

I'd like to suggest that the Berkeley Library debate is being framed as a decision on denaming as opposed to renaming.

A commemoration by the naming of a building need not be permanent one. Why frame the concept in this way? Can someone else who is deserving also be commemorated in a later phase by the same building?

If so, the question is simply who should now be commemorated? This way of thinking avoids intractable questions of how and why current mores can be applied to people who lived hundreds of years ago.

Summary: look at the process as a renaming, not a denaming.

Aidan Forde
Natural Sciences 1985