

Analysis of David Berman's April 10 False Statements

So, we have David Berman on his blog stating a flagrant lie on April 10:

"At the final candidate forum/debate on April 6, Briggs stated unequivocally that he would demand the resignations of all SCA committee members if he is elected and is in a controlling position on the Board. He also indicated that he would use this as an opportunity to "reevaluate" the committee members."

But, as you can hear from John Briggs' actual audio recordings, John said in his opening statement to the SCA Forum on April 6, 2008:

"I will request that all board officers and committee chairs submit their resignations so we could determine if we want to retain them or replace them."

And, John Briggs followed up in his closing statement at that Forum with the following:

"I think that all of the officers, and all of the chairmen, should submit their resignations so we could accept them or reject them, depending on how we view that chairman of that committee and/or that officer--including president, treasurer and secretary."

Did John Briggs mention committee "members" in any way? **He absolutely did not**--in neither of his Forum statements.

What should happen when a self-acknowledged forger like David Berman commits this kind of flagrant deception with the intent to influence the election outcome by enraging all SCA committee members? Do you consider this kind of personal attack as just "politics as usual"? We do not!

What if it could be shown that dozens of personal attacks by David Berman against John Briggs and Bob Frank during the past year have been laced with such lies and gross deceptions? Would you conclude that to be just "politics"?

Ask yourself, why would David Berman make up such a big lie? John Briggs clearly stated his proposal twice. There is **no chance** that Berman could claim he just misunderstood.

How could anyone believe anything Berman says?