

Print [Delete](#) [Prev](#) [Next](#) [Reply/All](#) [Forward/Inline](#) [Open](#) [Inbox](#) 1284 of 1288

**Date:** Mon 10 Sep 16:04:51 EDT 2007  
**From:** "Will Coggin" <will.coggin@gmail.com> [Add To Address Book](#) | [This is Spam](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: A reply to a response  
**To:** "Alan Kennedy-Shaffer" <axkenn@wm.edu>

See the below two emails. You can feel free to introduce this as "Exhibit X" at the hearing.

----- Forwarded message -----  
From: **William Angley** <[wmangl@wm.edu](mailto:wmangl@wm.edu)>  
Date: Sep 10, 2007 3:56 PM  
Subject: RE: A reply to a response  
To: Will Coggin <[will.coggin@gmail.com](mailto:will.coggin@gmail.com)>  
Cc: Review Board <[rboard@wm.edu](mailto:rboard@wm.edu)>

Will –

The Review Board has already discussed the issues around your standing. At last count, we decided to simply ignore the matter entirely. Alan Kennedy-Shaffer has clear standing to file the petition, and the remedy that he seeks is Constitutional rather than personal in nature. If, on the other hand, he sought to have you listed on a ballot for a graduate election, your standing might become an issue.

At this point, the best way to get your reply formally inducted into the Review Board process would be for Alan Kennedy-Shaffer to introduce a statement by you as an exhibit during a hearing. This is what the Law School currently wishes to do with their interview with David Solimini.

If the Review Board decides to hold a hearing, I'll let you know.

-- Will

---

**From:** Will Coggin [mailto:[will.coggin@gmail.com](mailto:will.coggin@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 10, 2007 2:59 PM  
**To:** [wmangl@wm.edu](mailto:wmangl@wm.edu)  
**Subject:** A reply to a response

Dear Will,

Alan forwarded me the SBA's response to the Review Board petition that he filed recently. I was listed as a petitioner, but I am not sure if I am allowed to be classified as such since I have graduated. Since the SBA's response directs some of its arguments against me personally, I would like to respond part-by-part to the SBA's response. Please forward to the appropriate parties as you are required. If you have any questions, I can be reached at [will.coggin@gmail.com](mailto:will.coggin@gmail.com). Thanks.

V/r

Will Coggin

## Part I

The respondents indicate that last year's Senate supported their wishes to appoint senators. Further, respondents allege that both myself and Mr. Kennedy-Schafer were not at the May 1 Senate meeting. Both of these points are irrelevant to the issue at hand. The support of any senators last year to have an appointment process means absolutely nothing as to the question of what the SA Constitution says. Constitutional meaning does not change with the tide of a group's opinion. Further, the attendance records of senators have nothing to do with the meaning of a section of the SA constitution. The evidence cited by respondents fails to prove what respondents allege in the title of their first section, namely, that "[t]here is precedent regarding the constitutionality of the Graduate Schools' ability to choose how Student Assembly Senators are selected in the Senate Internal Affairs Committee."

## Part II

Respondents allege that the presence of the word "select" in Article V, Section 3.4 provides for non-voting means to determine a graduate senator ( i.e. an appointment). The first definition for the word "elect" on [dictionary.com](http://dictionary.com) is "to choose or *select* by vote, as for an office: to elect a mayor." (emphasis added). In other words, an election *is* a selection- as voters *select* whom they want to represent them- and the use of the word "select" in Article V, Section 3.4 is completely consistent with the previous section of the Constitution stating that all Senators must be elected.

Respondents make further allegations in a hodgepodge of Latin phrases and case law citations. The Review Board is not bound by case law. Bluntly stated, a reference to case law here is ludicrous. The SA constitution is not a legal document. It was not crafted by lawyers. The SA constitution was written by students not of the legal profession who understood the everyday meanings of the words they chose. This is applicable as the respondents also highlight the word "sent" that appear in Article V, Section 3.4. In the vernacular, the verb "sent" is used to describe the action taken by voters as they "send" whomever is selected to the legislature, governor's mansion, etc. to represent them. (I invite members of the Review Board to type in the phrase "sent to Washington by voters" into Google for further examples of the use of the word "sent" in this sense)

Lastly, respondents interview Mr. Solimini, who was involved in the process of crafting the constitution. Mr. Solimini is but one person in a process that involved many. Respondents allege that because Mr Solimini agrees with them, and because he was one person who helped craft the constitution, that therefore they must be correct. This does not follow (or for the more sophisticated students, this is a *non sequitor*). Thomas Jefferson had many personal views that disagreed with what the US Constitution stated- but does the voice of one crafter supersede that of the actual document? The SA constitution is decisively clear in its requirement that graduate senators must be voted into office- a simple analysis of the language (as shown above) proves it. If the students that passed the constitution had wanted graduate senators to be appointed, they simply would have used that word.

## Part III

In the third part of the reply, respondents claim that " The student that attends the William & Mary Undergraduate is a very different person, both in age and stage of life, from many of the Graduate students." If respondents are alleging that being older means that graduate students are not cognitively capable of voting to select a peer to represent them, then it sheds some light on why respondents fear being put up to an election.

**Part IV**

I will let Mr. Kennedy-Schafer address the *ad hominem* attacks against him that, frankly, reflect poorly on respondents' character and response. It is one thing to vehemently disagree over an interpretation of a document; it is another to tastelessly make a baseless attack a fellow student's motives.

---

[Print](#) [Delete](#) [Prev](#) [Next](#) [Reply/All](#) [Forward/Inline](#) [Open](#) [Inbox](#) 1284 of 1288 [Go to](#)  [Move](#) [Copy](#) [Inbox](#)