

Order of The Golden Bear

διδάσκω

ESTABLISHED 1900

Usually Place, February 21th, 2023

The meeting was convened at 6:00pm

Items for the good of the order:

The fellowship starts with a clarification on the charge of confidentiality. Regarding the Order, confidentiality means that what is said within the Order are not attributed to names. The information is meant to be shared, and sharing is encouraged. The charge of confidentiality does not extend to include anonymity. The knowledge of membership within the Order is public.

Items for the good of the university: How can the University improve the experience of indigenous and cultural groups?

To begin the meeting, the Warden poses a few questions and recent events for consideration

- The closure of the Latinx student resource center.
- Oaxacal (student group) choosing to disaffiliate itself from the University due to push back and a lack of support
- What has the University done to progress or prolong injustices?
- i.e. the unaming of buildings but still referring to them as "formerly ... hall"
- How can the University and its constituents make identity based groups feel seen and uplifted?
- What impact does reading the land acknowledgement make, and how can more be done?
- Campus communication regarding community tragedies has made many students uncomfortable. Insensitive language/wording/timing.
- Consider related key concepts and terms: Restorative Justice; Empowerment;

Regarding the closure of the LatinX student resource center

- Current situation regarding the closure of the LatinX student resource center – Grand opening last semester, located in Hearst Annex. Upon opening, there was a gas leak and the resource center was shut down. There has been an ongoing effort in getting a temporary space.
- A fellow believes that the response from university leadership and student leadership has been slow.
- A fellow responds and poses the question for the fellowship – where to focus advocacy to make it more effective? The University is large, siloed and bureaucratic. Many people assume that emailing leaders with the greatest titles will solve their problems, but to make change, there are many people from every level that need to be brought into the conversation. It's very important to consider where the advocacy can be most effective.
- A fellow mentions that there are multiple avenues to seeking resources. The avenues for advocacy shouldn't be only focused on the university and the institution, but instead could there be community efforts that can be more effective? The bureaucracy is slow by design.

Regarding building renaming:

- A fellow mentions that, despite the official renaming of Barrows hall, the street, signs, directories, classrooms are still associated with the Barrows name.
- A fellow feels troubled by the renaming of buildings. The fellow believes that history should not be eliminated, and instead it should be broadened and expanded. Instead of erasing names, there should be history and commentary added in the building to explain and educate. The fellow poses a question to the fellowship: Where does the line for renaming stop? Why get rid of Kroeber, LeConte, and Barrows, but not names like Berkeley and Yale?
- A fellow sees the removal of names as progression and believes that it can be done in parallel with education.
- A fellow provides context regarding the naming of Berkeley's Business school. The Millikan name was considered before deciding on Haas. It's important to note that societal standards change. An individual who may be currently accepted may be seen differently in the future. No individual is perfect and are we pushing away people that can donate and support the University?
- A fellow adds on to the previous speaker: Not everyone will agree either. It's important to recognize that what is considered inclusive or politically correct is not necessarily to be used as bible. Different individuals or members of a community have different experiences and feelings about these terms.
- A fellow brings up the current naming methodology and wants to see more transparency and student input in such matters. Based on this fellow's knowledge, this committee meets twice a year.
 - The committee link can be found [here](#) [Chronicler: Currently, there are two students on this committee.]
 - [Building Name Review Process](#)
 - [Building Name Review Committee Principles](#). ["Whether or not a building's name is removed, we believe it is historically and socially valuable to retain a public record, perhaps in the form of a plaque in the building, that notes the building's history of naming and the reasons for removing the name." - Office of the Chancellor]
- A fellow referenced their experience with other students and professors in "Decolonizing UC Berkeley", the course taught in Arts and Anthropology (previously Kroeber Hall). To some people, renaming the building is liberating.
- A fellow mentions that striping the name away from a building is not an easy process – when a building is named after a donor, there are contracts and stipulations in place.
- The fellowship seems to be in agreement that this topic has no right answer – consensus is difficult to reach. It is important to hear as many perspectives as possible.

Regarding naming process:

- A fellow poses the question to the fellowship: How are names for buildings decided in the first place? When visiting other schools – it's social sciences 1. Why are we naming buildings after people?
- A fellow explains the naming methodology: philanthropic actions, teachers who were famous for academic work or doing great work with students, and historical figures.

- A fellow recognizes to the fellowship that no one is perfect and that the standards will change. People who think they are perfect now will find them to be judged by the people of the next generation.

Extending the renaming conversation to ethnic labels used by the University

- A fellow believes that the term LatinX is offensive to many. The University uses this term as a classification for Spanish speakers. The fellow supports the intention of gender neutrality behind the term, but feels like it is a label and box that is being forced upon Spanish speakers.
- A fellow mentioned that these labels represent what indigenous groups the University recognizes. This determines which communities will get resources and a seat at the table. For example, Oaxaca is not recognized by the University. Where can we be more inclusive with the labels? The University expanded the ethnicity option in their application process. Not all indigenous groups can get the same resources, which is based on federal recognition. Labels are also how laws and policies like affirmative action are applied. Can we give more funding and open bridges up to more groups? Can we give native and indigenous people more space on campus?

Discussion Adjourned at 7:30 PM.

The Meeting closed with Song, and notes were compiled by the Chronicler.