savio *(12)
- Others (1)

Graduate: Zartisky *(1) Others (9)

According to informed observers, Zartisky at press time was not planning to demand a runoff.

---

**Student wins bike suit**

**BICYCLE AREA WATCHED 24 HR. PER DAY BY SECURITY GUARD**

D.C. Superior Court Judge Tim Murphy last Friday ruled that the University must compensate a law student whose bicycle was stolen from the Law Center. The suit claims court decision awarded second-year student Irwin Trauss the $200 value of the bicycle, interest, and costs on a theory of negligence undertaking to monitor GULC bicycle racks. Testimony revealed that the monitor cameras guarding the rack area do not work after dark.

Plaintiff Trauss had claimed reliance on prominently posted signs proclaiming "THE BICYCLE AREA IS WATCHED BY SECURITY GUARDS VIA CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION 24 HOURS A DAY." Trauss' bike was stolen at 2:42 a.m. on January 24, 1974. An eyewitness reported that three youths cut through a case-hardened chain and rode off with the bike.

Physical Plant Administrator Clyde Martin, Assistant to the Dean Dan Hurley, and security guard Rufus Ratcliff testified for the University. Martin acknowledged that he knew at the time the signs were posted that the closed-circuit monitors did not work after dark.

The University was represented by counsel from its insurer, the Hartford Group, Jim Brommer, Hartford's attorney, argued that Trauss unreasonably relied on the cameras and signs, since the inadequacy of the system should have been apparent to him. The warning signs have since been relegated to a less prominent position.

Trauss expressed satisfaction with the verdict and stated that he had "spent 80 to 90 hours preparing the case." He also indicated that the insurance company was considering an appeal.

**Iolanthe set for this week**

**Vast array of talent**

This weekend's--maybe this month's--peak in low-cost, high-value entertainment is Phase III in the progression of annual Dale-Marshall Productions (this year joined by co-producers Tim Welch and Mitchell Dale).

For the cast of "Iolanthe," Jack Marshall has assembled a vaster than ever array of talent from the ranks of the law school and greater D.C. including the luminaries of "Princes of Peonance" and "Trial by Jury."

"With Wings, Even"

The glittering (literally) women's chorus of very influential fairies (with wings, even) will not only sing and dance but perform prodigious feats of magic as they wield their wands over a host of befuddled British peers.

W.S. Gilbert's plot runs the gamut of social satire, drawing peers, a Lord Chancellor, a private in the Grenadier Guards, and a shepherd lad and lass into the charmed fairy circle.

Weighty thematic issues raised include the intelligence (if any) required of a legislative body, the unlimited imagination of the law and its representatives, the consequences of 'women interfering in politics', and, inevitably, love. "Iolanthe" also happens to feature some Arthur Sullivan's most lyrical and delightful numbers.

All this for only $2.50 maximum! It's cheaper than more professional theatre, more fun than a movie, probably easier to park for than either, and a reminder, once again, that life is more than "The Law."

"Iolanthe" will be presented in its full splendor this Thursday, Friday and Saturday evening at 8 p.m. and Sunday afternoon at 2 p.m., Feb. 27 - March 1.

Tickets are on sale in the student lounge, 11:30 a.m. - 1:30 p.m. and in the lobby from 3-6 p.m.
Research assistants seek clarification of Metzger statement on book recall

(Continued from page 1)

believed other academicians would 'un- derstand' how such a thing could happen to anyone... I am, of course, liberal, but it is a good example of what shouldn't be done. I only hope people know me long enough to fit it into perspective.'

The professor "specialized" to the Post that "a lack of sophistication...a lack of real knowledge of the road" caused in the words of the Post "one or more of our research assistants to submit materials to him without properly identifying what was quoted from other sources."

Doesn't Identify Assistants

Metzger, however, declined to identify the assistant or assistants responsible for the improper attributions. He told the Law Weekly he was "purposely keeping vague" the persons involved in order not to cause them because it would "serve no useful purpose to identify them" and he didn't want to cause them any harm.

"By blaming unnamed student researchers, however, Prof. Metzger ten- dered to defend us," said Andrew De Cicco, GULC '73, one of the two as- sistants who had received an email letter of clarification from Metzger.

"Strange Situation"

De Cicco said that Metzger's state- ments regarding the assistants put him in "a Catch-22 situation. I hoped that he didn't mean that. I felt somewhat clarifica- tion was needed to make it clear what I meant."

He added that Metzger was not telling the truth when he said "everything that I did was normal and correct."

"By writing the email letter to me, Metzger told me that he actually expected to write a similar letter to the other assistant."

GULC '72, a research assistant from Summer 1971 to May 1972, also had received an email letter of clarification from Metzger.

"FELLER ARTICLE
COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

It has long been recognized that the US government's efforts to protect domestic industries and businesses by imposing duties and quotas on foreign imports are subject to the scrutiny of the World Trade Organization (WTO). While the WTO has provided a framework for resolving disputes, it has also been criticized for failing to effectively address cases of unfair trade practices.

The US government has implemented a range of countervailing duty measures to combat what it perceives as unfair trade practices. These measures are designed to offset subsidies provided by foreign governments to their domestic industries, which can give those industries a competitive advantage over US producers. Countervailing duties are calculated based on the amount of the subsidy and the injury caused to domestic producers.

In a recent case, the US government imposed countervailing duties on imports of steel and aluminum from China. The duties were based on a finding that China had provided subsidies to its steel and aluminum industries, which had resulted in a dumping of products into the US market.

However, the WTO has challenged the US duties on these grounds, arguing that the evidence presented by the US government was insufficient to support the imposition of duties. The WTO has also expressed concerns about the level of protection provided to domestic producers, which may lead to distortions in the global market.

These challenges highlight the complex and contentious nature of countervailing duty disputes. Policymakers must balance the need to protect domestic industries against the risks of trade protectionism.

MELTZER BOOK
COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

The importance of countervailing duty measures in protecting US industries has been highlighted by the recent imposition of duties on Chinese steel and aluminum. These measures have raised concerns about potential retaliatory actions by China, which could lead to a trade war.

The WTO has been called upon to resolve such disputes in a fair and transparent manner. It has emphasized the importance of providing adequate and clear notification to affected parties and ensuring that the ruling process is accessible and understandable.

In conclusion, countervailing duty measures play a crucial role in protecting US industries. However, the implementation of these measures must be done in a manner that is consistent with WTO rules and principles, ensuring that they do not lead to distortions in the global market.

DC. Bar may end exam waiver

(Continued from page 1)

admissions apparently stems from re- requirements by local bar members of non-reciprocation in Maryland and Virginia as a way to protect their own vested interest.

Virtually all jurisdictions, including Maryland and Virginia, have adopted the five-year practice rule. Many require that applicants pass their state bar exam regardless of, or in addition to, the practice rule.

The lack of reciprocity of the adjacent jurisdictions is considered by some Washington lawyers as patently unfair.

Not only does Rule 46 (I) (c) at (6) now stand permits attorneys from Virginia and Maryland to utilize DC courts while local lawyers are precluded from

(Continued from page 1)

was deeply hurt by the prestige of the law school's failure to receive the "general rules," to be consistent, and to be of "inertial" importance. These qualities were in short supply in the "general rules," wrote Bork.

As Solicitor General, Bork argued the Government case before the Supreme Court. As Acting Attorney General, Bork carried the fiery passion of Archibald Cox after the release of President Richard Nixon.

"I don't think that Prof. Metzger or anyone associated with him or acting in any way under his direction should be either in the Senate or in the Bar."

But John Douglas Johns also considered the Bar exam favor re- taining the present rule. Lawyers from Elliot Richardson and William Ruckelshaus, the home office in Washington, and it becomes necessary to be allowed to practice in the local courts, Douglas noted.

The Georgetown legal services program might also be inhibited by repealth of a liberal entry rule, he pointed out, with small law firms and solo practitioners made more difficult. Similar effect might be corporation counsel, public interest attorneys, and possibly military lawyers.

Institution of a five-year practice rule, moreover, would run counter to what many see as a liberalizing and nationalizing trend in bar admissions, in particular the rapid growth of the Multistate Bar Examination.

Professor John Colson said he would prefer a national exam or better quality law schools instead of the Bar exam to be undertaken some time in the future to protect the economic livelihood of local lawyers.

Responding to this economic protectionism, John Colson dismissed it and the Committee's proposal as indicating the thinking of a "medi- eval guild system" in place of the actual professional association.

John Douglas

(Continued from page 1)

In July, 1974, 93% of all students sitting for the Pennsylvania exam had passed. The corresponding figure for the DC Bar was 63%, for Virginia 75%, and for Maryland 60%. According to the Pennsylvania Nigerian-D.C. Bar Coordinator, more attorneys were admitted to the Bar last year by motion than by exam.

But John Douglas Johns is also considering the Bar exam favor re- taining the present rule. Lawyers from Elliot Richardson and William Ruckelshaus,

(Continued from page 1)

Bork

(Continued from page 1)

This same principle was applied to the "general rules," where, "the Department of Justice was trying to save the law school's prestige..." it was trying to save the law school's "general rules," wrote Bork.

As Solicitor General, Bork argued the Government case before the Supreme Court. As Acting Attorney General, Bork carried the fiery passion of Archibald Cox after the release of President Richard Nixon.
Prof. Metzger's Book

Elsewhere on this page, M. Stuart Madden, '76, writes that "given Stanley Metzger's outstanding career as a government official, a scholar, and a professor, a considerable penalty has already been exacted by the publicity surrounding this mistake. The admimnistrative benefit to scholars and students has been twofold. The matter has run its course and should stop." We agree, but it is a course we are not so sure it has or should.

Surely, the incident of the recalled Metzger's book should serve as a lesson in proportion. Surely, it should be kept in the perspective of Metzger's "total record of achievement" as Dean Fisher put it. Surely, Prof. Metzger deserves the cooperation and understanding of the entire Law Center community. But to the same extent, the Law Center faces a more complex explanation than it has received of what happened and why.

Several serious issues are raised by this unfortunate incident, including questions of academic integrity, the quality and preparation of preprofessional writing, and the possible need for more regulations or guidelines for both research assistants and professors. Prof. Metzger should have a chance to respond to the issues presented in whatever forum he chooses—on the record faculty meeting, a letter to the editor, or whatever. If Prof. Metzger does not choose to explain or clarify we think there should be a further inquiry by either the Academic Standards Committee or an ad hoc committee of the faculty.

As noted by Roland Hoover, director of publications for the Brookings Institution, the imputation made the decision reluctantly to recall and destroy Metzger's book because of its reputation. But Brookings, concerned about its reputation, finally decided to act on the matter. If Brookings was concerned with the integrity of its institutional process, the Law Center can be no less concerned with its own integrity. We doubt very much that there was any conscious, willful misconduct on the part of Prof. Metzger. He has acknowledged possible negligence, however, in failing to check the work of some assistants against original sources. These assistants in turn have requested a clarification from Metzger and a disclaimer as to their responsibility for the inclusion of the unattributed material.

Before the consequences of this incident can be assessed, Prof. Metzger should take the opportunity to clarify the situation and/or accept the responsibility of authorship.

Airing of this matter may or may not "be a good thing for the academic atmosphere," as Peter Schuck Fletcher noted. But if it is, we think it is. But at this point it seems the only alternative. We urge Prof. Metzger to respond. In doing so, we assure him our full cooperation.

No to D.C. Practice Rule

The D.C. Bar is considering a proposal from the Committee on Admissions to the D.C. Bar for a list of Columbia County Court of Appeals that a five year practice rule he instituted in the District eliminating "dubious" and "dubious" and the record of achievement as Dean Fisher put it. We urge the Bar to reject this rule change on the basis of philosophical and practical grounds.

Granted, the issue is not "a simple, clear-cut resolution" of an "academic fact," but rather an "academic" issue. Just as Samuel J. Brasel noted in an article in the Sept. 1974ABA Journal, "The full implications of the record of achievement as Dean Fisher put it. We urge the Bar to reject this rule change on the basis of philosophical and practical grounds.

To many, including the authors of a 1970 article in Cathol. Law Review, the rule of exclusion as such a practice rule "smacks of something less than professionalism. It brings to mind the medieval craft guilds or trade unions.

These authors and Prof. Victor Kramer are not the only lawyers to reject this goal, the right to practice. Eugene Rostow, former dean of Yale Law School, has written: "We should seek mobility for lawyers... It is good for the bar of a country to have a constant flow of new blood coming in. We don't want our bar associations to become trade unions and we don't want our bar examinasion procedures to become barriers to interstake mobility."

Rosten's last statement points out the principal, practical objection to a five year practice rule. At a time of increasing mobility, an end to the District's traditional admissions policy would severely restrict the career and location choices of thousands of lawyers, especially those just starting out in their careers.

Just because neighboring Maryland and Virginia have five year practice rules doesn't mean the District should adopt one. As the nation's capital, the District should lead the nation, not follow it. The District Bar should contribute to the solutions, not the problems, of misguided, protected, parochial bar regulations.

At a time of increasing nationalization of bar examinations epitomized by Multistate Bar Examination, a five year practice rule for the District of Columbia would be a step backward. We hope the D.C. Bar will decide not to take it when it forwarding its views next month to the Committee on Admissions and the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Letters to the Editor

The Brookings book: "A breach of trust"

To the Editor: As a friend and a student of Stanley Metzger I would like to add a bit of perspective to the unhappy incident involving the Brookings book.

The remarks of one professor I spoke with highlight the problem. This professor said, "It is difficult to check everything when you are writing for a deadline..." and mused "there but for the grace of God go I." Later, I spoke with a law clerk for a federal judge, who had this to say: "Especially in the legal community people should understand that a clerk or a research assistant can tell their boss a bill of goods... There is no way a judge is going to check the test for proper attribution."

The implications of these comments is clear. A professor or a judge hires a clerk or a research assistant so that he may rely on them. Without that complete faith, the value of the researcher's work is so diminished as to make it completely unworthy.

When a professor gets material from a research assistant, he expects not raw data but a written work product. If the work product is coherent on its face, and approximates the professor's writing style, it is placed in the proper slot in the essay. Without this fair time honored progression from research to publication, the writings of academics, judges, columnists and others would slow to a trickle.

A clear corollary to this proposition is the complete trust of the professor in his research assistant. This faith is appropriate in the professional community of a law school. As professionals in training, law students are vested in the ethical code of the institution and the profession. A breach of that trust led to the current problem.

Given Stanley Metzger's outstanding career as a government official, a scholar, and a professor, a considerable penalty has already been exacted by the publicity surrounding this mistake. The admimnistrative benefit to scholars and students has been twofold. The matter has run its course and should stop.

M. Stuart Madden, '76

(Continued on page 6)
Leaks Leaks Leaks Leaks Leaks

"I think the FBI should shadow the Law Weekly and not just... the dean candidates."

by SCOTT SPIEGEL

by DON WALLACE

* * 1/2 (On a scale of 0 to 4 stars.)

This may seem low to some, but I have always been a hard grader; I recolored once gave a movie called Son of Ariel a half star (and called it S.O.P. ).

Because the movie is set in Lawrence Hall, at Harvard Law School, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, there are some who think it is about Harvard, and because the professor who is the focus of the film, Charles W. Kingsfield, Jr. (John Houseman) is a professor of contracts and uses Leo Fuller's case book, there are some who think it is about Professor Fuller. I know better (I had Professor Fuller); Leo Fuller is taller than Professor Kingsfield, on the other hand, Kingsfield is about the size of A. James Carter (I also had Professor Carter, but then Professor Carter teaches property not contracts).

It is possible that the movie is really based on Georgetown! There are rumors which have never been denied, at least to my satisfaction, that Richard Alan Gordon has a daughter. On the other hand, it is clear that the movie is not about a Georgetown property professor (see picture). Moreover there are no dormitories at Georgetown University Law Center, and these are in the movie; and I have never seen a first-year Georgetown law student vomit.

Briefly, the movie is about the first year of law school, as seen by a male first-year law student. I gather from some students that they think the movie is realistic. This bear out something which I have always suspected, which is how unreal law school seems to many students, especially first-year ones. The Paper Chase is even slightly more unreal than law school. (I have been told that Walt Disney's Fantasia may be based on it.)

The movie begins rather like Dr. Zhivago, with figures (law students) shuffling into a classroom, in Dr. Zhivago it was concentration camp prisoners shuffling up the side of a hill. I will not give away the - unreal- - ending of the film. Then there is the study group. A lot is made of study groups and I have in fact always recommended them to students (I belonged to two at law school). The sheer competitiveness of the members of the study group - against each other - is wondrous to behold, but is it real? As the group's number declined, I was initially reminded of Ten Little Indians and then of Regina v. Stevens (the lifeboat case). It is here, Susan (Lindsay Wagner) enacting in her organized little talks about the evils of organization? Dare I reveal her relationship to Professor Fuller, or her - is Sociate - relationship with the movie's apparent hero, Mr. Hart (Timothy Bottoms)? Mr. Kingsfield (he had his first name), resembles Mark Spitz (Hart swims a good deal in the movie) with a Harpo Marx wig (the movie is a few years old), and also resembles Stephen Kllnman (the editor-in-chief of this journal) and is awfully cool. Finally how realistic is the great Professor Charles W. Kingsfield, Jr. himself, the real hero of this movie, with the warm blood of a dead fish? I am reminded of a Harvard Law School joke about a certain professor X who rang the doorbell of a house and asked the little boy who answered, "Excuse me, I am lost. Can you tell me where professor X lives?" The little boy answered, "Dad, this is your house." That however is a joke. Hart is obtained by Kingsfield.

The movie raises a serious question. Do first year law students really see the first year of law school in the way that the movie suggests. Presumably the script writer checked with a lot of lawyers and first year law students. My brother, who quit law school after three months, thought the movie excellent; I thought it a caricature. Obviously law professors do not think about the first year in the same way that first year law students do.

I hated the first year of law school - not only that, it even caused me to do such things as outline my letters to my mother before writing them. On the other hand I love the law. My recommendation to first year law students, in addition to enjoying the Sociate method and joining study groups, is to learn to swim, play cards, see movies - I found this is a very enjoyable 25 star one.

The author teaches first year property and was a former film critic for the Yale Daily News
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The Law Weekly was provided with a partial transcript of the last search committee meeting. The transcript was wrapped in plain brown paper and deposited in the Law Weekly suggestion box. Professor Frank Dugan verified the transcript's accuracy when he said, "Seems right."

JUDGE TAMM: This, the 25th meeting of the search committee is now convened. The agenda for the two hour meeting is as follows: 1) 30 minutes for examinations of the FBI reports on the committee leks; 2) 80 minutes for a discussion of the need for secrecy and 3) minutes to discuss the dean candidates and voting for the final names to be sent to the board. Based on the FBI reports my friends at the bureau gave me, despite pleas for confidentiality, on which we have held committee luncheons, the Law Weekly reports caused one dean candidate to knock out people because he and his wife were hosted at Macr billies machines while another ate at the cafeteria on the Hilltop. We need absolute secrecy.

PROF. KRAMER: I agree, your honor. The Law Weekly is not the New York Times and this isn't the Penang Times. I saw Frank Dugan stop by the Law Weekly office. Frank, you're a leak.

PROF. DUGAN: (Pleading) I have to live with you people. Do you think I would leak? What are those reports anyway - the social-parties of the fourth floor?

PROF. AREEN: Prof. Dugan, you are a known friend of the students. You and Professor Bulman leaked that story about Harry Boys...

PROF. DUGAN: That's not true Professor Areen.

MR. RAGAN: Professor Areen?... I didn't know you were a professor, Judy. I thought you were a student.

MARK BECK: Paul Dean, you have been talking so much to Law Weekly editors that I hear the paper is thinking about endorsing you for another deanship?

PROF. DEAN: Law Weekly is leaking to you now, I suppose?

DAVE HUARD: I think you should dry up or leak yourself off the committee, Professor Dean. And the rumor is that Judge Hart, who is in turn leaked to the Washington Post. I think the FBI should shadow the Law Weekly reporters and not just investigate the dean candidates.

JUDGE TAMM: I'm no leak. I was with the FBI for years and have always upheld the need for secrecy in a democratic society. A.G. McCartney's the leak. He's close to Harle and the students and...

A.G. MCCARTHY: And the Arabs (chuckle)?

KATHY IMIG: I want to know who leaked the story that Judge Moore met A.G. McCartney for the first time at a wine and cheese party we had at GULC last November when this seminar has been meeting since spring of the Law Weekly people were...

PROF. KRAMER: Ah Ha! (screwing sound) The leaks gloat. That is worth a nickel. Here, (sound of a coin rolling down a nable.)

JUDGE TAMM: For the record now. I want an oath on leaking.

PROF. DEAN: I do not leak.

PROF. DUGAN: I do not leak.

A.G. MCCARTHY: What, me leak?

PROF. KRAMER: I'll get the plumbers...

JUDGE TAMM: Now that we have returned from our break, we must now discuss the candidates for dean and whose names we'll send to Father President. Eight minutes are allotted for discussion and voting and two minutes for my closing soliloquy. All those in favor of...

END OF TRANSCRIPT
'Alice Doesn't Live Here Anymore'

**Film View**

by BEN BECKER

Alice Doesn't Live Here Anymore is the latest film of cinema's most distinct and exciting young movie star, Martin Scorsese. It is a comedy about a woman named Alice (Ellen Burstyn), who being broke and displaced upon the untimely death of her financially dependent husband, must try to regain some stability for herself and her 12-year-old son.

Though it may seem that Scorsese has blossomed the formula he used in his earlier films—Who's That Knocking at Door?—he has managed to avoid repetition. In this latest film, the female characters are not conservative housewives, and the male characters are not cast in the traditional roles. Rather, they challenge and threaten the societal values and lifestyles of their male counterparts. This conception of women seems to be the result of his sensitivity to subtle changes in human relationships, rather than any desire to make ideological points.

Alice, who is the protagonist of the film, is a beautiful, middle-aged woman who has struggled for years to make ends meet. When her husband dies, she is left with a small inheritance and a house in the suburbs of Los Angeles. She decides to sell the house and move to New York, where she hopes to find new opportunities.

Alice's journey is not an easy one. She faces many challenges, including financial hardship, loneliness, and the difficult task of starting a new life in a new city. However, through it all, Alice remains determined and resilient, never losing hope for a better future.

In 'Alice Doesn't Live Here Anymore', Scorsese has created a compelling and nuanced portrait of a woman who is both vulnerable and strong. The film is a testament to his talent as a director and his ability to tell a story that is both entertaining and thought-provoking.

Letters

(Continued from page 4)

HURLEY REPLIES

To the Editor:

I am curious as to how one of your reporters, Louis Jack, wrote an article in the February issue of the magazine which attracted my attention. I have never seen a copy of the magazine before. I am certain that these statements did not originate from some source. I believe that my name was not mentioned anywhere in the magazine. I was intrigued by the article written by Mr. D. M. B. I have always admired his work and I think he is a talented writer. I was surprised to learn that he was the author of this article. I would like to provide some additional information about the topic that he discussed.

Jack responds

Thank you for your interest in the news article about Irwin Traus' suit in the Appellate Court. I am sorry for any misunderstanding. I do not have any information about the case. The case was transferred to a lower court, and the report was filed by the by-line for Irwin Traus. The article was signed by the by-line for Irwin Traus.

I believe that the article is not related to the current discussion. The topic of the article is not relevant to the discussion. The article is not related to the current discussion.

INT'L GROUP HOSTS WEEKEND

Georgetown's International Law Society will host an "International Law in Washington" weekend Feb. 27-March 1.

Students from around the nation will tour the State Department Legal Advisor's office, the Brookings Institution, the Judicial Branch, the Congressional Committees, the AFL-CIO, and private law firms on Fri. Feb. 28.

A panel debate on the Trade Act and its implications will be held here Saturday afternoon followed by a banquet at the Embassy Restaurant. GULC students interested in attending the events, panel or banquet, or in putting up one or more visiting law students for the evenings of Feb. 27, 28 or March, should leave name and phone number on the ILS office door (Room 1B-46).

To bring you an up-to-date story concerning the Estate of Metzer's book, the Law Weekly, normally published on Monday, delayed publication until today, Feb. 25.

We hope the more complete story has clarified the delay. We regret any inconvenience or concern our late appearance may have caused.

See you next Monday.

Supreme Court Calendar

by DOLORES SMITH

Monday, Feb. 24

10 a.m. U.S. v. Louisiana (No. 9 Orig., three hours) Rights to mineral resources in seabed off coast of Louisiana.

11:30 a.m. U.S. v. Maine (No. 35 Orig., four hours) Rights to coastal states to natural resources in seabed of outer continental shelf of Atlantic Ocean.

Tuesday, Feb. 25

10 a.m. U.S. v. Maine (continued).

1 p.m. U.S. v. Florida (No. 52 Orig.) Rights to natural resources in seabed: dividing line between Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. (No. 243 Orig., three hours) Rights to seabed and专属 rights to seabed and专属 rights to seabed.

10:00 a.m. R. v. R. (No. 3033, one hour 20 minutes) Connecticut statute requiring motor vehicle to disclose last known address of driver to the department of motor vehicles; rights of drivers.

10:00 a.m. R. v. R. (continued).

10:00 a.m. R. v. R. (continued).

10:00 a.m. R. v. R. (continued).

10:00 a.m. R. v. R. (continued).

Res Pendsen

Calif. Dreamin' on Tape

A Los Angeles attorney will win a $5 million lawsuit over videotape interviews with first and second year law students interested in employment in Southern California law firms. The tapes will aid the firms in planning their fall recruitment drives.

However, the names of firms using the tape service will not be revealed to the applicants who have no idea which Los Angeles firms will see his or her videotape.

The Placement Office wants to keep abreast of the current legal job situation. All students are reminded to notify the office when they have accepted employment in a permanent or summer position.

Rights Act of 1968; right of civil rights activities to remove prosecution to federal court. 2:30 p.m. Harring v. New York (No. 73-6587) New York procedural rules authorizing judges to prohibit summons by defense counsel in non-military cases.

Harrington speaks here tonight

The Placement Office wants to keep abreast of the current legal job situation. All students are reminded to notify the office when they have accepted employment in a permanent or summer position.
Grading: some solutions to a dilemma

by DAVID PODOLSKY
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GULC students and faculty have suggested a number of changes to avoid or temper some of the inequities in the present grading situation. Although likelihood of adoption varies with each suggestion, all of the following alternatives have some support.

A different grading scale. One advantage is that adjectives may be more meaningful. Fewer alternatives reduce the often artificial distinctions between grades (e.g., between "A" and "B"). More categories (i.e., a numerical system) would allow employers to more accurately evaluate students' abilities. One faculty member argues that allowing only a smaller number of grades makes grading more objective.

Inflated grades. This alternative has little faculty support. While this proposal would make the grades at GULC competitive with those at other schools, it would have serious drawbacks. Where shall the line be drawn? How much can grades be inflated before they are not taken seriously? Will this cause a "grade war" among schools trying to give their students an advantage? Generally, the concern is that this method might be used to diminish the value of grades as feedback as well as to provide employers with more meaningful evaluations. The major drawback here would be that it would encourage grading to the curve.

Balance professors for first-year classes. This proposal calls for distribution of professors among first-year sections by grading section, and that professors be used to assign grades to their students. This method would be too small an intervention to have much impact.

Self-ranking by students. Here is a suggestion which can help many students without necessarily hurting others. If you want to put your grades on your resume, you can include a definition of the grade, that is, describe what position in the course your grade represented (i.e., Contrasts "B" equals 15th percentile, B.A. equals "B" equals 35th percentile, etc.).

Guidelines. Another possible solution would be to have either intra-school or national guidelines on grading standards. This issue has been hotly debated among members of the GULC faculty. As a compromise, the grading system can be changed to a 4.0 scale, with "A" as an average grade (with a 4.0 average). This would make the grading system more competitive with other schools. The problem is that it is difficult to decide what position in the course your grade represents. For example, a "B" grade could be used to represent grades in various sections of a course.

Law Journal Selection. A relatively new policy is the selection of staff members by first-year sections. This eliminates the possibility that the top students of one section will be shot out just because they had low grades in one section. Unfortunately, this new policy only affects about 15% of the GULC population.

More first-year professors. With the adoption of the new first-year curriculum, most professors may become more involved in grading. The problem is that it is difficult to decide what position in the course your grade represents. For example, an "A" grade could be used to represent grades in various sections of a course.

National grading standards are less likely in the future. In addition to the issue of academic freedom, there are severe problems with enforcing grades. Even if all law schools agreed on a standard grading system and a standard curve (all persons pulled agreed with impossible), there would be no way to force adherence to the guidelines.
Former Metzger aides seek 'clarification'

(Continued from page 3) found to be taken verbatim, 11 were substantially verbatim. 11 contained both paraphrases and verbatim extracts, and 10 paragraphs were paraphrases. According to the initial footnote and two additional footnotes, there was no indication that the text was not Metzger's own writing.

"Substantially verbatim" means the wording was changed in a minor way, such as the use of the word "that" for "which," or making the last clause of a sentence the first clause.

Additionally, the sections of the Metzger text which were analyzed followed the subject divisions of the Fletcher article. Footnotes from the Fletcher article, however, were occasionally dropped in the Metzger book.

Butler Article Also Used

Paragraphs, sentences and organization were also taken without proper attribution from an article by E. Bruce Butler, "Countering Drug and Export Subsidization: A Reemerging Issue in International Law," Virginia Journal of International Law (1964).

Like the Fletcher article, the Butler piece was cited "for a good discussion of controlling duties" and as having "been relied on for perhaps the most surprising procedure" of the chapter.

Unlike the two other references to the Fletcher article, there was only one reference to the Butler article.

Metzger told the Law Weekly that he had no intention of taking any action against any of his assistants. Feller also said that he plans to take no action.

Feller noted, however, that there was no intention of taking any action against any of his assistants. Feller also said that he plans to take no action. He said that he had met with Metzger and was satisfied with Metzger's expression of "discontinuation" and "deteriorating" which was not in the form of a monetary amount.

"These Things Happen"

Feller also noted that "these things happen," that he himself uses research assistants, and that the airing of these problems could be "a good thing for the academic world."

According to its president, Kermit Gordon, the Brookings Institution is still investigating the "incident." Gordon has not yet discussed taking any further action with Brookings counsel, William Staley, or with Covington & Burling. "Obviously, this is a very unfortunate and unprecedented situation and I'd prefer not to comment further," said Gordon.

Published a year ago, Lowering Non-tariff Barriers sold for $4.95. Out of a press run of 3500 copies, 500 had been distributed free and about 1600 had been sold, according to the St. Gordon told his staff in a memorandum that the institution was making "a pain-taking examination" of the book to "identify every case" of improper attribution. And as this material is identified, Gordon noted, Brookings is "promptly notifying and apologizing to the copyright holder and the author, and informing them that we are making all reasonable efforts to recall such copies of the book as have been previously circulated."

Examination "Still Underway"

As of Sunday, the Brookings examination was "still underway" said Roland Hoover, director of publications. "Still underway" meant that the material was still being examined and that no action had been taken. Hoover added that the recall and destruction had been chosen by Gordon on advice of counsel to protect the institution's reputation as well as against liability for copyright infringement.

A simple disclaimer was rejected said Hoover because it "would not have spoken to the books already sold" nor would it have dealt with the possible copyright infringement. "The severity of infringement varies with the number of copies in circulation. We therefore decided to take all the books out of circulation," said Hoover.

The publications director also acknowledged that the Brookings Institution system of pre-publication review apparently did not work this time. "Three anonymous readers read the manuscript and these experts reported to Gordon. None of them picked it up," said Hoover.

Reluctantly Done

Speaking of the recall and destruction, Hoover told the St. News he was "sure Kermit (Gordon) took these steps very reluctantly because of Stanley Metzger's reputation. But the institution is very concerned with its institutional honesty. If we lose our reputation, we lose everything," said Hoover.

Jeremy R. Bidinger, editor-in-chief of LPB which is the holder of the copyright of the Fletcher article, said that the Brookings recall was the "most extreme action on the part of any publisher" that he was aware of while at the Law Center and as a Georgetown university professor for four years before. "Brookings has done what they've had to be free from any action for damages. They want to protect themselves and their reputation."

Of his own reaction, Bidinger expressed his "tremendous surprise" and his "tremendous disappointment." He said that while he did not yet have a copy of Metzger's book, he hoped to obtain one over the weekend and review its contents as an effort to evaluate reports, confirmed by Metzger, that the book contains further improperly attributed or unattributed sections from other articles possibly from LPB. "If we find any, we have to do something," Bidinger said he expects to complete a review of the book within a week or so.

"Friend and Colleague"

Law Center Dean Adrian Fisher said that he was "very distressed by the news...I have known Stanley for 25 years as both a friend and colleague....I wouldn't have known him that way unless I had great respect for him," Fisher added that he hoped people would evaluate the situation "on the basis of the defense of theMetzger's total second of achievement" as a scholar, teacher, and public servant.

Metzger has taught at GULC since 1960. A graduate of Cornell University in 1936 and its Law School in 1938, he has worked as an attorney with the New York State Labor Relations Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and the Office of Price Administration. He was also the Assistant Legal Advisor for Economic Affairs for the Department of State.

In 1967, he was appointed chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission, and served for two years.

In 1972, while a professor at GULC, he was appointed consultant to the Department of State on programs to reduce international trade barriers.

Metzger is scheduled to go on sabbatical next academic year. According to Dean Fisher, Metzger requested the leave a year and a half ago.

Author of Four Other Books

Metzger is the author of four other books on international trade and of numerous articles. He is a member of the American Law Institute, the Executive Council of the American Society of International Law and of the editorial boards of American Journal of International Law and the Journal of World Trade Law, as well as the LPIB advisory board.

On Tenure Committee

Prof. Metzger is also a member of the Faculty Committee which makes preliminary recommendations on tenure as well as the GULC representative to the University-wide Rack and Tenure Committee. That advisory body makes final recommendations on all promotion and tenure cases at University President Henle. Metzger is known for his strong advocacy of publishing and scholarship as a major criterion for promotion and tenure.

On Friday, Metzger was scheduled to make a presentation before the Rack and Tenure Committee of tenure recommendations for Professors Kramer, Kratennaker, and Oldham. Prof. Robert Plofsky, chairman of the Faculty Committee, agreed to go in Metzger's place. But the meeting was later cancelled. Reportedly, the committee was concerned that proper protocol was not being followed with non-member Plofsky making a presentation.

Dean Fisher is expected to appear before the Committee later this week.

Join/Subscribe To The Law Weekly

Becoming a subscriber to the Law Weekly is the perfect way to stay informed of all the news coming out of the law school. Our knowledgeable and experienced staff ensure that you get the latest and most accurate information. Whether you're a student, faculty member, or alumnus, subscribing to the Law Weekly is a must. With your support, we can continue to provide high-quality journalism to the legal community.

Please consider joining our community of legal professionals today.