

**If you are to proceed with receiving my statement, I request that before this article piece is published, I am promised to receive a draft of the finished product so that I may personally insure that what is written is exactly according to what I presented at the public meeting.**

I would like to acknowledge that my attempts to reach out to the AS Review organization were silenced, and believed to not warrant a story based on my accounts as a Black student who is facing this system. My story was made invisible when your Chief Editor decided that it did not warrant a story. The email by Soleil de Zwart turned my story into a conditional situation where I would only be heard if the grievance board made a decision out of accordance to her opinions. This is a failure of the AS Review, who are supposed to be "objective". If I were a white student, my voice would be heard, amplified, and published, not reduced to the recommendation of an opinion piece. I am a current student senator that is a part of the Associated Students Organization and I deserve to be heard. Your primarily white organization is playing at the helm of institutional racism. The executive board AND your organization, the 'AS Review' released a statement committing to dismantling anti-Blackness.

My three points that I want every single student to know

1. Nate Jo's racially insensitive statement,

- a. **The comparison of current Black students to future white supremacists was extremely offensive, damaging, inflammatory, and not conducive. It is flabbergasting that you, Nate Jo, would think of AND express such an excruciatingly false dichotomy in the same breath that you stated you cared about Black students DURING this public meeting (for the record, many of my supporters are white and non-Black). If you are demonstrating that you are out of touch with the current climate of today's world, especially living in this country, the epicenter of the global injustices happening, then our Black students can not trust you to honor your commitments to dismantling anti-Blackness as the AS President. My platform as the former President of the Black Student Union (BSU) is built on my deep-rooted commitments to work towards dismantling anti-Blackness in our institution. In light of this, I commit myself to establishing a Black resource center within the multicultural center.**

2. Timeliness,

- a. **It is irrelevant to point out my "untimeliness" in submitting my grievances. Here's why: Ina, as the Elections Coordinator, shared a duty to create and submit the violation of the Elections Code in the form of a grievance according to the elections code. When I inquired about the digital grievance process, Ina delayed sending me the proper documents to file grievances by an entire day (22 hours) thus, the digital grievances process was inaccessible to everyone but her. I submitted grievances to Annie Byers five hours after receiving the document. Ina then released a statement (attached to Nicole's Appeal material) ([nepotism](#)) condemning my timeliness to submitting grievances among many things ([gaslighting](#)). In that exact same statement, it shows that she believed it was her moral obligation to stand in support of the appealing candidates instead of choosing to uphold her original call to action ([colorism](#)). This affirms the existing institutional racism that we at WWU have committed to dismantle and is a prime example of nepotism, gaslighting, and colorism. Both the grievance hearing, and the appeals hearing should have deserved a statement from her. She chose to support one side.**

3. The invalidation of certain Elections Board committee members

- a. **The decision to hold an official grievance meeting was only because the elections board chair did not receive all of the proper materials and evidence that was supposed to be delivered by Annie Byers, The AS Board Program Coordinator. It was even communicated in a screenshot of a conversation between Nicole Ballard (Appellant) and Nathalie Wagler (Election Board Chair), that Natalie did not receive any of the grievances from Annie until after 5/16/2020. Days after I myself submitted those grievances. Lastly, I will not entertain the conversations around bias in the elections board when it was not transparent that Breaker Chittenden - one of the two main writers for the dissenting opinion was publicly in support of the appellants (Verified by Jose Ortuzar and further verified by Ballard).**