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The AUTHOR hereby warrants to the PUBLISHERS that the said work is an original work, has not been published in volume form within the territories covered by this Agreement and that neither the above nor any part thereof is in any way whatever a violation of an existing copyright.

Some such clause appears in the standard book contract between an author and publisher, which requires the author to take on a legally binding obligation to deliver only an "original work" for publication. But it is not law alone that regulates our conduct as academic associates. To one side of the legal provisions governing intellectual property lies a less certain, though no less judicial, "machinery" for handling academic plagiarism. This administrative and ethical machinery, and the often shadowy border zone in which it operates, is the subject of this article. My argument, however, will be less penalistic: the failure of management of academic plagiarism is a task for those concerned with the ethics of the profession rather than with copyright reform.

We can begin to clarify what is at stake by drawing a general distinction between piracy and plagiarism. In the case of an already successful publication, the interest of a pirate is to reproduce the work, perhaps for sale, and to gain some direct or indirect benefit. Therefore, measures of copyright such as人体 copyright or the like, are often understood to control the right to reproduce a work for gain or pecuniary advantage. As a result, the publisher of the work is clearly in the position of having a legitimate right to take legal action against a pirate or plagiarism.

This is not the case with copyright and the public domain - generally speaking, fifty years post mortem of the author - its unauthorized copying is no longer a matter of copyright infringement. However, as an act of professional misconduct, or copying of the work of another for an ulterior motive. In this case, the author is the one who has violated the work, and the publisher is in that case, subject to certain specific limitations of what constitutes copyright of plagiarism. This, then, is not necessarily a legal matter, it is an ethical matter of honor and shame and professional conscience.

Perhaps because it is something other than a breach of copyright, academic plagiarism can remain concealed from sight of most of the public. It is something of the academic world that is not subject to the scrutiny of the public at large. It is a matter of the academic world, and the academic community, that is subject to the scrutiny of the academic world. The fact that the academic community does not take it seriously enough is an offense that is the very antithesis of what scholars do. (Mooney 1992:13)

In short, the issue of plagiarism is one of the most frequently raised in academic circles. It is a matter of great concern to all those who work in the academic world. The issue of plagiarism is not a matter of copyright or intellectual property law. It is a matter of academic ethics and professional conduct.

In order to address this issue, we need to understand the nature of plagiarism and the role it plays in the academic community. We need to understand the different types of plagiarism and how they can be detected and prevented. We also need to understand the consequences of plagiarism and how it can be punished.

We are now better placed to consider the question of how to regulate academic plagiarism. Some regulations are not in doubt: we should not allow plagiarism to occur. We should not allow anyone to copy another person's work without attribution. We should also not allow anyone to use another person's work without permission.

In addition, we should also consider the issue of how to punish plagiarism. There are a number of possible punishments, including fines, suspension, expulsion, and even criminal penalties. The choice of punishment should depend on the seriousness of the offense.

In conclusion, the issue of plagiarism is a complex one and requires careful consideration. We need to understand the nature of plagiarism and the role it plays in the academic community. We need to understand the different types of plagiarism and how they can be detected and prevented. We also need to understand the consequences of plagiarism and how it can be punished. By doing so, we can ensure that the academic community is maintained as a place of integrity and honesty.
Questions about plagiarism are appropriate in circumstances of proper concern with how public funding is utilized in the universities. For instance, if a student has read it, he will have assumed there are few to spewy paragraphs on what has been revealed in a fundamental theoretical and historical error - the institution of individual and institutional authorship, even in some procedures that support it. But I have done this in full awareness that the "death of the author" has become a cultural commonplace:

There is no more of such thing as the "first" literary work: all literature is interdependent. A specific of writing is that it is a contextually defined boundaries. It spills over consciousness into the works scattered around it, generating a hundred different perspectives that dwarf to a vanishing point. The work cannot be a specific thing. A determinate, an appeal to the author, for the "death of the author" is a slogan that modern criticism is now confident able to acclaim. (Eagleton 1983: 138)

With this alleged passing, a "theory of plagiarism" has emerged as an aesthetically radical and politically correct position to intellectual property. The "death" is by deliberate and publicly disclosed acts of plagiarism we amassitate ourselves from established authority, we resist commodification of our creative potential by monumental forces and, last, we see through the illusion of private property that has dissipated to exist in its control to the extent that which cannot be "owed" - language, meaning and images.

This postmodernist "theory of plagiarism" has furnished a rationale for copyright practices in "appropriation art" - and for cacumenal "diced" music techniques of "scratching" and "sampling," that is, creating a new work by appropriating and transforming others' works. Among some literary intellectuals, this theory has even been accorded primacy over copyright law.

'Originality,' the necessary and enabling concept that underlies the [legal] notion of the proprietary author, is best a problematic term in current thought, which stresses rather the various ways in which, at least in theory, one idea may be derived from another. Where does one end and another begin? What current literary thought emphasizes is that texts produce and enact such selves, and from this point of view the notion of distinct boundaries between texts, a notion crucial to the operation of the modern system of literary property, becomes difficult to sustain. (Rose 1988: 78)

The complex historical phenomenon of authorship and its related law and ethics is reduced to an issue in epistemology. Yet these same practices on the part of "plagiarism," or the "plagiarized" nature of all writing are not usually confronted with specific practical issues, such as how best to control academic plagiarism. We can not measure their response in the abstract.

Some may advocate that "publish or perish" is the approach to academic work where the "plagiarist" gets a free pass, and thus, why worry about plagiarism? So plagiarize and free yourself from the need to treat your dissertation as a "plagiarism," and begin to develop a "plagiarism." This is certainly a view that is self-serving.

But what is our objective in going to achieve a moral and ethical existence in this world here and now? For all their theoretical attraction, these highly refuted theoretical schemas have not effectively translated to revolut for those who have not been taught that regulation of plagiarism involves. In fact, such schemas tend to direct plagiarism as a professional and ethical crisis by shifting discussion to a more "professional" and "ethical" plane of existence that has no place for "plagiarism." In such cases, the "plagiarist" is "bound," that no individual author has proprietary claim on words or images. These might be interesting but they remain unreal. They are out of their depth in administrative spaces where judges, monotonous on (and demented - following a proven set of plagiarism) have routinely been made in relation not only in publishing but also to decisions on professional appointment and promotion. Nor is it clear that these activities have pertinence in the legal sphere of copyright. For all who take on the "death of the author," this is to confer on the ethical achievement still in the making not as a barrier to human freedom, this reasoning is to argue that there is no bridge from articulating a literary theory to determining on a case of professional malpractice.

It is possible to insist on the need for decent administrative measures to govern the problem of academic plagiarism while recognizing that plagiarism is always a historically variable phenomenon (Dombrowski, among others). In the age of Romantic rhetoric, Quinlivan's advice was current: "It is a universal rule of life that there may be wrongs all over the place. But what we should aim is to improve in other directions. (Quinlivan, Book X, chap. 2, 82 A). A modern commentator can observe about intertext in such cases: "The humanist doctrine of imitation, which encouraged careful siphoning of expression as whole wholes out of the best writing of antiquity, helped stock the mind with both ideas and words." (Ong 1971: Yet, to judge from the lines of Jonathan Swift, then too everyone saw copying as so unqualified.

But how is worse, who (beggarly) do their Others with truths, and in his ravenous man Famously digested, with this thing at once. As his own things: and they are his own, his, your. For if one eat another, then he is known. The meal is mine. I have eaten it (Isa. White 1565: 127). Chew it over, we might say, but then you source and give its attribution. This is her practice, this ability to create is capable of ethical justification, what is needed now is an agreed array of procedures for dealing with charges of plagiarism. An American lawyer has expressed the view that "to lose copyright in these writings would mean that academics were likely to lose one of their few remaining sources of notice and fulfillment within the academy." (Thornton 1992: 5) Perhaps so. But autonomy can mean everything and nothing. The fact that some identify with transgression and law breaking while others invoke the law as its protection leads me to think that the social conditions of autonomy - and the conduct that goes with it - remain quite obscure. In relation to plagiarism, few would equate autonomy with "being left alone" in plagiarism.

Although few academics would include within the norms of professional conduct, academic plagiarism brings insufficient shame and dishonor because the university code of professional conduct remains embryonic and pre-professional. Historical developments inside the universities have no yet "naturalized" the malpractice that is