

The Coalition to Rename Porteus Hall has a Special interest in this proposed naming policy. The over 2,000 people who signed the petition to rename Porteus Hall, the 300 people who jammed Crawford Hall in April, and the 30 individuals--representing the campus and the community--who testified at that hearing have a special interest in this proposal. It was because of their struggle that this policy came about. It was in reaction to broad and mass pressure that the BOR directed the Administration to review its naming policy. And, after months of re-evaluation, this is the result. The Coalition is not pleased, nor is it appeased.

The naming policy was one issue. Student and community input was another issue. But the thrust of the struggle was clear: **RENAME PORTEUS HALL!!!**
The issue was **RACISM**.

The review ~~serves~~ to deceive the public into thinking that the University administration and the BOR are really interested in serving the needs and sentiments of students. This is an attempt by the administration and the BOR to make themselves look good--like they are giving students and community a lot of input in the naming process.

The whole process of the ad-Hoc committee and its policies can be seen as a tactical move by the administration to satisfy criticism that there was no student input in the naming of the Social Science building.

Let us now look specifically at the proposed policies.

The policies that are recommended contain several contradictions and inconsistencies.

First of all is the matter of the appointing of ad-Hoc committees to recommend a name for each new facility that needs to be named. Since the general policy recommends giving new facilities descriptive or functional names anyway, this committee will be recommending names generally chosen already, by policy. It seems to say if a new building will house the art department an ad-Hoc committee will be appointed to recommend that the building be named the Art building.

Apparently, student-community input in naming a facility is limited to taking part in recommending names as opposed to taking part in the decision making process.

The thing is that there is a double limitation. Student input on these ad-Hoc committees are not only limited to recommending names. Input is also limited to what kinds of names, as general policy, can be recommended. In other words, student input is only an illusion, since in most cases, the ad-Hoc committee will simply recommend names that are already given by policy.

Despite the window dressing of the new proposed policy, nothing has really changed. Final decision making power still lies exclusively with the politically tainted BOR. They can accept or reject a name as they see fit.

Certain questions also arise as to the phrases "where appropriate", and "very unusual circumstances". What do these mean? What are the criteria to judge appropriateness and unusual circumstances?

We see that this new policy is designed to avoid future confrontations similar to the one involving Porteus Hall. This new policy proposal does not fool us. We see that it is an attempt to delude everyone into thinking there will be actual student input when in essence, there won't. This, of course, is consistent with the past practice of the BOR and administration. They are again making reformist proposals that don't really change the basic structure of things.

They still want to hold all the cards and make all the rules.

The administration is always scrambling around to maintain the status quo despite demands for change. If students don't say anything, the administration goes on their merry way, ignoring problems. If students organize and demand progressive change, the administration, under the suggestion of the BOR, hustles up fools gold-type policies like this present one--which avoids the real issues--issues like sanctioning racist ideas, and avoiding real student input.