

Fall 11-1-2018

Sustainability and Carbon Neutrality

Jennifer Thomson

Bucknell University, jct021@bucknell.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/bucknell-occupied>

Part of the [Environmental Studies Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thomson, Jennifer, "Sustainability and Carbon Neutrality" (2018). *Bucknell: Occupied*. 17.
<https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/bucknell-occupied/17>

This Interview is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Broadcasts at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bucknell: Occupied by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dcadmin@bucknell.edu.

Bucknell: Occupied
Copyright 2018, WVBU Bucknell
Jennifer Thomson, interviewer (JT)
Amanda Wooden, interviewee (AW)
Anonymous, interviewee (Anon)

2018-11-01 00:56:11

[NB: The first thirty minutes is a call-in interview with Amanda Wooden. The audio quality is extremely poor, attempts to reduce noise and amplify the recording were not successful.]

JT: Good evening and welcome to Bucknell: Occupied here on 90.5 WVBU. Lewisburg. Thanks for tuning in tonight. Tonight we are having a conversation about all things sustainability here on the Bucknell campus. We'll be talking about the IPCC report which was recently released. We'll also be talking about sustainability historically here on campus as well as present-day issues. In the studio, I will be joined remotely by a favorite guest of this program--Amanda Wooden. Who should be calling in and joining us momentarily [RING] Again, calling us right here, our resident expert. Welcome to the program, are you there Amanda?

AW: [POOR AUDIO QUALITY] Yes, I'm here [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Thanks for joining us. I appreciate you taking time out of your schedule to be with us remotely here in studio.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: So Amanda when I gave the introduction to this particular program, I was talking about how in fact you've been a favorite guest of this program. I think you been on three or four times talking about sustainability and environmental issues both here on the Bucknell campus and then more globally. So today we're gonna talk about sustainability here at Bucknell, but putting it in this new and more anxiety provoking context of the recently released IPCC report on climate change. So I'm wondering if we can start our conversation there, and if I can ask you to give our listeners a bit of a recap of that report and the stakes that it laid out, right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE, Amanda discusses the recently released IPCC report and the warning about extreme weather events. May possibly be heard at top volume or with file manipulation.]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: So just even putting this in the framework of the United States, how likely is it that the United States is going to be able to meet the kind of cuts necessary to limit warming to 1.5°?

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: [LAUGHS] Right

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: And...

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm. And I mean, one of the things that the IPCC report really brought out in addition to all of the information you're sharing with us is just how erratic these changes actually are, right. It's not as though there's some such thing as linear climate change, which will seem to think at one point right. It's the increase in completely random and seemingly unpredictable events right?

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: No you didn't. You did answer my question. What I was trying to do was sketch out how extreme this present and future reality is likely to be.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Yeah.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Yeah.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Wow.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Yeah.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right. So I mean, I like how you said that Amanda because it really is a good way to transition into one of the more local context for this conversation, which is the campus of Bucknell University. So you had quite a bit of experience here, both as a professor, but also as a real advocate for environmental change on campus. So I'm wondering, can you talk to people who might be more recent to the campus or more recent to the show about Bucknell's particular commitments, both historically and in the present to sustainability?

AW: [INAUDIBLE, Amanda provides a brief chronology of sustainability related events on the Bucknell campus for the past decade. May possibly be heard at top volume or with file manipulation. Topics mentioned -- building, divestment, carbon neutrality, reductions, teaching students, "sustainability working group," University climate commitment, construction, petition, fossil fuels.]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: OK.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: OK.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: [LAUGHS] No that's fine, I'll just interject briefly in case anybody is tuned in over the last 20 minutes. We're talking here on Bucknell: Occupied with Amanda Wooden about both the IPCC climate report as well as sustainability issues and climate commitments here at the University. You're tuned into 90.5 WVBU Lewisburg. So yeah, take us back to 2012, please.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: No, it was not.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right and how did that go?

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Aaah.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: So you're saying that... you're saying that all of these changes don't necessarily require the kind of gigantic financial commitment that administrators sometimes speak of?

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Hmm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: So Amanda, I know you you've got some limited time so I don't wanted take up too much of your time, but I'm wondering if you could just talk to us just for a few minutes on your thoughts about the relationship between the institution's priorities and its responsiveness to faculty, staff and student input and dissent?

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Yeah.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Right.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: MmHm.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Yeah.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: All right, well, Amanda, I want to thank you very much for coming on the show. I have a second guest joining me tonight who's going to be able to dissect the sustainability forum that happened yesterday in quite a bit of detail, but I really appreciate you spending this half-hour with us.

AW: [INAUDIBLE]

JT: Okay take care, bye.

[INTERLUDE]

JT: Welcome back. You are tuned into Bucknell: Occupied here on 90.5 WVBU Lewisburg tonight is our sustainability conversation. Those of you who have been with us since the start of the show, you heard Amanda Wooden on talking about the recent IPCC report and the real necessity for Bucknell and all institutions to shift course rapidly and immediately. For the second half of the hour, I am joined in the studio by an awesome guest who is here to talk to us very specifically about yesterday's sustainability forum as well as thoughts on our campus's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030. So welcome to the studio.

Anon: Thank you.

JT: So first I know you were at the sustainability forum. I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about the capacity in which you were there and then and then take listeners through some of the things that you noticed.

Anon: Yeah, so I think just to start out, I want to quickly follow up on what Amanda was saying and to say that to call it an actual forum is a bit disingenuous.

JT: Hmm.

Anon: I think presentation will be a more appropriate word for what actually happened. But it's... yeah... so maybe I can tell you a little bit about... so I was there amongst sort of a whole bunch of other people who were also there holding up a few signs, which essentially were just asking simple questions of the process. Which should have been asked early on and apparently were not or are not or that there's no space for that. But essentially an audience member observing the proceedings right from the beginning almost until the end.

JT: Now you mentioned these signs that people were holding what did these signs say?

Anon: So there were about ten or twelve of these signs. Most of them said things like "Divest Now," "Zero Carbon Bucknell Now," there was something about rebuilding, something about new construction not being sustainable, and so on and so forth.

JT: Hmm.

Anon: And they were scattered about the room to an extent.

JT: OK.

Anon: So, so going back again to this idea that this wasn't a forum, I think... I just... the email that was sent out about this, I think the language in that is worth paying close attention to, because it actually makes clear that this was not a forum. It says stuff like "come to learn more about you know what Bucknell is doing for sustainability." It specifically does not use words like contribute. It then says "Come to learn how to provide feedback." It does not actually say "Come to provide feedback."

JT: MmHm. MmHm.

Anon: So I think it's kind of interesting and almost a little surreal that the language is so meta that they're talking about the thing that they're talking about on some level. But there was a fairly large audience, and I think that it was large enough that they had to actually move rooms to the Forum in the LC. There was a very short, quick nod made to the fact that there were signs in the room, but then the presentation proceeded just as planned.

JT: MmHm. You know you talked about the invitation, inviting people to come and learn what what was it that audience members were taught?

Anon: So I think largely it was about Bucknell's quote unquote sustainability efforts in the past.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: And a sense of what might be coming looking ahead. So the email, of course, said they would present a plan for sustainability, but again, I don't think there was actually a plan presented in that there were no specifics, there were no deadlines mentioned, there were no quantitative aspects mentioned at

all. So to give you an example of some of the things that were mentioned -- there were things about having added new signage to recycling bins on campus and that evidently was one of the last year projects that was for some reason in collaboration with the power... a private power company in Pennsylvania, which I found a little astonishing. There were words mentioned on achieving many of the 200 goals on sustainability. I actually did some extensive looking around, but I could not find these 200 goals were.

JT: Hmm.

Anon: So it's hard to actually say whether these were substantial goals, were they really tiny little things like, you know, getting rid of plastic straws or something like that. And how these were counted and so on. Again there was something mentioned on composting, carbon neutrality, so, so all the words were there, so I think if you just sort of paid cursory attention you might come out with the impression that there's a lot going on,

JT: MmHm.

Anon: But if you actually looked for details there was really nothing.

JT: So when Amanda was on before giving kind of a historical narrative about what's happened campus, she focused on two major issues. One being new buildings here on campus and the second issue being that of our investment portfolio. So I'm wondering to what extent did those two issues come up, in yesterday's presentation?

Anon: I think the investment portfolio didn't really come up and if it did it came up in the sense that, you know, we have limited resources, especially when someone brought up the question of solar power on campus. I think the largest argument was that it is still too expensive to bring on board, and I can say a little bit about that in a second. I actually caught some numbers about that...

JT: Sure.

Anon: Buildings they were largely presented as a given. That indeed there are these buildings, now lets talk about the sustainability features of these buildings.

JT: MmHm. MmHm.

Anon: Again as Amanda was saying, these are LEED certified. LEED itself has come under a lot of criticism even from rather mainstream and technocratic media like New York Times and NPR. And so you can imagine that this is actually not something that is a particularly effective way of going about the primary goal of reducing carbon footprint. To give you a simple example, I have a little table in front of me.

JT: OK.

Anon: Of the kind of things that most people use to get LEED credits, and how the LEED user guide actually describes those credits. So it's something like "Hire a LEED accredited professional." So 99.7% of people use this to get a LEED point, right. And LEED user guide describes it as "you can easily earn this point," right? So then it says something like "Reduce water use by 20%" and the guide says it's very doable, right. And if you look at the other end of the spectrum which are things that people really don't

do at all, it's things like "Boost energy performance by 42%" which only 10% of LEED buildings actually do.

JT: Hmm.

Anon: Things like "Reuse existing building elements," which only 5% do and the LEED guide description of this is "can be labor intensive." So there is very clear delineation in the guide of what you should do to get those credits,

JT: MmHm.

Anon: And what you shouldn't do. And interesting enough, you would expect that the primary goal is to reduce energy consumption. And that's something that is very, very low on people actually getting LEED certified buildings built. So that kind of puts in perspective how LEED actually works. I think it's a very publicity-oriented,

JT: Hmm.

Anon: Market-oriented solution, that doesn't necessarily address the basic issue of reducing carbon footprint. Yeah. So, right, about solar panels. I just found out that in 2011, Rutgers -- decidedly a very different institution from us -- installed 32 acres of solar paneling on one of their campuses to provide almost 10 megawatts. This is almost twice Bucknell's average power consumption during a year.

JT: Oh wow.

Anon: And it cost them about \$40 million in 2011. \$40 million is incidentally also the cost of Academic East. So it turns out that the money is there and I think this calls into question this whole business of how priorities are actually laid out.

JT: Yeah, that's pretty remarkable, I mean if I'm correct I think the figure that was given at the presentation yesterday was that the reason why Bucknell couldn't in fact install solar panels was because there wasn't a good seven year financial return on them.

Anon: Well, I would want to ask the question what the financial return on Academic East is.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: I'm not sure that a building actually has a financial return.

JT: Right.

Anon: So I think, just to sense that if the process of deciding where to put a decidedly finite set of resources was actually a public, democratic process,

JT: MmHm.

Anon: Then maybe the larger community would decide to instead of building a building that uses more resources, to put a solar farm on campus. That I think if you covered all the parking lots you'd probably

get about 10-12 acres of solar paneling, which gets you about 3 megawatts of power, which is a little over half of what we consume.

JT: Yeah.

Anon: That's pretty remarkable. And costs have gone down dramatically, right. \$40 million of solar paneling in 2011 probably will cost about \$15-20 million at this point.

JT: So we really are then in the realm here of moral institutional commitment or ethical commitment.

Anon: Absolutely, absolutely, absolutely.

JT: I'm wondering if you talk just a little bit about the other piece that Amanda was very clear on, which is this issue of where our money is actually invested, right? So to what degree did either financial transparency or the prospect of divestment come up at this presentation yesterday?

Anon: It did not come up. At all.

JT: OK.

Anon: So I don't think there was anything mentioned about divestment at all. There was nothing mentioned about, you know, what the sources of money are, what's being put into what, and you know how it's partitioned. I think everything that was being done was being done as a given and the presentation was essentially to tell us how awesome everything was.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: And the Q&A was there, I think there were a lot of good questions, but they were largely sidetracked again by people who were presenting delving into the details and sort of doing this general fragmentation and obfuscation of the information. Which then you think "Oh maybe it's some complicated thing that I don't understand and you sort of forget about it."

JT: Right. And then I think another thing that was going on there, -- speaking now as someone who was also the audience -- is that there was a lot of rerouting of ideas about sustainability away from the environment or the climate and towards economics, right? So there's a lot of conversation about economic sustainability.

Anon: Absolutely. Yeah. Yeah.

JT: And financial choices.

Anon: And I think to a large extent, that's a made up, that's a made up issue. I mean certainly we have a finite amount of money, but I think the fact that we can put up two new buildings and make large-scale renovations building fraternities in the last five years, I think it goes to indicate that there isn't such a shortfall of money that we're really struggling.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: I think it does indicate what our institutional priorities are more than anything else.

JT: Yeah. So for those of you who joined us during this last bit you're listening to Bucknell: Occupied here on 90.5 WVBU Lewisburg. We're talking all things sustainability this evening and right now thinking specifically through the so-called sustainability forum held here on campus yesterday. So I want to go back to this conversation about the people who showed up at the forum with signs.

Anon: MmHm.

JT: As someone who was holding a sign, what was what was the reason for that action?

Anon: I think it was basically the minimal possible action to draw some attention towards the fact that there is a segment of the Bucknell population on this campus that is... that feels left out of this process. That feels like there are decisions that are being made that are outside the realm of you know the other stakeholders in the institute that is the faculty, the student, and the staff. And that repeatedly, as Amanda was saying, that good conversation is blocked.

JT: Hmm.

Anon: And oftentimes... there's a lot of "we invite comments..." and "we invite feedback..." but what sort of black hole that goes into is not clear.

JT: Yeah.

Anon: Because the bodies that actually take this information and -- and you know there are faculty on these bodies -- but again these faculty are not necessarily democratically chosen, they're not voted for... So it's a very opaque process, so even though there might be an argument about "Oh there are representatives," I think the process itself is very opaque, and what the larger University body gets to see is some end result which is such a confused mess of things that you don't even know where to begin poking a finger. Because it's just... there's so many pieces of it, there's so much additional information about all sorts of things that you can't really directly engage with that I think it takes away any agency that you might have.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: Even while giving it in some sense.

JT: Yeah. For sure. So, I think one of the most evident things at the meeting was the extent to which the signs clearly disturbed administration.

Anon: Right.

JT: So can you talk a little bit about how the mini-protest was dealt with by the members of admin in the room?

Anon: So I think one of the most glaring aspects was during the Q&A. So there was about a 15 minute Q&A where a bunch of people asked decent questions. Some of the members of that audience who were holding up signs had their hands up almost the entire time, and were never called upon to ask

questions. In fact I think there was even an instance where one person had a hand up and the presenting body actually waited until another hand went up so they could pick on this other hand. So I think there's sort of a... it's this simultaneous denial, plus a refusal to engage, while at the same time a hope that this would just kind of like disappear and go away into its own little shadow. And and you know, I don't think that's an unreasonable hope because I think people are burnt out by action on this institution on this campus by repeatedly being stonewalled this much.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: But I think it was quite stark that there was absolutely no recognition of the fact that there were you know that there were people in the audience who were actually gathering quite a bit of attention. I saw a lot of people looking around to see what these signs said, but it was sort of this giant elephant in the room and no one really acknowledge it at all.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: It was just weird.

JT: So, I mean, we've sort of had two... you've done a really good job of sketching out the two pathways of engagement on this campus, right? One is to stage a protest or offer a criticism and be completely ignored and the other option is to get co-opted into a very opaque process in which it is quite unclear whether you're actually having any measurable input or not. What are your thoughts on on a better way forward? What might actual decision-making on this campus or on this issue look like?

Anon: I think one of the... one potential idea is to just you know, build some sort of community around the notion that... So I think one of the very effective ways in which protest is dealt with is by fragmenting protest, right. So you say that "Oh you know you are blah blah blah and we don't care about this or there aren't other people like you, you're unique." So I think one aspect is actually building community amongst people that think that something good can come out of all of this and that we can actually make progress given the resources that we do have and given the kind of contingencies that have been placed upon us by present environmental scenario and everything. But I think for that to work, people need to sort of also start not being passive, but being active about coming together, taking initiative, applying their own agency to problems, while at the same time recognizing that these problems are not actually independent individual entities, but really fall under an extremely large structure and global disenfranchisement of power.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: On this campus

JT: MmHm.

Anon: Which has been happening extensively over the last several years.

JT: So on that note, I'm wondering if you could talk to us a little bit about the way in which this particular incident connects to larger institutional patterns and priorities?

Anon: Right. So I think one thing that I don't know if, I think Amanda briefly touched upon this was strategic planning.

[CROSSTALK]

JT: MmHm. Yes. Very briefly she did.

Anon: Which is largely the issue around the fact that indeed there are there are constraints, there are sort of difficult times ahead, at least that's the narrative, and therefore we need to make some choices about what needs to go and what needs to stay. And it's sort of largely this narrative of something needs to go if something else needs to stay. While, simultaneously on the side, we're making new things, we're building new buildings. So there's this certain... it doesn't feel like a genuine narrative on some level. But what makes it even worse is that the process is completely opaque, again, like the sustainability stuff. There has been really no community input, and again I'm saying there might have been 5 or 6 or even 10 or 15 faculty that provided input on these things, but that's hardly community when you're talking about 365 faculty and 3600 students on this campus. So I think it is absolutely crucial for us as members of this community to create spaces to allow for the genuine democratic and transparent participation of all members of the community, and to address not only issues surrounding sustainability and strategic planning, but also issues surrounding staffing, surrounding labor issues on campus, surrounding food insecurity. I think these are all tied into sort of a very large-scale concentration of power on this campus.

JT: What might that political community that you're talking about, what might that actually look like in practice?

Anon: So I think it might possibly... first I think it's important that a bunch of people get together and actually start knowing each other, but then it also revolves around both building community around action and at the same time, building community around stuff that's not necessarily associated with the University or the campus at all. We are humans outside of this campus as well.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: And I think that when we know of each other as partners in action on campus, but if we know of each other as only that, then again, it is easier to produce this sort of fragmentation if we don't have other things that are tying us together in ways that are not defined by the institution itself.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: So I think, I don't know getting together and socializing around just imagining, just new imaginations of what these spaces could like, what could a University look like that's not like this? I mean, I don't have solutions, but I think these are questions that people people spend a lot of time thinking about in their bedrooms or living rooms, and I think it's time to sort of bring these together and then it's not only about talking and sort of getting to know each other, but then it's to build action surrounding that.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: I think such a body can have tremendous potential to actually institute significant change. I think we saw elements of this in 2016 with the BAD group on campus when they actually successfully lobbied for an Islamic studies professor,

JT: MmHm.

Anon: And a new Muslim chaplain, and a Women's Resource Center director. All sorts of stuff. I think that they actually won a lot of their demands on their list. And I think that's just a small window into what is possible when we form large communities of people that care.

JT: MmHm. No, I mean, I like what you're talking about, right. The way in which many of these different issues that seem in fact and do in reality isolate and fragment people from one another are in fact resulting from this concentration of power, right. And the concentration of power in such a way that makes it seem as though there are no avenues, and in fact there is no point in democratic participation.

Anon: Absolutely.

JT: At this point we are reaching towards the end of the hour, I'm wondering if there's anything else you would want to bring into the conversation either about the sustainability forum or about the interrelationship of these various issues that you so wonderfully analyzed.

[CROSSTALK]

Anon: I'll stick to sustainability... So I found another intriguing fact in my journey this afternoon through the Bucknell sustainability website. So it says on the website that we, that Bucknell composts 870 tons per year. I found this number extremely shocking,

JT: Hmm.

Anon: Because that corresponds to about four and a half thousand pounds a day, which is which is...

JT: A lot.

Anon: Honestly a terrific amount if we're actually managing to do that without an official composting program.

JT: Right.

Anon: To give you a comparison point, Dickinson College which has about 2500 students and about half our endowment. They actually managed to compost 100% of their pre and post-consumer food waste. And this amounts to about 125 tons a year. So if you do dig into the FAQs, what you actually learn is that what is being composted is actually lawn trimmings.

JT: Yard waste. MmHm.

Anon: So it's basically trees, and trees get pretty heavy. So you can imagine that... So I think that the bigger idea to take from this is that the notion that someone would want to put that data up there and not really saying anything explicit about it unless you go to another page with FAQs, I think it's... Maybe

one shouldn't read too much into it, but I think it does speak to a bit of an underlying current towards publicity

JT: MmHm.

Anon: And towards wanting to look good rather than wanting to actually do anything about the situation.

JT: Yeah.

Anon: And again this speaks to these priorities that we talked about earlier.

JT: Right.

Anon: Just sort of a small example.

JT: No and I mean I think just to put another data point on there, there was another conversation yesterday at forum regarding the extent to which our food supply is being sourced locally. And one student in particular raised the issue that even though we claim to source 30% of our food locally, much of that, in fact, is final production, right.

Anon: Right. Right.

JT: So things like bakery, which fine, are baking locally, but are bringing their products in from wherever it is that they choose to purchase it from. So again, the way in which you look at a certain statistic is... is pretty telling.

Anon: Yeah. Yeah. And I think the sort of other hints that you see here and there. And again, I was looking at the Dickinson College website, is just the way they talk about certain sustainability efforts on... You know, they're also doing LEED, and they're doing this and that, so maybe thirty years down we look like them, which is not an ambitious goal, I think if we continue to follow this. But I think just the way they talk about how they... the kind of pesticides they use, they actually know the issues the substantive information on not using neonicotinoids for example,

JT: MmHm.

Anon: On bee-pollinated plants. Talking about how they actually use Purple Martin nests to actually control their insect populations on turf. So there's all these little snippets of information which are very readily available which gives you a sense that there are people there who actually care.

JT: MmHm.

Anon: But there is a very corporate feel to the Bucknell end of things, which -- again, I don't know how much one should read into that, maybe it's just a function of a bad web-site -- but that that was striking as well.

JT: But then I think that you know, certainly there's a lot of attention paid to improving websites as indicative of sustainability, but certainly I think this is part and parcel of the larger issue we talked about, which is just the general corporatization and concentration of power.

Anon: Right. Right.

JT: Well thank you very much for joining us, it's really been a pleasure talking with you.

Anon: Thanks for having me.

JT: So this is coming to the end of the show here on Bucknell: Occupied. Next week we will be digging in detail into an issue that both of my guests this evening have raised, which is the issue of strategic planning. I will have two guests here in the studio talking about the nature of that process. Some serious procedural issues which have come up with it, and what the introduction of democracy into the process might actually mean for the whole project moving forward. So I will talk to you all next week.