

Judith T. Newman (University of Oregon) posed as a social worker to conduct an illegal sting. Steven E. Brown (Evergreen Healthcare) and Dave Frohnmayer (University of Oregon) have not addressed illegal activity by Newman; instead, they condoned a cover-up.

Introduction

Seattle Jewish Mafia has spread its tentacles into Oregon with another cover-up of elder abuse in the guise of geriatric counseling. Dereliction by Evergreen Healthcare and University of Oregon administrators with respect to crimes committed at Council House, Seattle and a subsequent cover-up of behavior by Judith T. Newman, University of Oregon allegedly violated federal and state laws. [*Seattle Jewish Mafia*]

Victor J. DeLeon, President, Council House, declined several requests by Lauren Jeanne Hawk (66), a Council House tenant, to speak with him personally. Instead, he allegedly instructed Newman to contact her. Newman's subsequent actions construe as a deliberate invasion by a landlord on the common law right to privacy of a tenant living independently in a government-subsidized apartment block. [*Travesty*]

US Constitution does not mention any particular right to privacy; however, disputes over privacy issues have always had a common law resolution against landlord invasion of privacy similar to the right against search and seizure. DeLeon, Newman, and Stephen A. Mitchell, Council House Administrator (all of them state actors) have invaded tenant privacy and violated both common and constitutional laws that control state actors.

Newman Sting

In a new version of the JoRene Dodson farce, Newman posed as a Council House board member and social worker to conduct an investigation into a complaint by Hawk against Mitchell. Newman clandestinely tried to check Hawk's mental health condition by psychological assessment without her prior knowledge or consent allegedly on instructions given by DeLeon and Mitchell. [*Contractor's Daughter - Dodson*]

Newman's contact with Hawk resulted from Hawk filing complaints against Mitchell for harassment and elder abuse. Council House board of directors allegedly employed Newman to pose as a recently appointed member of the board of directors and social worker to investigate harassment complaints against Mitchell.

When Hawk questioned Newman about her credentials Newman told her that she held qualifications as a social worker. Newman neither disclosed that she worked for Evergreen Healthcare Mental Health Department nor as a University of Oregon affiliate and did not provide copies of her social worker credentials, or identification as required by law. Hawk said: "She

refused to show any identification and said she had no cards with her". [*Mental Health Counselors*] [*Social Workers*]

Instead of investigating the complaint, Newman conducted a sting operation in which she supported Mitchell's psychotic transference of his own behavior onto Hawk. A check with the telephone company revealed that Newman called Hawk from Evergreen's Seattle mental health office. [*Ravening Sociopath*]

It transpired that DeLeon, Mitchell, and Newman planned this fishing expedition to try to prove that Hawk had mental health problems - the first step in another unlawful eviction process similar to that used by Mitchell to evict Dodson and other Council House tenants. If the ruse had succeeded, then it would have given Mitchell an opportunity to evict Hawk and prevent her from testifying against him - his *modus operandi*. Hawk claimed that she later reported the illegal psychiatric assessment to Seattle Police Department (SPD) as harassment and elder abuse.

Mitchell has repeatedly used psychotic transference to make false allegations against tenants. Newman tried a similar tactic on Hawk. Most victims of this tactic have no knowledge of the hidden transference psychosis until too late for them to do anything to protect themselves.

If Mitchell and Newman could prove Hawk insane, then Council House lawyers could dissolve an outstanding mandate to pay \$63,000 in lawyers' fees awarded to Hawk after a successful illegal eviction court case. They could also prevent her from testifying against Council House in the future. By legal precedent, death or insanity of a mandatory ends a contract.

The directors had either to force Hawk to withdraw her case against them or to commit another homicide by abuse. They could cause her death by harassment or have her declared insane. The latter method gave a reason for the Newman mental health sting. [*Witness Tampering*]

Since *Contra Cabal* reported the sting (which amounted to nothing more than witness tampering and had nothing to do with psychiatric evaluation) Council House lawyers have bribed Hawk to leave the state. An independent source said that Hawk has accepted a payoff and will move to California.

Another source reported that: "She [Hawk] told me and other people that she is moving out at the end of March as Council House offered her big big [sic] money; and, she said that she signed a paper that she is not going to reveal the amount".

Statements by Lauren Jeanne Hawk (66)

I have been very ill and am in danger of dying from heart complications if I don't relieve my stress. So I signed off on the appeal before the mandate was done and am packing to leave now. . . . I can no longer deal with this situation. . . . I need to disconnect from Council House or I will be another death by elder abuse of [by] Mitchell et al. . . . I cannot discuss the settlement and I received no money for the lawyers as I withdrew the appeal. I withdrew

the appeal so that there will be no further action. . . . they didn't have to pay. It is over and I really need rest and that is why I withdrew.

Aware of two other allegations of homicide by abuse against Council House directors, Hawk apparently made a Hobson's choice - she accepted an option that offered no viable alternative. According to other Council House sources, with her health in jeopardy from stress due to a serious heart condition, she decided to return to California which gave her a chance to live and to fight the injustice heaped upon elderly people and minorities another day.

Evergreen Healthcare Cover-up

Evergreen Healthcare provides mental health services and has an in-home mental health program and a geriatric crisis service with clinicians who have extensive experience and training. They claim to work with adults suffering from physical or psychiatric disabilities. They also have a specialized intervention and stabilization service staffed by geriatric mental health specialists and social workers.

Steven E. Brown, CEO, Evergreen Healthcare, holds a legal responsibility to insure that his staff act in strict accordance with Washington state law. He must check that his employees and affiliates hold mandated qualifications and have specialized training yet apparently neglects to do so then irresponsibly refuses to address those issues.

By law, Evergreen employees must not act without client approval and certainly must not conduct psychiatric stings using *ad hoc* psychiatric evaluations. Moreover, a reasonable person must question that they employed a poseur as a mental health social worker without investigating her background. Evidently, Evergreen did not require a *curriculum vitae* or check her license before turning Newman loose to conduct a sting operation on an unsuspecting elderly person. That defines as elder abuse.

A well-documented misuse of therapy by phoney social workers and mental health counselors at Council House shows a pattern or practice of denial of human rights. Council House directors repeatedly choreograph mental health scenarios to control, abuse, and incarcerate elderly people if they complain about harassment. [*Witness Tampering*]

During his investigation, the author filed public records requests with Evergreen (05 Feb 07) to verify what Hawk had said. Beth Zborowski, Evergreen Media and Communications Coordinator, referred the request for copies of employment records from Newman's personnel file to Laurene H. Burton, Director Governance and Community Services.

After two weeks procrastination, Burton claimed that employment and social worker credentials for Newman do not exist in Evergreen files although she did not deny that Newman worked for Evergreen. No public information exists that Burton holds a public disclosure officer appointment

with Evergreen. Zborowski appears to be covering up that implication by silently withholding the public information on Evergreen public disclosure officers required by state law.

That law requires an agency to appoint a public records officer with a responsibility to serve as a "point of contact" for members of the public seeking public records. The agency must publish the public disclosure officer's name and contact information in a way reasonably calculated to provide notice to the public in the state register and on its web sites.

Burton's name and affiliation do not appear in any media as required under the act which gives the impression that she has posed as a public disclosure officer. The act requires all agencies to provide special training for public disclosure officers. Burton has apparently misrepresented her duties as a public official evidenced by her complete incompetence in dealing with requests and subsequent evasion and prevarication. She has obviously not received any training.

No trained public disclosure officer would sign herself as "Public Disclosure Act Officer" - a *non sequitur*. This immediately raises suspicion that Burton classifies as yet another bureaucratic poseur employed *ad hoc* to cover up Newman's lawless behavior by silently withholding public records.

Burton claimed that Newman did not submit a *curriculum vitae* when Evergreen hired her despite state law that requires full disclosure of education, professional experience, and job qualifications prior to employment. Burton's general denial prompted another request for copies of documents from the personnel files of both Burton and Newman which Burton has delayed for almost two months. [*Silent Withholding*]

Disingenuously, Burton implied that Evergreen had checked Newman's social worker qualifications by ambiguously stating in a letter: "As to licensure, the District verifies licensure on a state website set up for that purpose and does not maintain a paper copy of such. It only notes electronically that licensure is current".

State of Washington does not have a web site for social worker licensure. Instead, it relies upon accreditation by National Association of Social Workers (NASW). A check of NASW clinical records (including aliases that Newman used to distort her affiliations) revealed no record of Newman as a licensed social worker (21 Feb 07). A reasonable person must question that Evergreen employs a person for mental health social work without investigating her background or requesting a *curriculum vitae* then lets her loose to conduct a sting on unsuspecting elderly people.

Moreover, City of Seattle and King County (although cognizant of all the facts) have not addressed the Hawk incident, the unlawful incarceration of Dodson by Evergreen, and confinement of other tenants in their apartments and at other locations in retaliation for filing legitimate complaints about Mitchell's sociopathic behavior - all without psychiatric evaluation or due process of law.

Paula Adams, King County Department of Executive Services, Public Disclosure Officer, claims that King County has no regulatory authority over Evergreen (King County Public Hospital District #2, dba Evergreen Healthcare). However, Evergreen has five commissioners elected under state law and Evergreen, located within King County, has its organization proceedings recorded at the office of King County legislative authority. [*Evergreen Commissioners*]

No public information exists that Burton ever held a public disclosure officer appointment with Evergreen. Beth Zborowski covered up that implication by silently withholding a copy of the public information on Evergreen public disclosure officers required by state law. Steven E. Brown, Evergreen CEO, blatantly refused to investigate the silent withholding or to explain the behavior of Newman or Burton which gives cause to believe that he condones a cover-up.

University of Oregon Cover-up

Judith T. Newman co-directs Early Childhood Coordination Agency for Referrals, Evaluations, and Services (EC CARES), an affiliate of University of Oregon. By claiming to be a director of Council House, Newman automatically became a state actor. Her employment at University of Oregon and Evergreen also places her in that category.

Newman posed as a recently appointed Council House board member and tried to cover up repeated sociopathic behavior by Mitchell. Mitchell viciously assaulted tenants both verbally and physically when they complained about abrogation of their constitutional rights or merely looked at him cross-eyed.

Newman claimed that she holds a Council House directorship, social worker credentials, and a doctorate yet no trace of any of those credentials appears on official records. State of Washington, Secretary of State, Corporations Division records for non-profit corporations show no record of Newman as an officer, board member, director or in any other Council House capacity. NASW clinical records revealed no record of Newman as a licensed social worker and the librarian at University of Oregon could find no trace of a doctorate (21 Feb 07). [*Evergreen Healthcare*]

Washington State law requires social workers to register and to provide clients with accurate disclosure information upon initial contact. The information must include relevant education and training, therapeutic orientation, and details of a proposed course of treatment. In the case of geriatric contact, the social worker must demonstrate previous experience with senior citizens.

Social workers must inform the client of the purpose and resources available including the right to refuse treatment. Both counselor and client must acknowledge in writing the exchange of that information. According to Hawk, Newman did not comply with any of these legal requirements.

EC CARES provides early childhood special education services which have nothing to do with geriatric social work or psychiatry. Newman has no qualifications or experience to act as a

geriatric social worker. Federal law proscribes working as a social worker or working with geriatric clients without specific certification and experience.

Social workers in HUD financially-assisted buildings housing senior citizens must have specific credentials, none of which Newman possesses. They must hold a certified social worker certificate that contains evidence of: a doctorate or master's degree in social work from an accredited graduate school of social work or comparable; two years of post-master's degree social work practice under the supervision of a certified social worker for at least thirty hours per week for two years or at least twenty hours per week for three years; practice of social work for two of the previous four years; qualification by examination after submission of all necessary documents and payment of required fees; and, attend mandatory continuing education before certification renewal. Certified counselors must also obtain thirty-six clock hours of continuing education during the two-year reporting period immediately preceding renewal which includes professional ethics and law.

Newman, virtually unpublished as an academic, claims to have both a master's degree and doctorate. Oregon University library provided an abstract of a master's thesis entitled: "Three methods of training caregivers to teach specific skills to their developmentally delayed children six to 42 months of age. . . ." From that description and with Newman and two of her three employers withholding copies of her records, it seems that the master's degree does not in any way relate to social work, psychiatry, or geriatric studies.

Newman also lists herself in University of Oregon directory of Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (UCEDD) as a discipline coordinator who possesses a PhD. A search of Dissertation Abstracts International found no doctoral dissertation. This indicates that she probably does not possess a doctoral degree. University of Oregon has not provided validation that she holds any degrees at all or a copy of her "secret" *curriculum vitae*.

Public Records Machination

Randolph (Randy) Geller, Deputy General Counsel and Special Assistant Attorney General, University of Oregon, (admitted to Oregon Bar 15 Apr 03) apparently has no published opinions to his credit according to Oregon Bar records. He answered a simple public records request for Newman's curriculum vitae with a plethora of legal mumbo-jumbo and wants to charge \$530.53 for a copy of a resume. The author dreads to think what tyro attorney Geller would try to charge for a copy of the author's 50-page *curriculum vitae* which spans sixty years and includes a study of law.

Geller has apparently read the Lawyer's Little Book of Dirty Tricks that he received at his graduation from law school and disingenuously claims in his ambiguous reply to a public records request made to Department of Education, University of Oregon for Newman's *curriculum vitae* that:

. . . under Oregon law, the University may require you to pay for the "actual cost" of making the requested records available. Actual cost may include, but is not limited to, a charge for the time spent by University staff members in locating the requested records, reviewing the records in order to delete exempt material, and copying records. The University may charge for search time even if no responsive records are located or even if the records located are determined to be exempt from disclosure.

The University may also estimate charges for responding to a records request and require advance payment of the estimated charges before acting on the request. If actual charges are less than the advance payment, the balance is refunded promptly. If actual charges are more, additional payment is required. Our estimate of the charge for responding to your request is \$530.53. . . .

There is no provision in the Oregon Public Records law requiring the University to provide the "breakdown" you have requested. However, the majority of the time required to respond to your request would consist of searching for and copying the records and reviewing them for exempt material and redacting the exempt material. The material you requested includes a substantial amount that the University is prohibited from disclosing under Oregon law, and thus careful review and redaction will be required.

Geller has used a "risk management" tactic by telling only half the story and not mentioning that Oregon state law that allows public records officers to provide documents free of charge for the benefit of the general public.

ORS 192.440(4) The custodian of any public record may furnish copies without charge or at a substantially reduced fee if the custodian determines that the waiver or reduction of fees is in the public interest because making the record available primarily benefits the general public.

It seems that Geller does not believe that media disseminate information for the public good and wants to cover up malfeasance by university employees. Or, perhaps Geller wants to hinder a prosecution by concealing documents or evidence that could result in prosecution of Newman for a class C felony.

ORS 162.325(1) A person commits the crime of hindering prosecution if, with intent to hinder the apprehension, prosecution, conviction or punishment of a person who has committed a crime punishable as a felony, or with the intent to assist a person who has committed a crime punishable as a felony in profiting or benefiting from the commission of the crime, the person: . . .

A reasonable person must question why Dave Frohnmayer, University of Oregon president, has appointed a deputy general counsel/special assistant attorney general to reply to a simple public records request. His behavior implies that by withholding the resume of a relatively low-level employee the university has something else to hide.

The author's many years experience has shown that grandiose titles compensate for low pay and employment of government officials who cannot make it in the real world - as the adage goes: "If you cannot practice law then teach law, and if you cannot teach law then become an assistant

attorney general". Geller has apparently used risk management, a disingenuous practice used by university lawyers to silently withhold public records which could embarrass the university.

Attorneys either garner fatuous arguments to make open documents exempt or ridiculously price themselves out of the market. Moreover, risk management policies create serious obstacles to public awareness. Lawyers paid to reduce financial risk do not perform the same function as lawyers paid to resolve problems through due process of law. The two procedures remain incompatible because they serve opposing purposes. On freedom of expression and public disclosure issues they construe as unconstitutional.

Risk management supports blatant conflict of interest. It allows university officials to circle their wagons to cover up their wrongdoing. They then deny access to promulgated university grievance or other procedures. They ignore the maxim that justice must not only be done but be seen to be done by using a consortium of attorneys general and university officials covering their own asses.

Conflict of interest negatively impacts the public interest when lawyers occupy several positions (assistant attorney general, university lawyer, and public advocate) that require judgment on issues that affect the public good. Particular conflicts occur when an official has an ethical responsibility to follow professional codes of practice, then uses professional skills to abrogate laws for personal gain and political expediency - a typical risk management technique. Competing professional or personal interests make it difficult for them to perform their duties without bias. A mere appearance of prejudice undermines confidence although no evidence of impropriety may exist.

Risk management regulates the cost through assessment strategies that avoid or transfer risk to adversaries such as charging exorbitant fees for public records. That process either reduces vulnerability by mitigating risk or applies cost effective controls. It includes both risk prevention and damage control. It has no legitimate part in due process because it involves consideration of political, social, economic, and legal hazards to determine an optimal situation for the organization paying the advocate's tab.

Risk management in universities frequently results an erosion of rights through biased decisions that balance risk economics with mission benefits to the detriment of constitutional and human rights. The combination results in identifying and controlling events and people - political opportunism to the detriment of the public good.

Stanford University privacy and risk management policies allow administrators to withhold student directory information. In that environment, academic cheats prosper and do not fear discovery. Several universities adopted this system in attempts to comply with federal privacy regulations. However, they normally release directory information that confirms or denies the existence of a degree.

Unfortunately, this privacy (secrecy) and risk management by some universities has allowed many former students to exaggerate their credentials without fear of discovery. Former students can

exaggerate their credentials and political correctness by friends and colleagues which covers up academic and credential fraud as in the case of Washington Court of Appeals judge Mary Kay Becker.

Becker claimed to have graduated with honors from Stanford University with a “BA English with distinction” (1966). Stanford did not respond to a request for verification and validation - a procedure universally accepted in the academe. Instead, the university referred inquirers to an agency that requires personal information and approval by students before validating claims to academic degrees. [*Bimbo Jingo*]

Becker also claimed that she has an “identical” degree with a similar major from Western Washington University (WWU) granted four years later. Degrees from departments of education in state colleges rank at the lowest level in the academic pecking order. Why would anyone spend four years (and pay one of the highest tuition rates in the US) to obtain a prestigious Stanford degree then spend another four years obtaining an inferior degree with a similar major from a cow college?

Becker lied to the electorate which resulted in publication of the details in *Contra Cabal*. This cost her the election by a few votes. By the same token, Geller’s obstructive tactics make it appear that University of Oregon has something else to hide apart from Newman’s resume and her unlawful sting. That calls for digging deeper.

Conclusion

University of Oregon describes Newman’s present job as co-director for University of Oregon Early Childhood Agency for Referral, Evaluation and Screening (EC CARES). That affiliate contracts with the Oregon Department of Education, through Lane Educational Service District, to provide early intervention and early childhood special education services to children and their families who have eligibility under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. That description has nothing to do with geriatric psychiatric counseling or social work.

Newman apparently only has experience with children yet works with elderly people - ironic when one considers that Mitchell treats all Council House tenants as children and choreographs Yiddish nursery rhymes for highly intelligent and lucid senior citizens to sing.

After the author traced Newman, who used several aliases, she received a prepublication notice explaining to her that personal information about her and Evergreen Healthcare staff members would appear in *Contra Cabal*. That notice followed international codes of ethics agreed among journalists which gives featured individuals a chance to respond to charges affecting their ethical or moral character. Newman did not respond. Furthermore, neither Evergreen Healthcare nor University of Oregon have furnished a copy of her resume as required by public disclosure statutes.

Newman has allegedly committed criminal acts. Laurene Burton and Beth Zborowski (Evergreen) have allegedly conspired in a criminal cover-up of those acts. Steven E. Brown has chosen to build a wall of silence to evade his responsibility to investigate the elder abuse and to process public records requests in accordance with state law. Brown, Burton, and Zborowski have repeatedly procrastinated to a point where their behavior has become a matter of public interest.

University tyrants have traditionally used elaborate procedures and ceremonies to make their exercise of power acceptable to the public while simultaneously denying due process of law. They use independent judicial systems along lines generally accepted in law; however, a closer look at these systems shows that administrators absolutely control them by simultaneously assuming the roles of prosecution, defense, judge, and jury.

Risk management procedures hide kangaroo courts that conduct business without regard to the rights of one or both parties and with complete disregard for the rights of associated individuals. Decisions result from foregone conclusions made in secret and based upon political or other bias by judges.

University of Washington (UW) has a system of self-regulation that amounts to no regulation at all. It allows administrators to investigate themselves and find themselves not guilty. This initially operates through procrastination and kill-the-messenger techniques that delay justice and effectively deny constitutional rights. [*Sherking Responsibility*]

Universities frequently convene secret courts to deny due process and to cover up their own crimes that legitimate hearings would expose. The procedure characterizes dishonesty by violating established legal procedures. Administrators emulate Star Chamber proceedings used with increasing arbitrariness to enforce royal prerogative in the seventeenth century. Truly democratic governments have outlawed those practices ever since. However, universities operate "risk management" policies that amount to a similar denial of due process of law. Is Dave Frohnmayer, University of Oregon president and a prominent lawyer, pursuing similar policies?

Nmesis.

University of Oregon Hypocrisy

Dave Frohnmayer published his *curriculum vitae* without reservation: likewise, Martin J. Kaufman, University of Oregon, former Dean of Education. However, the same cannot be said of their employee Judith T. Newman who uses a variety of aliases and refuses to provide a copy of her credentials although required to do so by Washington state law. [*Frohnmayer*] [*Kaufman*]

Both University of Oregon and Evergreen Healthcare have hedged public disclosure requests for a copy of Newman's *curriculum vitae*, allegedly to cover up an illegal psychiatric sting that Newman conducted on an elderly person - another victim of Seattle's Jewish Mafia.

Dave Frohnmayer, President, University of Oregon spoke at Oregon Chapter of the American

Jewish Committee (30 Nov 04) in a way that apparently contradicts reality at University of Oregon. In his speech Frohnmayer claimed:

“. . . so often we are torn not between choosing right or wrong but rather choosing between two rights or two wrongs: we become confused, perplexed, even paralyzed, by the realization that our values actually seem in conflict. . . .

If you can't avoid the physical situation, you may still be able to change the psychological situation that leads the research subject to inflict senseless and brutal pain, or commit some other evil. . . .

In fact, one might even read Machiavelli to be saying that in his moral universe, it is evil not to do evil, if the price is loss of power. In Machiavelli's world there are two co-existing and incompatible codes of ethics: those which leaders must follow and those which may apply more generally to other citizens. . . .

Politicians have interests. All human beings have interests. Whenever people have interests, it gives them something to protect. So people, including politicians, lie to protect their interests and those of the people they care about. . . .

If you follow Machiavelli literally, you have, at a minimum, two other problems: You must always sleep with one eye open - if people know you will hurt them, they will try to hurt you first! And, if you put your faith, as did Machiavelli, in the preemptive strike, you always must observe, calculate and act with complete precision. There is no latitude for your error". . . .

Constitution saw corruption of the civic virtue as likely; feared tyranny profoundly; and worried how long their construction of government would last. . . .

They divided power among three competing institutions of government, separated power, held out for no heroes, and counted on checks and balances to deter tyrants. So far, 215 years later, it seems to be working. . . .

The challenge is not only the extreme ethics of murder and deceit; it is more in the dangerous immorality of civic disengagement and indifference. It can be the smug satisfaction that our values and virtues are superior to those of others. . . . It also lies in not trying to have ethical standards, and in giving up. Not caring is worse than being wrong. The struggle must be engaged. That, truly, is the Machiavellian challenge we face." [Situational Ethics]

The editor does not take issue with the validity of what Frohnmayer said although it smacks of risk management. He has no wish to derogate Frohnmayer or his integrity. However, recent aberrant behavior by his staff (for whom he holds ultimate responsibility) indicates that he may have practiced willful blindness and condoned their actions which suggests hypocrisy.

Frohnmayer criticizes the Machiavellian behavior which now applies to a majority of university presidents in the US; however, as a university president and prominent lawyer himself, he

apparently fails to recognize that his primary duty must predicate upon law and not political expedience. He holds a mandate promptly to address subterfuge and elder abuse attributed to University of Oregon employees and affiliates.

The three branches of government in US Northwest generally, and university administrators in particular, do not function according to law. They have developed a political norm that borders upon anarchy. Even the traditional fourth estate no longer acts as a watchdog on the three branches of government. It remains silent when university administrators and government officials abrogate laws to expel and jail scholars predicated entirely upon the content of their research and writing.

University of Washington administrators go to an extreme of denying both constitutional and human rights by employing hack attorneys-general to protect the public but who have no intention of following that brief. Instead, they indulge in political correctness and risk management to the detriment of the public good. They act outside the law for political expedience using risk management criteria. It seems that University of Oregon has followed suit.

In view of the Machiavellian behavior of Judith T. Newman, for whom Frohnmayer remains ultimately responsible, and the unlawful actions of her associates in Seattle Jewish Mafia, Frohnmayer may wish to try to exonerate his presidency in a Letter to the Editor that explains how he proposes to “engage in the struggle” to handle the elder abuse and unlawful activity in which his university has evidently become implicated or condones.

© Copyright 2007 by Paul Trummel
All Rights Reserved: 3 Mar 07/08:08
Edition: #801-45-80/07-0327-0742
Feedback: Webspinner@ContraCabal.org