

## Keep it clean

Less than a month ago this editorial space was devoted to a discussion of the approaching ASUN election campaign. The final paragraph called for "honest, mature, sincere and above-ground" campaigns. It noted that the candidate that ran that type of campaign would be the most "deserving of victory."

Now that the campaigns have expired, whether or not they met this criteria can be determined.

The quality of the four party campaigns remained on a very respectable level until late Monday evening. Then the All University Party (AUP) headed by presidential candidate Roy Baldwin began distributing leaflets that the whole campaign could have done well without. They were expressly designed to discredit the opposition, rather than further the cause of the party.

The party that succeeds in the election today should be the one that ran the best campaign. A rival party distributed literature Tuesday that said, "As any party grows uncertain of its stability, it may resort to slander and mudslinging in a final effort to

gain your vote."

This is just what has been done by the AUP. Students know better than to believe that. It is hoped they'll vote accordingly.

In addition to ASUN and advisory board candidates and the proposed ASUN constitution, there are other issues that will require the perusal of every student voting.

The Nebraska Public Interest Research Group is asking for a refundable tuition assessment to finance its consumer interest organization. If NEBPIRG is to succeed, then an affirmative vote is necessary on the ballot.

The whole student fee question also appears on the ballot. Every one of the itemized areas listed on the ballot deserve the fee support they are now receiving. The vote on these items should be "yes". Fees are now being studied and recommendations concerning their fate are forthcoming.

The issues have been presented and are being debated. It is hoped that many students will vote for them. The ASUN election procedure is the only chance students get regularly to participate in their University and its operation.

Barry Pilger

editorial



## to the editor

*Editor's note: Letters to the editor referring to previously published letters are normally not printed. However, due to widespread interest in Larry Wolfley's Faculty Senate motion concerning plagiarism, the following letters are being published.*

### Wolfley—censure, not dismissal

Dear editor:

I want to thank Richard Boohar for making a serious response to the Prokop censure question. In particular, more thought should be given to the possibility that a question of due process may be involved here.

The wording of my original resolution merely asks for "censure", not "dismissal," which is the word Boohar used in his letter. Censure is a mild term. It means the Faculty Senate doesn't like the man, that

he is not our kind of person, that he hasn't been playing by the rules we consider fair. To me it means that I wouldn't let Prokop enroll in one of my courses—for obvious reasons.

Boohar doesn't name "the pertinent reasons for voting against my resolution, which have nothing to do with cowardice or fear of economic repercussion." If he is referring to the due process question, I maintain the issue is open for debate and remains to be decided. I would like to know Boohar's other reasons for being against my resolution.

They might include strong agreement with Prokop's politics and his views on homosexuality and an overriding desire to maintain good (i.e. submissive) relations with the regents at any cost.

Boohar does not deny that Prokop plagiarized, but says it was a "single offense" (but so might murder be). We come down to the fact that what Prokop did was morally and legally wrong.

Further, Boohar's idea that Prokop is not a member of the academic community, and therefore is not bound by the rules enforced in it, is totally absurd. Prokop is a member—he never lets anyone forget he is a real Ph.D. Not only that, everyone in our society is bound by common-sense rules against plagiarism.

Finally, my resolution is not politically motivated. For instance, I approve of Regent Schwartzkopf's political stand, but if he had plagiarized instead of

Prokop, my response would have been the same.

Prokop as an individual did something wrong in an attempt to maintain public support for his elected position ruling over the academic community. We should have the moral strength to stand up and say we simply do not like it.

Larry Wolfley  
Department of English

### Academic community members

Dear editor:

Richard Boohar's letter in the March 20 Daily Nebraskan seems to me to ignore the basic issue in the controversy surrounding Regent Prokop's sermon against homosexuality. In the first place, he writes as if Larry Wolfley's resolution and the handout concerning it were one document, and that he and his colleagues were being asked to support one in supporting the other. I thought the handout was silly and juvenile; I do not think the issue addressed by the resolution is.

There may well be reasonable doubt whether the Faculty Senate should occupy itself with censuring or approving various statements or actions by local or national figures. But it comes as a shock to hear from Richard Boohar that the officers of the University are not members of the academic community. (I suppose secretaries and students aren't either.)

I see nothing in the resolution involving due process one way or the other, but I find Boohar's implication that non-members of the academic community are free of the rules which bind members to be rather amusing in this case.

Plagiarism, as one of my colleagues put it, may or may not be morally an "offense," but it is legally a crime, out of the academic community as well as in.

Frederick M. Link  
Professor of English

### Radical law number one

Dear editor:

As a member of the English Department, I should like to support Richard Boohar's excellent criticism of Wolfley and Company's Campus Crusade against Prokop. I do not defend plagiarism, whether conscious or unconscious, but I find equally distasteful the eagerness with which leftist students and even some faculty members impugn the moral characters of those who presume to disagree with them, especially when the same individuals can justify breaking the law when it suits their own interests (e.g., the use of marijuana).

That Wolfley's witch-hunt is not politically motivated is ridiculous on its face. What we see being implemented is Radical Law number one: "Thou shalt zap the blue meenies whenever possible"—regardless of how trivial the offense or what laws of due process must be dispensed with.

R. D. Stock  
Assistant Professor of English

### Thought control

Dear editor:

First of all I'd like to thank the Daily Nebraskan and particularly its "different drummer" for clearly outlining some of the implications of the proposed ASUN constitution.

This could be a good lesson to all of us. Often reforms supposedly in the interest of streamlining and simplifying governmental activities can lead to the development of undemocratic oligarchies, responsive primarily to themselves.

Perhaps CSL, or the regents, or whoever, is planning on appointing a "big nurse" who'll decide when our poor misguided hopheads have mended their ways and can be released from personal counseling. Beware of those who seek to control your thoughts, or we're all through.

Mark Dalton

### Constitution misconceptions

Dear editor:

It seems necessary to clear up some misconceptions about the new ASUN Constitution that were in Monday's editorial. In no place in the new constitution is there any mention of a "secret" recall procedure. The writers of the editorial seem to be confusing recall with impeachment.

The new constitution states that impeachment proceedings are initiated by a two-thirds secret vote of the body. This means that the person will be brought before the Student Court to be tried on charges of malfeasance in office. Impeachment is applicable only to officers of the association—it does not include committee appointments. This does not mean that the Executive Board can secretly recall anyone it pleases.

The new constitution states that procedures should be established for the appointment and recall of representatives to the Faculty Senate and All-University committees. This is intended to make student appointees responsible to the student body. One problem ASUN now has is that students who are appointed to various committees, including CSL, sometimes are not diligent in performing committee work or even in attending meetings. There must be a means to replace these people—this is all the constitution states.

The new constitution is a major improvement over the current system. Students have complained that the current ASUN Senate is purposeless. The new constitution gives senate a purpose: it would make it an effective body to represent student views.

Steve Fowler  
ASUN President

### Class-construction conflict

Dear editor:

A situation on this campus that should be corrected involves the conflict created each time a construction project begins near classrooms.

Presently I am in a sociology class on the second floor of Richards Hall, directly across the street from Memorial Stadium. With the construction work going on at the stadium's south end the teacher's lecture is impossible to hear.

If the University is going to conduct classes and construction projects concurrently, each classroom near a construction site should be equipped with a good quality public address system, and teachers should be ordered to use it.

Charlie Brogan