**Halloween Party**

Kristen Mullen and Deborah Gilbert read tarot cards at Sacred Circle Ministry’s Halloween party in the Daly’s Board Room on Monday, Oct. 31.

**Reminder:**

**Election Day is Tuesday, Nov. 8. Get out to your local polls and vote!**

---

**‘FCC’ Continued from page 1**

The 1994 act specifically exempted the Internet from its regulations, but the FCC has now extended CALEA compliance to include “facilities-based Internet service providers,” which includes the Internet networks at universities like Rider, K-12 schools, libraries and interconnected voice over Internet protocol (VoIP). A private network is now defined as a network that does not have the capacity to interconnect with the public Internet. Universities are seeking an exemption.

Internal networks at universities, which carry documents between servers and workstations, are not subject to CALEA compliance, but the way these internal networks are connected to the Internet is, said Mark Wigfield, pre-committee contact for the FCC Wireline Competition Bureau, in a phone interview.

“(The word) ‘facilities’ refers to the way these internal networks are connected to the Internet, which has high capacity data on it,” said Wigfield. “So that would be, in telecom jargon, like a big fat line that can carry tons of data from the whole university system to the Internet and back and forth. So, that in particular would have to be CALEA-compliant.”

Kondrach said the Rider network would be subject to the regulation.

“We’re considered by definition to be an Internet service provider because we serve our own Internet service,” she said. “We have our own firewalls and our own connection to the Internet. We have our own rules and policies about our own network, so the [FCC] views us as an Internet service provider.”

The new FCC CALEA ruling went into effect when it was published in the Federal Register. Now, the institutions will have 18 months to comply with the order, unless it is successfully challenged by lawsuits or if groups that have opposed the order reach an agreement with the Department of Justice for an exemption by the FCC.

The order has caused uproar, as many groups filed comments opposing the new regulations set forth by the FCC, and argued that CALEA does not cover Internet access.

Groups like EDUCAUSE, a nonprofit association who says its mission is to advance higher education by promoting the intelligent use of information technology, have asked for an exemption from CALEA. The group argues that “it is not in the public interest to require that every college, school and library redesign their networks just in case a lawful request for surveillance may arise in the future.”

The group also asserts, “Requiring full compliance with the proposed new rules would impose an unreasonable financial burden, increasing the costs of education and impacting innovation, with no guarantee for better security for our nation.”

The other issue that concerns organizations is the fact that innovation would be hindered. Kondrach, who said that Rider is an active member of EDUCAUSE, emphasized this point by saying that a lot of creativity occurs on the Internet.

“If we’re required to maintain these standards so that they can do this, it’s going to be a lot of overhead on our network, and some of the newer technologies won’t be able to be used because we’re going to be bound by this law,” she said. “This is just a small step toward more regulation of the Internet.”

David McGuire, director of communications for the Center for Democracy and Technology, said that it’s best for the government not to tell technologists and universities and others who are in charge of dealing with technology how to develop their products.

“A lot of technology is dependent on this lightly regulated climate in which people can sort of create these wonderful pieces of technology,” said McGuire. “Imposing this government mandate is the opposite of this design process. We think it’s really dangerous to innovation.”

According to the language in the new ruling, the FCC has not reached any conclusions in its CALEA order on whether an exemption might be warranted, and that more information is necessary before making a final decision. Currently, organizations have until Nov. 14 to file comments regarding the order, after which the FCC will begin to contemplate a decision.

Most groups have not found issues with the order regarding privacy, since the government already relies on a lot of information with a court order. The Electronic Freedom Foundation, however, says on its website that “the privacy of innocent people is likely to be violated.”

Wigfield, of the FCC, confirmed that the order has nothing to do with the USA PATRIOT Act or terrorism. Still, many groups are continuing to voice their opposition.

“We don’t disagree with the notion that the government has a right and a need, in some cases, to get wiretap information,” said McGuire. “But we just don’t think that the way to solve that problem is to force technology makers or the people who oversee technology into putting design changes into their technology, because what frightens most is that the sort of thing that will stifle the incredible growth that we’ve seen online.”

The FCC contends that all this advancement in technology since 1994 is what “presents challenges to executing authorized electronic surveillance” and requires the new standards, according to a written statement by FCC Chairman Kevin J. Martin.

Many groups say that they haven’t seen a problem that would be detrimental to law enforcement’s ability to retrieve information.

“Technology companies, Internet companies, have worked very closely with law enforcement when they’ve been given careful consideration,” said McGuire. “There’s not been a showing by the government of any sort of substance that they’re having difficulty in getting this information, which they purport to need.”

In addition, according to statistics on the EDUCAUSE website, an informal survey of 700 of its member campuses found no reports of wiretap orders being denied.

“If the government were to come to us today to ask, based on a subpoena, to do this sort of business, there are ways they could accomplish [it],” said Kondrach.

In addition to the problems the order poses for tuition costs and innovation, Kondrach said it would affect Rider and its students on a more personal level.

“I’ve got a lot of projects on my schedule for [enhancing] our ability to serve students, and if we’ve got to redirect our attention to this, then lots of those things have to slow down,” she said. “So, everybody loses as far as I’m concerned.”

---

**‘SMOKE’ Continued from page 3**

said, “There are even ashtrays in certain common rooms, although there are no-smoking signs.”

Among Rider students, about 30 percent smoke, according to a Residence Hall Association survey last year.

For the benefit of these students, Residence Life director Cindy Threatt is leading a project looking for outdoor places that could be enhanced by adding benches and receptacles. Smokers she has talked to want to improve existing benches and not be too far from the doors, especially on cold days.

Communication Professor Frederick Turner passed along a student’s idea that would go further. “They talked about this in my class,” he said. “One of the things that somebody suggested was that they should build some covered smoking areas.”

“No one prefers to smoke outside in the winter snow,” notes junior Dani Rodgers, a smoker who never smokes in her ZTA sorority house.

“The Greek houses on campus are smoke-free,” she said, “and I’m the house manager so it will look bad on my part if I decided to break the rules that I enforce.”

Cathleen Ziegler, a senior communication major, says she knows smoking cannot be completely stopped at Rider, but she doesn’t like having smoke blown in her face as she walks to class. “My whole thing is, it’s my choice not to smoke so I don’t like when I’m bombarded with nicotine.”

But because no one wants to force smokers across Route 206 onto private lawns, it’s extremely unlikely that Rider will go further and ban outdoor smoking. Barnard College in New York City barred smoking everywhere except for two patios, and results have been mixed, according to the Columbia Spectator.

“Most smokers on the Barnard campus ... approved of the new policy,” the newspaper reported “But it hasn’t stopped many from smoking in locations more comfortable than the designated areas.”

Locally, N.J. Manufacturers Insurance Co. banned smoking everywhere on its Ewing campus.

“Basically, if you smoke on campus, you’re fired,” said John Infrarya, an NJM employ- ee. “Employees are allowed 15-minute breaks. Smokers have to leave the campus and either walk across the street to smoke or go to the West Trenton train station.”

Dr. Joseph Gowaskie of the History Department said outdoor smoking should continue to be allowed. “I feel that people should be free to smoke if they want, outside, away from other people that can inhale the smoke,” he said. “You have a right to give yourself cancer if you want.”

This report was compiled by Susan Chu, Janice Dillaf, Carlos Gandules, Adam Grassino, Iliana Iusen, Jonathan Martek, Devin O’Leighoush, Jennifer Parker, Brian Paradiso, Nicole Penner, Jen Pina, Mike Rocha, Scott Shrime, Jeffrey Smith, Ellen Thompson, Barbara Walder and Patricia Wintersburg.