

The case of stolen lab computer intensifies



COURTESY FUNFACTS.COM.AU

Lackluster security results in the theft of the Fine Arts' computers...again.

Nathaniel Buechler

CONTRIBUTING WRITER

I am sure that it is now common knowledge that the computers in the Fine Arts building have been stolen not just once, but twice! After reading the article from the last issue, and after reading the interview with the Police Chief, I have some understanding about what exactly happened (assuming one can understand how over 15 computers are

stolen by one person).

How exactly can something like this happen? I would assume a room that has high-valued items in it would be guarded better than it was. Maybe it wasn't thought of as high value (of course, an amount over \$20,000 is not that much). I can understand that compared to other more expensive instruments (not musical) on campus, \$20,000 really doesn't seem to be worth much. To my understanding, scientific spectrometers and

other measurement devices can range into hundreds of thousands in dollars (I am not a science major). Those rooms need to be guarded more.

Now that I am done trying to find justification for computers being stolen, I can know that I was honest in telling both sides of the story. There really isn't any reason why a computer lab should be burgled once, nevertheless twice. Security should naturally have been improved not just in that computer lab but in all computer labs. Instead, the computers were only tied to safety wires (with combination locks). That won't stop someone who is trying to take computers. That person would have premeditated the crime, and would therefore have had something to cut the wires. Let me paint a more optimistic picture than someone just trying to make a quick buck.

Is someone out there trying to tell the police they aren't doing their job correctly? I think a simple deterrent to solve a problem like this is simply put a camera monitoring the doorway (there are cameras in The Commons all over to monitor all the important things). Or how about just locking the doors when

someone isn't in the room? To me (correct me if I'm wrong), that sounds like a fantastic idea.

According to the article in last week's issue, "academic buildings are typically locked on the weekends, but because of all the activities going on, the building could have been legitimately unlocked and the thieves could have taken advantage of this opportunity." So then, it was either an inside job or what was in the room really wasn't considered to be that important (remember, this was a second time). Also in the article, it is now an "embarrassment" because it happened again. I would have been "embarrassed" the first time it happened. Interesting.

It doesn't make much sense to me. I hope it does to someone (because I want them to explain it to me). There isn't any reason why an entire lab of new computers should be stolen. Actually, I can think of one reason: stupidity. Let's just put this into perspective. Fool me once, shame on you, fool me twice, shame on me.

11/03/09

Comments can be sent to
nat9@umbc.edu