

# the catalyst

*(kat' ə-list) n., an agent that provokes change*

## “Nickel and Dimed”

On (not) getting by at Bucknell



The BCEJ has dedicated its efforts to the living wage campaign for two years now.

## DO YOU WANT TO SPEAK OUT?

TO ENDORSE THE PETITION, ALONGSIDE MANY SUCH AS Howard Zinn, Noam Chomsky, Ralph Nader, Ani Difranco, and over 1300 Bucknell staff, students, alumni, and faculty, simply send us an email. <ckeffer@bucknell.edu>

IF YOU WANT TO SEND INFORMATION REGARDING unfair labor practices at Bucknell, we rigorously protect anonymity. Other comments are welcome and requested; email <ckeffer@bucknell.edu>, or write us at our mailbox, B2915. For more information, meeting times, or past issues, please check us out: <<http://www.orgs.bucknell.edu/catalyst>>

**the catalyst** is a collective product of all members of BCEJ/PULSE and is published by the Catalyst Editorial Board:  
**Editors:** Cody Keffer, Jamie Rosen, Emily Park, Shannon Melligan, Cristina Behrens, Amy Wollish, Josh Fisher

**Special thanks to** Paul Susman, Geoff Schneider, Sandra Morris, Charles Sackrey, Janet Knoedler, and Tom Travis.

**PLEASE SEND US YOUR IDEAS, ILLUSTRATIONS, PHOTOGRAPHS, POETRY AND PROSE!** THAT INCLUDES YOU,  
AARON HANLON!!

## IN THIS ISSUE:

PAGE ONE: *Do we know conservation?* by Cody Keffer. *Economic justice conference galvanizes BCEJ* by Jamie Rosen and Cody Keffer.

PAGE TWO: *It's a Bad Bet for Greyhounds* by Jamie Rosen.

PAGE THREE: *Why the 'Right' Hates Americans* by Sacha List.

PAGE FOUR: *No Money, More Problems; Why we Still Need a Fair Labor Committee.*

PAGE FIVE: *Living Wage & Poverty Line - A Review.*

PAGE SIX: *Living Wage & Poverty Line - A Review (cont.).*

PAGE SEVEN: *Nickel and Dime at Bucknell.*

**NOTE:** Letters to the Editor will be printed in the next issue.

Printed on  
Recycled Paper



Please Recycle

Conservation should become a way of life for Bucknell students, staff and faculty. Resource conservation is an important global issue. Yet Americans are often criticized for thoughtless consumption. Are we, as students, enlightened about the use of campus resources at Bucknell? There are several ways the campus could do better.

For example, Bucknell students print *everything*. Whether we use the printers in the computer labs on campus, or take the printer paper to our rooms and use personal printers, the wasteful practice of making a personal printout is widespread. We are all guilty of it. What happened to pre-technology study habits like attending class? Taking notes? Today's students are served up faculty outlines and website summaries, internet articles and PowerPoint presentations. Whether or not students learn as well by relying on pre-printed information may be a question worth exploring for its own merit. Few would dispute, however, the wasted paper associated with the volumes of information currently available at the tap of a keyboard "print" command. With one simple step, though, dramatic change is possible. Instead of printing every page of a Power Point presentation, click on the "handouts" option when printing; then choose to print "six slides per page." The result? Each printing of that document will consume 4 pages instead of 24 pages.

Some campus traditions are, unfortunately, built on wasteful practices. For example, fraternities send out invitations to registered parties through campus mail. It is a luxury that should be re-examined, in light of the paper that could be saved, and greater speed, ease and reliability of electronic mail. Why not send out an email to each invitee? Once at the party, how about recycling all those empty bottles and cans?

The campus seems to place undue reliance on energy consumption; buildings and grounds remain lighted at all

hours, day and night. While keeping a college campus well lit is a necessary safety precaution, the choice could be made to equip certain fixtures with sensors or with the lowest-energy consuming light bulbs available. In residence halls, students ought to pay for excessive consumption as an incentive to turn off the lights when the rooms are not occupied, and turn off the television when nobody is viewing it.

The final point should be about people as resources, about opportunity, health and future generations. The "conservation of resources" is one facet of insuring a future. The wise use of resources conserved is a corollary. Bucknell students pay hefty tuition for unique opportunities and a valuable education. However, students ought to know and take responsibility for the wise use of resources. President Rogers has indicated that Bucknell University cannot immediately afford to pay its lowest wage workers a living wage. But if Bucknell students committed to conserving campus resources, savings could help fund the living wage. Assuring Bucknell staff a living wage — the wherewithal to raise their children in a healthy, safe learning environment — is an essential use of campus resources. Lighting, paper and other concerns involve trade-offs. Bucknell students enjoy the rich educational opportunity provided at the University because their families effectively conserved their resources and made their children a priority. Students ought to insist on priority treatment for the staff families as a conservation measure — to preserve and nurture the human resources that sustain the campus.

► Cody Keffer

## *Economic justice conference galvanizes B.C.E.J. 'More fun than a barrel of monkeys,' conference attendees claim*



January 31<sup>st</sup> to February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2003, three members of the BCEJ attended the fifth annual conference of United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) in Los Angeles, California.

The conference brought together student activists for economic justice from across the nation. BCEJ representatives discovered that our living wage campaign, unlike the most successful ones represented in L.A., lacks two key factors: worker involvement and union support.

While at the conference we listened to passionate speakers and organizers, participated in workshops and strategy sessions, and marched among hundreds of students chanting, "What's outrageous? Sweatshop wages! What's disgusting? Union busting!"

Conference forums covered more economic issues: campus efforts to eliminate sweatshop labor, and ways to encourage the farm worker movement and immigrant rights.

Because people of color and women are disproportionately represented among low-wage workers, discussion about gender and race is profoundly embedded in the struggle for economic justice.

USAS, a major force behind economic justice struggles that are sweeping across college campuses

nationally, urges college campuses to affiliate with the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC).

The WRC has developed a code of conduct for factories that produce school apparel, and requires full disclosure of the factories that the university buys from to rectify workers' rights violations, enforce the school's code of conduct, and improve conditions at the factories. As of January 2003, 112 schools were affiliated with the WRC. In our view, Bucknell University should be next.

BCEJ is energized to have linked with a national network of student activists and we wanted to express our thanks to all those who supported our participation in this educational and inspirational experience.

► Jamie Rosen  
& Cody Keffer

*If you are interested in learning more about the conference or you wish to offer your financial support, please contact either Cody Keffer at [Ckeffer@bucknell.edu](mailto:Ckeffer@bucknell.edu), Jamie Rosen at [JRosen@bucknell.edu](mailto:JRosen@bucknell.edu), or Larissa Brown at [Lbrown@bucknell.edu](mailto:Lbrown@bucknell.edu).*

Imagine that you have been a loyal employee of a company for your

entire life. As you begin to age, even though you're working at your maximum pace, the speed with which you work decreases. One day after work, your boss brings you outside and, without warning, shoots you. This frightening scenario is hardly conceivable, when thinking about a human being's life. However, this episode fits the fate of a greyhound to a tee. The killing will never cease unless the public realizes that this business of greyhound racing is one that fosters and perpetuates cruelty.

The greyhound breed existed more than 4,000 years ago. Their importance in ancient time is illustrated by the fact that the birth of a greyhound ranked second in importance only to the birth of a son. Due to their speed and natural hunting instincts, the popularity of greyhounds rose in the 1800's. Friendly neighborhood competitions between the dogs were the forerunners of today's greyhound racing industry.

Unfortunately, these friendly competitions turned into the abuse and neglect that are greyhound racing today. After greyhound puppies are bred on large dog farms, they are sent to training farms throughout the country where they are kept in stacked crates for eighteen to twenty-two hours a day. Bedding, for their crates, is shredded newspaper and thin carpet remnants. Many tracks continue to use wooden crates despite the fact that they're prone to fire and difficult to clean. The wood can become saturated with urine, making sanitary conditions virtually unlivable. In most kennels, greyhounds are heavily infested with fleas and ticks. Due to the apathy of some trainers, greyhounds are kept muzzled even when in their crate, and receive scarce, if any, veterinary care when sick or injured. The usual greyhound diet consists of raw 4-D meat, which is composed of meat taken from animals that are dead, dying, diseased, or disabled at the time of slaughter. Susceptible to contamination, this diet can easily cause the dogs to become ill. In order to make it

## *It's a bad bet—for greyhounds!*

possible for the greyhounds to run quicker, they are kept at starvation level.

Not only are the dogs' living conditions horrendous, their treatment while racing is also deplorable. Risk of injury on the track is intense and inevitable. With the greyhounds' massive muscular structure, they struggle to support their weight on very thin legs. Injuries are common on tracks with a poorly constructed first turn or racing surface. After racing, many dogs suffer from broken or missing toes, strained or separated muscles, shattered hocks, and broken ankles. Damage and even death are caused by the greyhounds' lack of daily exercise.

For most greyhounds, the running during the race is the sole component of the amount of exercise they receive. Although racing a greyhound every other day is almost the standard, the dogs are only meant to race once every four days, to allow time for recuperation. Despite extreme temperatures, greyhounds are forced to run in virtually all weather conditions. One documented incident of this occurred in Arizona, where, in a three-week period, five dogs perished due to heat stroke after being forced to run in 106 degree temperature. Unfortunately, the public is not aware of the abusive racing conditions because the kennels are fully guarded to avoid the fixing of races. This provides a convenient cover-up for dangerous racing conditions and treatment.

Greyhounds are not the only animals that are abused in the racing industry. Approximately 100,000 domestic rabbits and wild jackrabbits are maimed and killed each year in the process of training greyhounds to race. Since trainers believe that dogs will run faster when trained on live animals, live lures are used. Often the legs of the rabbits are broken by the trainers because it is thought that greyhounds respond with more energy to loud squeals. For economical purposes, the same rabbit can be used to train twenty different dogs, ensuring that the rabbit will die a slow and painful death. Rabbits are

discarded while still alive, suffering in agony while their death awaits them.

But this is not even the worst of it. The most gruesome aspect of greyhound racing is the ultimate fate of the dogs. By the age of three or four, a greyhound is of little use to the racing industry, due to the advantage of the younger dogs' speed and agility. Options after retirement are limited. Although some are used for breeding, and others are adopted or used for research, approximately 28,000 greyhounds are killed each year in the United States. In order to avoid euthanasia fees, owners often use a cheaper means of disposal, such as shooting the dog in the head, bludgeoning, electrocuting, and cutting off tattooed ears and abandoning the dogs far from the track. 45 dead greyhounds outside a farm near St. Louis, and 143 found in Arizona, are only a few of the many reported mass killings.

The racing industry would like the public to believe that greyhound racing is a fun and harmless sport. However, it is not harmless when 20,000 to 30,000 young dogs are killed each year. Claiming that the abuses of racing greyhounds are isolated and rare is also a lie. Since 1990 there have been more than 51 documented cases including shootings, abandonments, starvations, electrocutions, and medical experimentations. This collection of lies from the racing industry is a cover-up to keep greyhound racing alive. If the truth about greyhound abuse were known, their profits would drastically decline. The extinction of greyhound racing would lead to the extinction of the bizarre and inhumane ritual of demolishing thousands of greyhounds every year in the name of entertainment. Of the 22 states where greyhound racing has been known to occur, it has already been banned in six of these states. Now is the time to end this practice in the remaining sixteen states where it is still permitted. Stop the abuse and cruelty and end greyhound racing immediately.

► *Jamie Rosen*

*Last semester came to a close and left a sour taste in our collective mouths. Debra Norville (a tabloid journalist from Inside Edition) was elected commencement speaker for the class of 2003. And the commencement speaker from 2002, former trustee, Bucknell alumnus, and owner of Home De(s)pot, Ken Langone, was charged with securities fraud for unethical trading of IPOs. So, we at the Catalyst decided to write a series of haikus inspired by those events. Enjoy!*



*this figurehead makes  
eight figures with her figure  
I won't -- go figure*

*first Langone intones  
then Deb's inane edition  
next Anna Nicole?*

*our corporate crook  
when did commencement become  
'don't turn out like him'*

*sugar-dad Kenny  
left L-burg a c-student  
back for 5 to 10?*

Inspired by Daniel Flynn, author of *Why the Left Hates America*,  
The Catalyst is proud to present...

# Why the 'Right' Hates Americans

*Another unilateral conduit of liberal propaganda by one of our own*

Last year the Bucknell University Conservatives Club (BUCC) sponsored a right-wing talk by Daniel Flynn entitled "Why the left hates America." Sorry to burst their bubble, but it's not "America" that people on the left hate. In fact, with all of the name calling and nastiness coming out of the right today, both on campus and in the media, it sure seems like the right is the group doing a good portion of the hating. So it would be more appropriate to ask, as long as we're playing these games, "Why does the RIGHT hate AMERICANS?"

Just for the record, here are some things many real Americans (who love America) believe, even if it doesn't conform to the conservative idea of what Pro-Americanism is:

- Slavery was wrong, and the fact that the US participated in it and benefited economically from it should be acknowledged. Maybe, just maybe, we should do something to correct the consequences – that are still with us – of this horrible injustice.
- Most Americans don't automatically agree with everything President Bush says, and they realize that there is frequently more ambiguity in the world than "good" and "evil."
- Many, perhaps most, Americans do tend to agree that Bush is...well...not the brightest bulb...not the shiniest coin in the fountain, not the sharpest tool in the shed...
- Americans often use that pesky right to freedom of speech to criticize war, inequality, and corporate misdeeds. People who oppose war, inequality and corporate greed are, it turns out, American. They like most of America, just not these things.
- Americans aren't all white, straight, Christian and rich. Although people on the right seem to think they should be, they just aren't. You can't change that.
- Most Americans don't really agree with any major right-wing initiatives – tax cuts for the rich, lawsuit restrictions that would make it impossible for poor people to sue for legitimate injuries, allowing the movement of jobs and corporate headquarters overseas to increase corporate profits, allowing corporations to ruin the environment and plunder public resources, to name a few.

So if the right doesn't like the people who bring these things up, then they don't really like most Americans. And if these things make the right uncomfortable, that's probably because it indicates how out of step they are with the views of many Americans. Calling Bush's critics un-American and unpatriotic doesn't change that fact. It's just more right-wing name-calling.

► *Sacha List*

## CATALYST INFOGRAPHIC:

*Conservative Hypocrisy versus the Bucknell University Conservatives Club*

### BUCC Stance Number One:

Free Speech for hate groups and for BUCC to criticize everyone, even in an obnoxious, hateful fashion.

No affirmative action for minorities. Everyone should get "equal" treatment in admissions.

We support US foreign policy. Operation "Iraqi Freedom" is about freeing the Iraqi people from an oppressive dictator.

### BUCC Stance Number Two:

Peaceful war protestors and liberal speakers are un-American and should stop criticizing the president.

Except for legacies, athletes, and other groups we like. We won't complain about their special treatment.

Never mind that our president is supporting (and arming) oppressive dictators in Saudi Arabia, Burma, Kuwait, and Equatorial Guinea, among others.

### Sacha List's Comments:

Free speech is OK only as long as you support the president. How are we supposed to think this is *not* fascism?

So, you really want us to believe you're not a bunch of racist elitists? How about some consistency here?

Why aren't you protesting Bush administration stances in these countries if you care so much about the oppressed of the world? Show us you're more than vacuous cheerleaders for a dopey president!

# No Money, More Problems

As Bucknellians, we ought to care about the conditions of the workers whose job it is to make our lives more comfortable, convenient, and easy. Yet our campus community has shown little support for the campaign to get workers the living wage they deserve. Last year, the University chose to spend an exorbitant amount of money to create and distribute a survey to the support staff on campus. The purpose of this survey was to provide an anonymous way for employees to evaluate their working conditions. The administration planned on publishing the results of the survey. Apparently the results of this survey were telling (ALTHOUGH we can't know for sure) — they were never released.

Details of the pay and working conditions for service employees at Bucknell are cause for *serious, immediate* concern. Bucknell service employees do not earn enough money working at Bucknell to support a family; the starting salary is about \$7.55 an hour. This is not only far below the calculated living wage for living in the area, but it takes years for an individual's salary to reach \$9 (the living wage floor mandated for immediate implementation by the faculty last year). In addition, it seems that the process (or lack thereof) for determining how much of a raise each person receives is relatively arbitrary and potentially biased. Some individuals have received a raise as low as 6 cents at the same time as some of their peers received 24 cents. If there is logic behind this discrepancy, it has not been shared with the staff members. This fact and others like it lead us to question the system's justice, especially when the administration refuses to release survey data it had promised to disclose.

Working conditions are less than satisfactory for both Dining Service employees and the Custodial staff and, according to Catalyst Collective surveys from years past, in other employment areas across campus. Workers in Dining Services generally receive very few breaks during their day, are sometimes required to work through their breaks, and are very limited in terms of the amount of food they can consume at no cost while they are at work — a supposed "benefit" to supplement their below-life-sustaining wages.

Workers are also expected to follow a strict code of conduct which contains many excessive requirements. For example, individuals who work at the Bison are not supposed to sit down while working, even if there are no customers. It would be interesting for us to apply that rule to professors, and, even more, to administrators. In addition, in recent years the Custodial staff has been forced to expand their duties. There used to be an outdoor crew to shovel snow, rake leaves, etc., for example, but now such duties fall upon the custodial staff who receive no increase in wages for their expanded obligations. Staff members are being unrealistically asked to do many more and more varied jobs and the guidelines of their duties are being redefined on a weekly basis.

Considering the working conditions and pay, you might wonder why people would choose to work at Bucknell. The greatest incentive for working at this University is the tuition benefits for workers and their children. However, not all staff workers need additional education (or have time to get it, given that they often have to work two jobs or overtime to survive), nor do all of them have children.

Currently, the administration is spending time and money on another survey, but will we ever see the results? Furthermore, think how many workers would benefit if the money spent on surveys is used instead to hike wages rather than promote false hopes. We argue that one of the only things worse than not conducting a survey is to conduct one, then sweep the results under the rug as if they were meaningless.

We Bucknellians must act, strongly and now. We must take a stand for justice, here at home, however we can. There is no question that implementing a living wage and improving working conditions will cost money. The question is whether this elite and privileged institution values the lives of the people who work to give it the reputation it has. By reallocating small amounts of money across the board, we could make life-altering and sometimes even life-saving difference in the lives of our lowest-paid staff. If you've made it this far in the article, maybe you don't want to remain stagnant. Maybe you want to help convince the administration that there is an imminent need to establish a living wage on the Bucknell campus.

**HERE AND NOW. JUSTICE.**

---

## Why Bucknell Still Needs a Fair Labor Committee

### The Ombudsman Program is a Sham

For the last several years we have been cataloging problems with working conditions at Bucknell. Our response to the lengthy list of problems identified by staff members was that Bucknell should implement a Fair Labor Committee, which would give staff members a fair, impartial hearing about problems in the work place and that would preserve their anonymity.

The university's response was a Staff Climate Survey and the implementation of an Ombudsman program. Unfortunately, our investigations have discovered that both of these efforts turned out to be cosmetic in nature and did not improve the working climate at Bucknell. Despite reports from numerous staff members that they cataloged serious problems in the staff climate at Bucknell during the survey, the Staff Climate Survey Report was whitewashed and no serious effort was made to improve working conditions as a result of the data gathered. Faculty members were not given access to the Survey results, and staff members have seen no progress in the areas they mentioned. Similarly, the Ombudsman program was designed to give staff someone other than their supervisor to go to if they had a problem.

Yet, according to the staff we spoke with, the Ombudsman program has been a dismal failure and staff members continue to have no safe, fair system to air their grievances.

The problem, according to staff members, is that supervisors and department heads are on the committee that hears grievances through the Ombudsman program. Thus workers have no anonymity in the system, and they fear that their complaints will get back to their immediate supervisor, who is responsible for writing up evaluations. As one staff member put it, "Everyone's afraid to say anything because of who's on the committee." Another staff member said, "We don't complain because things always get back to Personnel, and it could get you fired." This climate of fear seems to be a product of the belief that supervisors penalize staff members who speak out. Indeed, most staff members we spoke with believed that raises are determined arbitrarily and depended more on who you know and how much you suck up to your supervisor than your overall job performance. At minimum, the university needs to clarify how raises are determined and construct a fair, above-board system for staff members to air grievances.

# Living Wage & the Poverty Line - A Review

In November 2002, the university faculty voted to recommend to the President “the immediate implementation of a wage floor of at least \$9 per hour (annually adjusted for inflation) for all Bucknell staff (including dining services).” If health care benefits are not provided, then an additional \$1 per hour should be paid. Benefits are essential, but cannot be counted as part of the take home wage. If these non-cash benefits are excluded, then the take-home wage ought to be higher. After all, you can’t eat a health care benefit or, at Bucknell, a tuition benefit, no matter how important these may be.

The principle of a living wage, drawn from the 2001 Pennsylvania Self-Sufficiency study by PathWays,PA, Inc., is that the wage should be sufficient for the household to live without need of public or private charity. It takes into account both the costs of basic needs such as food, rent, and clothing, and also locally applicable taxes and tax credits. (See <http://www.womensassoc.org/programs/standardlist.htm>.)

Although we calculated that a wage of \$10.54 per hour for each working adult in a household was needed (see Table 2 on the next page), the living wage motion voted on by the faculty used a compromise lower figure of \$9 per hour .

Still, \$9 is better than the starting figure of \$7.55 for many Bucknell employees.

What does \$9 per hour mean? It means that more Bucknell workers (including the sub-contracted dining service workers) would be able to escape poverty level wages.

How is the poverty line calculated? In the United States, the poverty line is defined simply as 3 times the estimated cost of food to a low-income household (adjusted annually for inflation). That is based on the early 1960s pattern of food taking about 33% of a low-income household’s budget or \$1 out of every \$3 spent.

But, since the 1960s, the relative cost of food has dropped to only about 16% of a low-income household’s budget, while other costs such as housing take up a greater share of the budget. That is, food takes only \$1 out of about every \$6.25 spent. If we use this newer figure provided by the government, then we would multiply the share of food costs in the low-income household budget by 6.25 to calculate a meaningful poverty line today.

Table 1 below shows the US Health and Human Services Department poverty thresholds for different size families, based on

food taking 1/3 of the budget (columns a & b). Column c shows what the actual poverty threshold would be if the figures reflected the 16% share of food in the low income family budget.

The resulting figures conform to the overwhelming view of poverty experts that a meaningful poverty line, given real costs of living and available benefits, should be roughly twice the official threshold.

Now to turn to a \$9 per hour wage. If a person earns \$9 per hour and works 2080 hours [40 hours for 52 weeks per year (which is more hours than most workers average)], that person would earn \$18,720. As column c above suggests, that is enough to put a single person \$20 above the poverty line.

But, it is below the amount necessary to bring the worker and one additional person (for example, a child) above the poverty line.

Because of inflation last year, the poverty threshold this year is higher. Thus every delay in enacting the \$9 wage floor at Bucknell places our lowest paid workers closer to poverty.

*What would a living wage really be closer to?*

Using cost of living figures for each county from 2002 and including taxes [state sales and payroll taxes (Social Security), federal & state income taxes, Child Care Tax Credits, and the Earned Income Tax Credit], and when we consider the cost of living in the counties where Bucknell staff employees live, the living wage comes to \$10.54 per hour for each adult in the household. This assumes that each adult is working full time.

*Are we getting closer to even \$9 per hour?*

Since the faculty recommended the \$9 wage floor what has happened? As far as we can tell, very little. The President appointed an ad hoc committee to consider the issue further. The ad hoc committee excluded from its wage deliberations sub-contracted dining service workers along with part-time casual workers, even though these workers were explicitly

*Table 1. 2003 HHS Poverty Thresholds*

(a) Size of Family Unit	(b) 48 Contiguous States and D.C.	(c) Food Expenditure x 6.25
1	\$ 8,980	\$18,708
2	12,120	\$25,250
3	15,260	\$31,792
4	18,400	\$38,333
5	21,540	\$44,875
6	24,680	\$51,417
7	27,820	\$57,958
8	30,960	\$64,500

SOURCE: Federal Register, Vol. 68, No. 26, February 7, 2003, pp. 6456-6458.

# A Living Wage in This Area

	<b>1 Adult + 1 pre-schooler</b>	<b>2 Adults + 1 infant</b>	<b>AVE.</b>
<b>Union County</b> (60% BU staff employees)	12.78	9.68	11.23
<b>Northumberland</b> (34% BU staff employees)	10.31	8.66	9.49
<b>Snyder</b> (6% Bucknell staff employees)	10.37	8.80	9.59
<b>Weighted Average Value</b>	11.80	9.28	<b>10.54</b> per Adult

discussed during the motion on the floor at the faculty in the fall of 2002.

The President has not yet reported progress on the living wage issue to the faculty. Some members of the administration have talked in terms of including the value of non-cash benefits as if they are actual cash wages received by the employees. While benefits are vital and should not be reduced, the reason for a wage floor is to ensure that Bucknell workers have a fighting chance of escaping poverty. As we noted above, you cannot eat or pay rent with non-cash benefits. Simply stating that a wage of \$7.55 is actually worth a lot more may only fool those not living on it.

*Where should we be heading?*

Of course, hard economic times for the university may mean fewer dollars are available to achieve many goals. We should be openly discussing our priorities as a university and consider the trade-offs of one goal against another.

We should not try to fool ourselves by saying we cannot influence the wages sub-contracted employees receive or that employees receiving benefits receive enough. We can insist upon standards for people who work at our institution, just as we can decide not to purchase items made with child or slave labor elsewhere. Bucknell's mission statement refers to civility, compassion, and a sense of justice. It is time we open our eyes and embrace this mission.

**Write for the Catalyst! The Catalyst Collective meets Thursdays at noon and publishes articles on a wide range of issues. Contact [ckeffer@bucknell.edu](mailto:ckeffer@bucknell.edu).**

## **Vote for your favorite Bush/Cheney 2004 Election Slogan:**

- \*Four More Wars!
- \*Assimilate. Resistance is Futile.
- \*BU\_\_SH\_\_!
- \*Because the Truth Just Isn't Good Enough.
- \*Compassionate Colonialism
- \*Leave No Billionaire Behind
- \*Putting the *con* in Conservatism
- \*Thanks for not Paying Attention
- \*The Last Vote You'll Ever Have to Cast
- \*This Time, Elect Us!
- \*We're Gooder!
- \*Bush/Cheney, Asses of Evil
- \*Don't Think. Vote Bush!
- \*George W. Bush: It Takes a Village Idiot
- \*Vote for Bush & You Get Dick!

## Nickel and Dimed at Bucknell: other indignities our staff members are subjected to

- Overtime pay cuts for staff members who work special events. Previously, staff members used to get time and a half for working overtime at special events assisting public safety. This year workers' overtime hourly pay has been cut to \$8 per hour (with time and a half resulting in a \$12 per hour wage rate), regardless of whether or not their normal pay rate is above \$8 an hour. Many workers depend on overtime to make ends meet because they are paid so poorly at Bucknell. These cuts place additional burdens on staff member and their families.
- Dining service workers have to work weekends without getting time and a half. While other workers at Bucknell are compensated for this time they must be away from their families, dining service workers have the double indignity of being among the lowest paid workers on campus and of being denied overtime pay for weekend work. Simply defining weekends as part of a normal schedule doesn't change the fact that this is an onerous burden for anyone with a family.
- Low pay. Bucknell staff members continue to be paid less than a living wage. Custodians start at \$7.55 an hour and food service workers even less. No wonder so many workers need overtime to survive.
- An increasing work load. At the same time pay remains below a living wage for many Bucknell staff members, they are being asked to work harder and harder. The number of people maintaining each building has been reduced in many buildings by over 50%, and new responsibilities outside buildings have been added.

It's time that Bucknell took serious efforts to address the poor conditions that staff members labor under. We need a **living wage**, a **fair labor committee**, and a **workplace free of fear and hostility**.

## Hail FOXNews!!

*Despite criticism, The Catalyst maintains that FOX "News" is not news at all*



NEWS CORPORATION LTD. / FOX NETWORKS (RUPERT MURDOCH)

Television Holdings:

- Fox Television: includes 22 stations, 50% of US households.
- Fox International: extensive worldwide cable and satellite networks include British Sky Broadcasting (40%); VOX, Germany (49.9%); Canal Fox, Latin America; FOXTEL, Australia (50%); STAR TV, Asia; IskyB, India; Bahasa Programming Ltd., Indonesia (50%); and News Broadcasting, Japan (80%).
- The Golf Channel (33%).

MEDIA HOLDINGS:

- Twentieth Century Fox, Fox Searchlight.
- 132 newspapers (113 in Australia alone) including the New York Post, the London Times and The Australian.
- 25 magazines including TV Guide and The Weekly Standard.
- HarperCollins books.

OTHER HOLDINGS:

- Sports: LA Dodgers, LA Kings, LA Lakers, National Rugby League.
- Ansett Australia airlines, Ansett New Zealand airlines.
- Rupert Murdoch: Board of Directors, Philip Morris (USA).

YOU WRITE WHAT  
YOU'RE TOLD!



THANKS, CORPORATE NEWS!  
We Couldn't Control The People Without You

Did you know?...

In October Rupert Murdoch's Fox News Channel threatened to sue the makers of "The Simpsons" over a parody of the channel's right-wing political stance.

Fox took exception over a Simpsons' version of the Fox News rolling news ticker which parodied the channel's anti-Democrat stance, with headlines like "Do Democrats Cause Cancer?"

Other satirical Fox news bulletins featured in the show included: "Study: 92 per cent of Democrats are gay... JFK posthumously joins Republican Party... Oil slicks found to keep seals young, supple..."

Yet the lawsuit never materialized because they finally realized that they were the same company.

"Now Fox has a new rule that we can't do those little fake news crawls on the bottom of the screen in a cartoon," Groening said, "because it might confuse the viewers into thinking it's real news." Fox has denied these allegations, but the Associated Press maintains that it is true.