

1I 230215

- THIS EMAIL CHAIN HAS BEEN PUT IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER FOR EASY READING. NOTHING HAS BEEN OMITTED.

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]

Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2023 at 9:47 AM

To: WRowan <[REDACTED]>

Cc: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]>, Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>, [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]

Subject: Adrian [REDACTED - REGION]/ [REDACTED - CITY] Dates

Hi Wingham,

As discussed, I will not be in the [REDACTED - REGION] until March 6. In my absence, Adrian will be in [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] from Feb 24 - Mar 2. He will be able to join meetings, so please include him in any meeting where it would be helpful to have a TWL presence, especially given our local footprint.

[REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] (cc'd) manages Adrian's schedule, please keep her and [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER], in the loop as well. Feel free to continue to cc me as well.

Thank you,
Jeshua

On Thu, Feb 16, 2023 at 1:22 PM WRowan <[REDACTED]>wrote:

Jeshua, no problem with anyone from TWL attending any meetings. But I will have an agenda that I want to talk through with [REDACTED - FUNDER] and it will revolve around our need for post Design Sprint funding. If Adrian is happy to allow that agenda to unfold while offering quiet support it will be a pleasure to have him attend.

I didn't issue the invite so can't add him. Can you handle the details at your end?

W.

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]

Date: Friday, February 17, 2023 at 1:40 PM

To: WRowan [REDACTED]

Cc: Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>

Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates

Great, thanks!

Please add Adrian to the invites/meeting blocks you send as optional (*since I won't be in [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] that week, but I can do the once I happen to be included on*) and he'll attend as he's able to. Please also include [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] in the emails for meeting context & so that she can help him manage his calendar.

Whatever I can join virtually, I'm obviously happy to as well!

Best,
Jeshua

On Fri, Feb 17, 2023 at 1:50 PM WRowan <[REDACTED]>wrote:

OK, but I would expect AH to have better things to do with his time than sit in on endless "can we just delve further into how your payroll process works" operational meetings. I thought we had decided on an intelligent division of labor/resources already.

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]
Date: Friday, February 17, 2023 at 2:35 PM
To: WRowan [REDACTED]
Cc: Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>
Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates

Yes, we are aligned. Per my initial email "please include him in any meeting where it would be helpful to have a TWL presence" - you should help delineate which ones are worth/helpful having Adrian for vs. just numbers/operations and would not be helpful. Separate from that, I'll just echo a reminder on the need and relevance of cultural and racial sensitivity around this work, especially here in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] given the explicit scope outlined by [REDACTED] and the community-based groups that are central to this work, and all the work that we do at TWL more broadly - we are here to be helpful and move the work forward on all fronts.

Have a great weekend,

Jeshua

On Mon, Feb 20, 2023, 11:00 AM WRowan <[REDACTED]>wrote:

Yes, let's stick to the terms of our "January compact". I will aim to make a market in [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] with the efficiency, focus, relationships, and pace-driving we are committed to at this end. TWL will do the same in Chicago. Each of us will call on the other if/when the other can be helpful.

And Yes, [REDACTED - FUNDER] (who presents as white) has pointed out the racial aspects of their overall project. Like anything that can impact our planning, I take that very seriously.

But the only people who have ever suggested a white Brit somehow negatively triggers that sensitivity is TWL. I don't expect anyone I meet in [REDACTED] to be interested in me or TWL beyond a couple-of-sentences basics at the top of a meeting. Our conversations need to be firmly about them: their needs/aspirations and if/how we can support those objectives.

Personally, I think the CBO leaders we've met so far are of a caliber that will be much more focused on what we can tangibly do for local people than our philosophy around societal issues, however pressing. We are not important.

It's just all about delivery now. If we're going to get Chicago/[REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] live by end of June we don't have time for unnecessarily duplicative meetings and confused relationships.

W.

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]
Date: Monday, February 20, 2023 at 3:41 PM
To: Wingham Rowan <wingham@beyondjobs.com>
Cc: Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>
Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates

Wingham, I don't think we need to mull over this again, but if you don't feel like this issue had been put to bed, we just might.

This is a factually inaccurate statement -- "the only people who have ever suggested a white Brit somehow negatively triggers that sensitivity is TWL". Not only have you been called out on a call by folks in [REDACTED] on our Zoom call, that we all witnessed, we have also gotten direct feedback on this as well. I know you don't like it, and it's not your intention, but that doesn't mean that it didn't happen, or that it won't happen again, unintentionally. **I don't raise this to be a thorn in your side, but rather to ensure that the importance of that sensitivity, which really should just be common place, is respected. I know you know this, but somehow, I do still feel the need to reiterate it. Your intentions are always good, and I want to make sure your language and intentions aren't misconstrued by others.**

My point being, tangible action and values go hand in hand, they are easily aligned when intention and the way that intention is communicated is done the right way. Racial equity work is embedded deeply in how the work is done, not as an afterthought. This shouldn't be an area of misalignment given your acknowledgment of [REDACTED - FUNDER]'s affirmation of what I have repeatedly said about our work in [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED]. That being said, I think it's worth discussing between meetings in [REDACTED] when I'm there tomorrow.

See you then,
Jeshua

On Mon, Feb 20, 2023, 6:28 PM WRowan <[REDACTED]>wrote:

Jeshua, I was not “called out” on an [REDACTED] call about this. What happened was, I fumbled or was misheard using the phrase “selling people’s labor” so that it was received as “selling people”. There was a good natured comment from one of the participants that “we tried selling people, it didn’t end well”. I immediately apologized for any misspeaking which was accepted with complete amicability. I doubt if anyone else even remembers the moment.

I don’t understand why this minor incident has been elevated to a recurring issue within TWL. Do you remember when [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] wrote to the [REDACTED - CITY 1] stakeholders saying something like “this will be an exciting project for [REDACTED -CITY 2]”? (He’d copied some text from somewhere else.) They wrote back to say “we are not [REDACTED - CITY 2]”.

I wouldn’t normally think anything of this. We all flub our words or writing occasionally. And I am sure he was as embarrassed by his mistake as I was by mine above. I certainly wouldn’t assume it revealed anything about his character, intention, or need for supervision. Can you extend the same courtesy to me?

We have been over the [REDACTED - LARGE FUNDER] call many times. I was shocked and agitated by the way it was unfolding which had nothing to do with the race of anyone involved. It’s part of a wider issue that we are all aware of. I don’t accept blame for the unprofessional way that call unfolded. But I do profoundly regret if my frustration was perceived through a racial lens.

W.

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]
Date: Monday, February 20, 2023 at 10:07 PM
To: Wingham Rowan <wingham@beyondjobs.com>
Cc: Adrian Haro <[\[REDACTED\]](#)>
Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates

Wingham,

There are several missing pieces here, including inaccuracies around your recollection. One example: She said "I'm not sure if you're aware, but we tried buying and selling people in this country and it didn't end well. We don't do that anymore". I was on the call, you misspoke, you were not misheard. Speaking up to correct someone about something that doesn't sit well with you is the literal definition of being "called out". Yes, she did so with grace and a tinge of humor, and so is her prerogative in addressing a sensitive issue around her own race, but that should not be assumed to be the norm, both that (1) that type of grace would be afforded by external folks if there are future slip-ups, and (2) that everyone who has an issue will feel comfortable calling it out directly to your face, or even want to spend the energy having the back and forth since microaggressions like these (intentional or not) are felt by most people of color, especially Black Americans in both professional and personal settings on a daily basis.

I have said this on calls before and I will repeat myself - I don't and have never disagreed with you that your intention is in the right place, the fact that you did apologize is an example of that, but how intention is received or perceived is what takes precedent for all our working relationships. In other words, how what you say is received by others is more important than what you think you mean/how you think it will be received when you say it. It's the audience that matters. If we have to spend time mending issues and relationships, that is a detriment to the project and potentially even funding. Just like when you remind us that if we misrepresent technical aspects about the project, that you have to backtrack and correct, that is a waste of time, and that those issues should be addressed by you at the outset. That is why we have put so much time and energy into messaging and communication in this project, and correcting and replacing language that is problematic.

Your lack of acceptance around reality does not change what happened and how it was received. Please do not say things like "complete amicability" or "doubt anyone remembers" unless you actually had a conversation with that person and have explicitly had their word on it, because in your words, it is not a "data point". This is a recurring issue because it has been voiced to us more than once, and because you seem dogged about deflecting accountability. It's as simple as accepting that there have been a couple slip ups that indeed were not your intention (we know that, have your back, and have spoken up in your defense every time we have received feedback on this issue), and that you show a willing and open nature to correct yourself and prevent it from happening moving forward. I truly believe that you're almost there but the missing piece and central issue here is that you continue to minimize these instances and almost appear to act like they never happened. You weren't on the receiving end of these slip ups, so it's not up to you to judge the severity, or try to tell a different story. I know you may feel differently, but I am giving you feedback about what I have witnessed, as a queer, biracial person of color, who has lived experience and professional experience in the arenas of human rights, as well as diversity, equity, and inclusion.

We are where we are now in this email chain because of the explicit choice you made to minimize what was otherwise a simple reminder. I am attempting to solve this with you at the outset, and will commit to always trying to do that with you. Even if you don't want to agree with the extent of these incidents for yourself, it would be professional courtesy to respect when I have chosen to intentionally bring an issue like this up, and perhaps say to me, "no problem, I understand the importance and will do my best" or some version of that when I initially echoed the reminder that started this back and forth -- *"on the need and relevance of cultural and racial sensitivity around this work, especially here in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] given the explicit scope outlined by [REDACTED] Thrives and the community-based groups that are central to this work, and all the work that we do at TWL more broadly"*. You did not do that.

Finally, Wingham, if your character was in question, I certainly wouldn't be making any effort on this. It's explicitly because I know you care and want to see the work succeed, that I am hashing this out over email on my day off and before you head into [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] next week. If we can find common ground and agreement in this, then yes, I am happy to extend that courtesy moving forward and hopefully put this issue to rest once and for all. Let's use some of our face-to-face time tomorrow to do this.

Best,
Jeshua

On Tue, Feb 21, 2023, 1:53 PM WRowan <[REDACTED]>wrote:

Don't have time to read this just now but I think the point you're trying to get across is "you should have someone who's not white with you at meetings". (It's a point AH has made in the past.) Am I correct? W.

On Feb 23, 2023, at 21:24, [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER] wrote:

Let me know when you've had a chance to read it!

On Fri, Feb 24, 2023, 8:02 AM Wingham Rowan <wingham@beyondjobs.com> wrote:

Just give me the takeaway. What do you think I should do to move this project on that I'm not doing?

Wingham Rowan. US: (562) 972 1080 | UK 07977 116 693
Sent from my phone.

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]

Date: Friday, February 24, 2023 at 8:43 AM

To: Wingham Rowan <wingham@beyondjobs.com>

Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates
Wingham,

Respect - first and foremost. True and equal respect, especially for others who are not from the same background as you and may have different sensitivities. That involves making a real effort to adapt your language and approach.

This situation is again an illustration of the deeper issue -- you send long emails all the time with full expectation that they are read by others. How are you not affording me the same respect right now?

I think it is extremely disrespectful. Please let me know once you have read the email in full.

Best,
Jeshua

On Fri, Feb 24, 2023 at 10:18 AM WRowan <[REDACTED]> wrote:

What are you telling me to DO that I don't do now. Make it concrete, don't tell me how to think. What am I saying that I should stop saying?

From: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]
Date: Friday, February 24, 2023 at 10:31 AM
To: WRowan [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates

I am still waiting on confirmation that you've read the email.

From: WRowan [REDACTED]
Date: Tuesday, February 28, 2023 at 11:10 AM
To: [REDACTED - TWL STAFFER]
Cc: Adrian Haro <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Adrian [REDACTED]/ [REDACTED] Dates

Have read your email. It's thoughtful and sincere. Rest assured: I am acutely aware of racial sensitivities and have worked to learn from you guys about the specific American context. The international context I believe I have some insight into: I have in the past used my white privilege explicitly to protect people threatened by militarized racial aggression in areas like the occupied territories.

But I still question the value of resurfacing minor flubs of wording, and how they were handled, months after the event. I stand by my reading that it was understood by the group as misspeaking and that I was absolutely mortified by what I'd said.

And I think this kind of sensitivity needs to extend to multiple groups. Last week we met with key stakeholders ([REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]) who have been shaped by houselessness and deal with it every day. None of us present as someone who has lived on the streets. That also concerns me.
