

Calling Out Sheepdog Sanders

WE CALL FOUL

Injured workers, immigrant families, and the unfinished promise of the progressive left

Darren Raye Fonzseu • Darren Fonzseu

First manuscript • September 2026

Contents

Author note on AI and this manuscript

Opening statement

1 The worker after the work is gone

2 What the grand bargain owes labor

3 A national question that keeps returning

4 The healthcare agenda needs the rest of the worker

5 When a medical opinion becomes a benefit cut

6 The school and the promised return to work

7 Sanctuary is not a secure future

8 What I mean by the sheepdog

9 Washington and the question that would not go away

10 What the preserved exchanges show

11 The answer about jurisdiction

12 Our families are not campaign material

13 The business advantage I want examined

14 What an answer would look like

15 I use AI and I want the public to have a voice

16 We call foul and we keep the record

Sources and reading record

Reporting still to be completed

Author note on AI and this manuscript

I use AI, and I love it. It helps me organize my records, sharpen my writing, and get my voice—and other overlooked voices—heard. I am an injured worker trying to make years of correspondence, filings, video, and political experience understandable to people who were never in the room. These tools give me another way to do that work.

I will share this book with publishers free of charge. I am one retired worker trying to get the truth told to America; making money from this account is not my purpose. I call AI my little Encyclopedia Brown: a helper for following leads, organizing records, and finding the next question. The experiences and judgments are mine, and every factual claim still has to answer to the evidence.

The experiences, demands, and political judgments in this book are mine. AI assisted with research, drafting, editing, and document production. That assistance is disclosed here because readers deserve to know how the book was made. This is a first investigative manuscript, built from selected records and public sources. It is not a claim that every email in my archive has been read or every allegation resolved.

I support Medicare for All. I want injured workers' protections and broad immigrant legalization on every table alongside it. I will not accept a definition of solidarity that welcomes my support and then treats my family's needs as an interruption.

AI does not get to decide what is true because it can produce a confident paragraph. Neither does a politician, a doctor, an agency, or I. Follow the source. Read the reply. Correct the mistake. The technology helps me ask the question; the record must carry the answer.

The book uses "human rights" as my moral and political demand. Where I propose a new federal guarantee, I identify it as a proposal. My belief that people deserve protection is distinct from a claim that a particular court has already recognized an enforceable right.

I have not hired a machine to make me polite enough to disappear. I am using a tool to make my argument clearer and harder to dismiss.

Opening statement

Senator Sanders, put injured workers' federal protections and broad immigration amnesty on the table alongside universal healthcare. Put them in the platform, in legislation, in hearings, and in the organizing work that continues after an election. Give the people whose stories move your audiences a say in what happens next.

That is the demand behind this book.

I am an injured worker from Everett, Washington. I am a husband in a mixed-status family. I have spent years asking people on my own side of politics to hear what happens after a worker's body breaks and what happens when a family's life remains subject to immigration laws that its members cannot repair themselves.

I support healthcare for everyone. I want a worker to see a doctor without worrying about the bill. I also want that worker to keep a home when wages stop. I want medical evidence that can be challenged fairly. I want the cost of a work injury to remain visible and the responsible system to pay what it owes. I want immigrant families to have a secure future, beyond the next policy announcement or election.

These demands fit together. A movement claiming to represent working people should be able to carry them together.

I use “sheepdog” as a political metaphor for leadership that gathers people’s anger and then limits the remedies they are encouraged to demand. It is my judgment about agenda-setting. It does not establish a secret agreement between a politician and business interests. Readers should test the judgment against the record and against the demands I make here.

The record contains actions that deserve credit. Sanders and Patty Murray pressed for workers’ compensation oversight in 2015. Sanders has advocated a path to citizenship. Pramila Jayapal has pursued immigration legislation. Those facts belong in this book. My criticism is that recognition, proposals, and individual interventions have not delivered the full protection families like mine need.

I will tell my own experience as my own experience. A complaint I filed is evidence that I complained; it is not a verdict against the person I named. A recording of me describing a conversation proves what I said on that recording, not automatically what someone else said beforehand. These distinctions keep the argument honest enough to demand an answer.

We call foul because the unfinished work has a human cost. We call for a remedy because people still have to live tomorrow.

1 The worker after the work is gone

There is a point in an injured worker’s life when politics becomes very practical. Can I get the treatment? Will the next payment arrive? Will the person reading my file understand the injury? What happens to my family if the answer is no?

The language of public debate rarely stays with that person for long. We hear about jobs created, wages negotiated, businesses opened, and economic growth. I want to know what happens to the worker who helped produce that growth and can no longer do the work.

I worked for decades. My working life included healthcare and physically demanding jobs. After my workplace injury in 2011, I entered a long struggle over the support I needed. I eventually received a Washington workers’ compensation pension. I value that protection. It matters to my family, and I will not erase it to make a more dramatic story. My account of winning support also includes the years spent fighting and the damage I experienced along the way. [P1]

Prevailing did not end my concern for the people who were still trying to get through the system. It made me ask a larger question: why should obtaining essential protection demand so much from someone who is already hurt?

People sometimes hear an injured worker’s criticism as a request for more money in one claim. My public demand reaches beyond my own claim. I want rules that protect the next worker, including the worker who has no union, no savings, and no relative able to take over the paperwork.

The consequences spread through a household. A spouse may become a caregiver. A child may watch adults argue about bills they used to pay without discussion. The person who once measured a day by what got built or finished may spend it trying to understand a decision letter. These are foreseeable burdens of losing income and function; they deserve a place in the design of the remedy.

I have used writing, music, and video to make my case. They give me ways to speak when ordinary political participation is difficult. My demand does not become less important because I repeat it. Repetition is what happens when a question remains unanswered.

I want readers to begin with this measure of a labor movement: does it still recognize the worker after the ability to work is gone? Can that person help set priorities, or is the person welcome mainly as a story about why somebody else's campaign matters?

My pension is part of the truth. My continuing criticism is part of the truth too. A system can provide an indispensable benefit and still require reform. A person can be grateful for survival and angry about what survival required.

2 What the grand bargain owes labor

Workers' compensation is larger than health insurance. The Congressional Research Service describes a system providing medical and cash benefits for covered work injuries and illnesses, with benefits for survivors after covered deaths. Its historical bargain generally exchanges no-fault benefits for restrictions on suing an employer over the covered harm. The details and exceptions depend on the governing law. [S1]

The word "bargain" should make us ask what each side receives. Employers gain predictability and protection from many lawsuits. Workers are supposed to receive a workable remedy. When politicians discuss reducing costs, I want them to explain whose costs they mean and whose protection becomes weaker.

A medical payment is one part of the remedy. A household may still need income while the worker cannot earn it. A person who cannot return to the old occupation may need meaningful rehabilitation or retraining. Permanent disability and a worker's death raise needs that a health insurance card cannot answer by itself.

Imagine a worker whose surgery is covered but whose income has stopped. The hospital may be paid while the rent remains unpaid. That hypothetical is enough to show why the two policy questions must be examined separately. Expanding healthcare access is valuable. Adequate compensation for work-caused loss requires additional rules.

I call the arrangement unjust when the employer's legal protection is dependable and the worker's practical protection is fragile. That is a moral and political judgment. I am not telling workers that a disputed benefit decision automatically cancels an employer's legal immunity. I am demanding that lawmakers examine whether the legal arrangement delivers what it promises.

The remedy I want would make the worker's side measurable. How quickly does treatment begin? How long does a disputed payment take? Can a worker afford to contest an adverse medical report? Does rehabilitation lead to work the person can actually sustain? What happens when the injury leaves lasting disability?

Counting closed claims cannot answer all those questions. Neither can pointing to a few large awards. We need to understand the ordinary claim, the denied claim, the abandoned appeal, and the family that survives by drawing on other resources.

Federal minimum standards are my proposed answer to part of this problem. States could continue administering their systems and offering stronger protections. Congress would establish a floor beneath which essential protection could not fall. The design would require difficult decisions about

coverage, financing, enforcement, and remedies. Difficulty is a reason to hold hearings and write carefully.

I want the grand bargain discussed in the same public language as other labor rights. A worker's claim to dignity does not expire when an injury makes the worker less productive. The benefit system is where a society demonstrates whether it believes that.

3 A national question that keeps returning

The demand for national attention did not begin with my videos. The 1972 National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws reviewed state systems and recommended reforms. Decades later, Representative Joe Baca introduced H.R. 635 in the 2009–2010 Congress to establish another national commission. The introduced bill proposed investigation and recommendations; it did not itself enact a comprehensive benefit floor. [S1, S2]

That distinction matters to the movement I want. A commission can establish a record, compare states, and expose failures. A report does not automatically create a right a worker can enforce. The commission must be connected to a legislative and enforcement program, or it risks becoming another document that injured people are expected to cite while waiting.

When I talk about the missed Baca opportunity, the correct starting year is 2009. I cannot use the bill's failure to become the remedy I wanted as proof that Sanders personally killed it. I can ask Congress, including the people who claim labor as their constituency, to explain why the national question keeps returning without the protection workers are seeking.

In October 2015, Murray, Bobby Scott, Sanders, and colleagues called on the Labor Department to strengthen oversight. Their warning described inadequate support and the transfer of occupational-injury costs to workers and public programs. That was a documented intervention. [S3]

For me, that intervention creates an obligation to follow through. They identified a national problem. Injured workers should be able to see what happened afterward: the proposals advanced, the hearings sought, the opposition encountered, and the work still planned. A clear account would be more useful than another general assurance of sympathy.

I have often called the years since then "ten years of silence." The more exact criticism is a decade of inadequate follow-through on the remedy I am demanding. There were statements and investigations. I want the national floor and a lasting body that makes state performance visible.

An accountable movement can explain defeat without treating defeat as the end of its responsibility. If a committee will not schedule a hearing, say who controls the committee and what request was made. If a bill lacks votes, identify the provisions at issue. If supporters disagree about federal authority or financing, let workers hear that debate and participate in it.

The passage of time has different meanings to an institution and a household. An institution may call another study a reasonable next step. A household may already have used its savings. That difference should shape the urgency of reform.

My demand for a permanent National Workers' Compensation Commission is a proposal for continuing attention. Its work should include injured workers and surviving family members, public reporting, and recommendations that Congress must confront openly. I want responsibility to remain visible between scandals and elections.

4 The healthcare agenda needs the rest of the worker

Universal healthcare belongs in a humane society. It can reduce the fear of seeking treatment and the dependence of medical access on employment. My argument begins with support for that goal.

I object when healthcare reform is offered as a sufficient answer to an injured worker asking about compensation, income, and accountability. A proposal can accomplish something valuable while leaving other urgent needs unresolved. Supporters should be able to say exactly what their proposal does and where separate legislation is needed.

The 2025 Medicare for All text published by Sanders includes a workers' compensation coordination provision. Section 801 requires liable compensation carriers to reimburse the program for specified occupational medical services. It is therefore inaccurate to describe that text as simply giving employers a free pass on every work-injury medical bill. That provision does not itself establish my proposed national schedule of adequate wage-loss and disability protections. [S4]

The introduced House bill, H.R. 3069, also contains reimbursement coordination in section 801. Section 1102(c) preserves existing workplace rights, remedies, and obligations under federal law, state law, and collective bargaining agreements. That preservation provision is important. My demand is to improve the protection workers actually receive through enforceable federal standards alongside healthcare reform. The text does not support a claim that Medicare for All itself abolishes the worker's side of the bargain. [S16]

My question concerns the whole design. How will occupational injuries be identified? What happens while causation is disputed? Who resolves reimbursement disputes without leaving the patient waiting? How are cash benefits protected? Where can a worker appeal an inadequate decision?

These are questions a strong healthcare movement should welcome. Addressing them would make reform more credible to injured workers who have learned that the details of responsibility can decide whether help arrives.

Whole Washington's state proposal deserves the same close reading. The introduced 2025 House Bill 1445 seeks broad health coverage; its sponsor list includes Julio Cortes and Mary Fosse. That public sponsorship is a fact. It does not prove a private motive to weaken workers' compensation. [S5]

I want its advocates to make an explicit public commitment to preserve and strengthen Washington's industrial-insurance protections, explain occupational-cost coordination, and support a federal floor alongside their state work. A state health proposal should not be presented as a complete answer to a national compensation problem.

I have called state-by-state strategy "incrementalism" because I worry that workers are repeatedly asked to wait for a separate campaign to succeed before their own demand receives attention. Supporters may believe state reform is the most achievable route and a model for wider change. They should explain how that route carries injured workers forward now.

The practical test is whether the organization gives these protections an owner, a platform commitment, and a next step. An issue can be praised in principle and excluded in practice. If everyone agrees it matters but no one accepts responsibility for advancing it, the injured worker remains in the same place.

Senator Sanders, Representative Jayapal, Whole Washington, and every healthcare organization I have challenged: show us how your program handles the complete worker. Include the person whose health coverage improves but whose work-caused loss still needs compensation. We should be able to fight for both without being treated as a distraction.

5 When a medical opinion becomes a benefit cut

A doctor's words can reach beyond the examination room. In a benefit system, an opinion about causation, recovery, work capacity, or permanent impairment can affect treatment and income. A worker needs a fair way to challenge an opinion that is inaccurate or poorly supported.

This is the part of the healthcare conversation I keep trying to bring forward. Medical authority can help a person heal. When an unsupported assessment is used to deny support, that same authority can contribute to harm. More access to care does not by itself repair the process that decides whether the injury will be recognized.

Cascade PBS's 2025 reporting described workers who disputed independent medical examination reports and the consequences for their claims. It also included L&I's defense of the exams and doctors' explanations of the difficulty of determining causation. The reporting supports scrutiny of the system; it does not establish that every examiner lies. [S6]

An examination conducted to inform a claim decision is different from an appointment whose purpose is treatment. Calling both activities "healthcare" can hide the difference from the person who must attend. The worker deserves to understand the examiner's role, the questions being asked, and how the report may be used.

A disagreement between physicians does not automatically prove dishonesty. A knowingly false statement, a material omission, and a defensible difference of medical judgment are different problems. A credible accountability system must be able to tell them apart. Otherwise, both patients and careful professionals lose trust in the process.

I want independent review that examines the actual report against the records and, where lawfully available, the examination recording. I want a correction process that reaches every decision-maker who relied on a material error. A corrected document sitting in one inbox is inadequate if an earlier version continues to determine benefits.

L&I already provides complaint routes for IMEs, quality-of-care concerns, and provider fraud. Its examiner handbook describes complaint review and possible referral to the Department of Health. Those routes exist. The accountability question is whether they produce timely, adequate findings and meaningful remedies when misconduct is established. [S7]

When I raise immunity, I am asking lawmakers to examine particular legal protections and their consequences. I do not claim every doctor has blanket immunity from every kind of accountability. Civil liability, witness privileges, licensing discipline, contractual sanctions, and criminal law are different subjects. A serious review should identify which route applies to which conduct and what gaps remain.

The worker's time must count. A report can be corrected after a long fight while the person still carries the consequences of lost income, interrupted care, or housing instability. I want decision-makers to measure that interval and consider interim support, faster independent review, and remedies proportionate to established harm.

A humane movement should ask about those consequences every time it promises more affordable care. Who controls the report? Who can challenge it? What happens while the challenge is pending? What changes after a professional is found to have acted improperly?

I want good medicine and honest evidence. Workers should not have to choose between respecting medical expertise and demanding that powerful professionals answer for their work.

6 The school and the promised return to work

A retraining program makes a promise at a vulnerable moment: the old job may be gone, but another working life is possible. To an injured worker, that promise matters. It can influence whether a family believes there is a way out of dependence and dispute.

Office Careers belongs in this book because the official record lets us move beyond general anger and examine what an institution actually found. It was a vocational school used in Washington's workers' compensation system. Calling it a school that manufactured medical degrees would confuse two different subjects. The questions about retraining and the questions about medical examiners each deserve their own evidence.

In April 2026, Washington's Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment in Office Careers' dispute with L&I. The opinion describes agency concerns dating to 2014 and an audit beginning in June 2019. It recounts deficient records, graduates below the school's own typing minimum, and overbilling findings. L&I ended the provider relationship in 2020. The school challenged the agency's actions; the appellate court rejected its arguments. [S18]

That sequence matters. I cannot accurately say the agency did nothing before television coverage: the audit preceded KING5's 2020 reporting. Nor can I turn termination of a provider relationship into a claim that legislators closed every part of the school. The documented question is why concerns persisted for years before the relationship ended.

The school's appeal also needs its proper place. Challenging an agency decision is a right, including for a provider. A court's rejection of particular arguments does not transform every allegation made anywhere about the institution into a judicial finding. Readers should examine what the court decided and keep it separate from what I believe the case reveals about political priorities.

Here is what it reveals to me: oversight must measure what happens to the worker. Paying for training is an expenditure. Completing a course is an event. Neither establishes, by itself, that the injured person can obtain and sustain appropriate employment.

A system built around completed steps can look orderly while a person remains stranded. The referral was issued. The training was attended. A certificate was produced. The worker may still face the question that started the whole process: how will I support my family now?

I want lawmakers to examine how vocational success is defined, how workers can contest an unsuitable plan, and what happens when a provider repeatedly fails the standards it agreed to meet. I want the public to see the interval between the first substantiated warning and an effective correction. That interval is part of the cost of a failed program.

The court opinion does not establish that Sanders, Murray, Sawant, or any particular legislator knew each underlying fact and chose to disregard it. A claim about an official's notice requires the actual notice and the response. This case gives us a concrete question to put to them: what oversight changes do you support after a record like this?

Workers should not need a television investigation to become credible. Reporters perform an essential public service when they make a failure visible. The institutions paying for the service and deciding the worker's future still carry their own responsibility to detect and correct it.

This is why the retraining story belongs beside the medical-examination story. Both ask whether an official process produces a reliable conclusion about the worker's real capacity and needs. The mechanisms differ. The consequence of an unreliable conclusion can reach the same household.

A movement that says it stands with labor should be able to stay with that household after the headline. What protection changed? What happened to people already affected? What can the next injured worker do when the same warning signs appear?

7 Sanctuary is not a secure future

What good is a sanctuary state if its leaders will not also fight for the mixed-status families still harmed by federal immigration law?

There is a real answer to the first half of that question. Limits on state and local participation in civil immigration enforcement can provide meaningful protection. Washington's Keep Washington Working framework places limits on state and local involvement. Those protections have value to people living with fear. [S8]

They do not create permanent immigration status. A state's welcome cannot, by itself, erase a federal ground of inadmissibility or guarantee that a family can complete an immigration process without separation. Federal legislation and federal immigration decisions remain central. That is the limit I want sanctuary advocates to confront openly.

The 1996 history belongs in the discussion. President Bill Clinton signed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act in 1996. The federal unlawful-presence provisions include three-year and ten-year inadmissibility bars in specified circumstances, generally connected to departure and later seeking admission. Exceptions and waivers exist, and individual outcomes depend on the full record. A marriage alone is not a universal cure. [S9, S10]

For a family, the political history is personal. A law passed years ago can still determine whether spouses can plan a future together. A child grows older while adults wait for decisions. A family may live in a state that praises its contributions and still face a federal process it fears will separate it.

I am a husband in such a family. I want our life together taken seriously before a crisis becomes an emergency appeal. I want political leaders to understand why another statement about belonging does not settle the question of whether we can remain together securely.

I use "amnesty" to describe a broad political demand for lawful status, family unity, and relief from rules that trap long-established families. A bill must define its actual coverage, exclusions, procedures, and protections. Leaders should explain who would qualify and who would still be left out.

The public record also requires fairness. Sanders called for a path to citizenship in his 2019 State of the Union response. Jayapal co-led the reintroduction of the American Dream and Promise Act in 2025. It would be wrong to write that neither has advocated legalization. My demand is broader, and my question is about delivery, coverage, urgency, and the families still without relief. [S11, S12]

Jayapal's immigration-oversight work also extends beyond healthcare. Her office documents shadow hearings on third-country deportations, detention, and due process. These are concrete actions that belong in the account. Hearings can expose harm and build pressure; they do not themselves give every affected family lawful status. My question is how that work connects to legislation broad enough to reach the families still excluded. [S17]

State leaders cannot enact a federal amnesty on their own. They can use their political influence to demand it. I want governors, legislators, local officials, unions, and community organizations to say which federal changes they support, press their congressional delegations, and give affected families a continuing role in that work.

Amnesty also belongs in the argument about protecting Social Security Disability Insurance. Legal work authorization can bring more earnings onto reported payrolls and increase contributions to Social Security, including disability insurance. In its 2013 analysis of Senate Bill 744, Social Security's chief actuary explained that work authorization would substantially increase the number of workers paying payroll taxes. Many undocumented workers were already contributing. Legalization would also allow more workers to earn eligibility for future benefits; an honest assessment counts both contributions and benefits. That supports the case for legalization as part of a stronger social-insurance system, not a promise that any amnesty bill would have no costs. [S20]

The broader budget evidence also challenges the assumption that legalization can only drain the treasury. In 2013, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that the committee-approved version of Senate Bill 744 would reduce federal deficits by about \$175 billion over its first ten-year budget window after estimated discretionary costs. That was a projection for a comprehensive bill with several immigration changes, not a savings estimate for amnesty alone or for a bill written today. [S21]

Mass detention has a public price too. A Government Accountability Office review reported historical fiscal-year 2013 average daily costs of \$158 for immigration detention and \$10.55 for the alternatives-to-detention program. The programs and populations were not interchangeable, and those are not current prices. They nevertheless show why confinement should never be treated as the cost-free alternative. Immigration detention is a civil system, distinct from criminal incarceration. [S22]

My demand is to protect families, expand lawful participation, and count the whole cost. Let people work, contribute, and earn protection under fair rules. Do not describe an immigrant only as an expense while ignoring that worker's taxes, or call mass detention fiscal responsibility without examining its price. Human dignity matters even when a person cannot work; a family's right to be heard does not depend on a balance-sheet surplus.

Sanctuary should be defended and connected to a secure future. A family needs protection today and a route out of permanent uncertainty. I want movements to carry both responsibilities without using one as proof that the other has already been fulfilled.

8 What I mean by the sheepdog

I use a sharp title because I want an argument about political leadership. Who decides which demands enter the campaign? Who decides which demands wait? What happens when a supporter says the approved message does not cover the harm the supporter is living through?

The sheepdog metaphor describes my experience of being directed back toward a narrower agenda. It describes the feeling that the movement wants my agreement more readily than it wants my proposed remedy. Readers do not have to accept the metaphor to examine the conduct and priorities behind it.

My criticism of Sanders comes partly from the expectations he helped create. If a leader calls for a political revolution and speaks forcefully about corporate power, I expect the movement to ask who bears the loss when work permanently harms a person. I expect injured workers to help define that question.

Sanders's 2024 Senate HELP investigation into Amazon included compensation concerns. Appendix B, on printed page 152, explains that workers' compensation was largely outside the investigation's scope because of its predominantly state basis, while identifying concerns for further investigation. Amazon disputed the report and defended its safety practices. The report is therefore an important starting point for further scrutiny, not proof that every disputed claim has been adjudicated. [S13, S14]

My response is to ask Sanders to complete that part of the work. If a national investigation encounters a problem beyond its original scope, a leader can seek another investigation, propose legislation, or build a public campaign around the gap. The boundary of one report should not become the boundary of the movement's concern.

AOC belongs in this accountability conversation too. The Associated Press reported in 2019 that her campaign paid a \$1,500 fine for lacking required workers' compensation coverage for one month in 2018. That is a specific campaign compliance failure. It is not evidence that an employee was injured during the lapse or that she intentionally caused anyone's injury. [S15]

The lesson I draw is that pro-worker politics must include the obligations closest to home. Campaigns should comply with worker protections and explain failures plainly. Supporters should be able to insist on that without being accused of helping the opposition.

I also ask Jayapal, Kshama Sawant (Kshama.Sawant@seattle.gov), the Green Party, Our Revolution, and labor organizations to state their commitments to injured workers' federal protections. Their authority differs. A senator can introduce a Senate bill. A movement leader can organize, endorse, and demand action. A party can write a platform. Each should answer for the work within reach.

I am not asking these people to agree with every word I say. I am asking them to answer a specific policy demand. If they oppose it, explain why. If they support it, name the work and the next step. If they have already advanced it, show the record.

The test of a movement is partly how it treats the people whose questions interrupt its preferred speech.

9 Washington and the question that would not go away

My criticism of national leadership grew from years of trying to be heard locally. I brought the federal workers' compensation demand into political conversations in Washington. I also brought my family's need for immigration reform. In my experience, those questions were too often narrowed, redirected, or treated as problems belonging somewhere else.

I have described exchanges with Jason Call, whom I knew through local Democratic politics, in which I understood Medicare for All and Whole Washington to take priority over the federal remedy I was raising. That is my account. The reviewed material includes my later descriptions and preserved screenshots of an exchange about I-1600. The visible message challenges my characterization of the initiative; it does not itself prove the broader statement I attribute to him about excluding our federal issues. [P2, P3]

That limit does not make my experience disappear. It tells the reader what kind of evidence is being offered. Call should have the opportunity to answer the substance and to correct any account he disputes. The same standard should apply to every person named in a public book.

My July essay discussed a recorded exchange with Tyler Vega and his suggestion of further advocacy and a conversation involving an attorney. It also recorded my insistence that personal help did not answer the national policy request. A referral can be sincere and still leave the broader demand unresolved. [P3]

This is the distinction I want offices and organizations to understand. Help with one claim matters. A federal floor concerns workers who will never reach that office. The two kinds of work can proceed together, but they should not be confused.

My August constituent message asked Senator June Robinson (june.robinson@leg.wa.gov), with Representatives Cortes and Fosse copied, to support a permanent commission, federal standards, public reporting on cost shifting, a legislative memorial, and a hearing. The preserved delivery confirmation establishes that the message was transmitted. It does not prove each recipient personally read it or establish what happened inside the offices. [P4]

I have also raised allegations about people discouraging others from hearing me. My state tort-claim attachment asks for investigation into possible misuse of public position, inaccessible complaint handling, inaccurate characterizations, and related conduct. It expressly separates allegations from established facts. That distinction must remain in this book. [P1]

I have named Julio Cortes, Lillian Ortiz-Self (lillian.ortiz-self@leg.wa.gov), and Tracey Carlos in my broader account of exclusion. The record assembled here does not establish that they coordinated a campaign against me or acted on Sanders's instructions. I want the original communications, dates, and context examined before any such conclusion is asserted.

Sea Mar and the Latino Civic Alliance also appear in my criticism of who gets heard. My demand to organizations serving Latino communities is straightforward: give injured workers and mixed-status families a substantive role in setting priorities. Event participation, professional relationships, and photographs cannot establish an agreement to silence someone.

There is enough here to ask hard public questions without pretending every unresolved allegation has already been proved. Who received the request? Who answered it? What was referred, and why? Which policy demands does the organization support? When will affected families be heard on the substance?

I want those answers preserved as carefully as my own words have been preserved. The records examined later in this book include actual replies, a formal jurisdictional dismissal, and supportive as well as hostile responses. The argument is about the adequacy and follow-through of the response, not a claim that nobody ever wrote back.

When I watch leaders denounce harsh federal enforcement while my family remains insecure, I ask a painful question: how am I supposed to judge my own political side? Opposition to Trump's policies deserves to be evaluated on its record. So does the work Democrats do to change the laws and systems affecting my family. An act of enforcement and an omission are different actions, with different responsibilities. Both can be examined without treating a party label as an answer.

To Cortes and the other Democratic Latino lawmakers I have approached: what did you do with the policy request? Will you publicly support broad legalization and a national compensation floor? Will you defend an injured constituent's opportunity to be heard even when you disagree with his language? Shared identity is not the basis for an accusation. Your public responsibilities and your response to the request are the basis for these questions.

Protest at a detention facility can be necessary and courageous. I also want political work before a family reaches that emergency. Give us the legislative demand, the coalition advancing it, and the next public step. Families should not have to become a crisis before their future enters the agenda.

10 What the preserved exchanges show

One screenshot in my archive shows a message from an account displayed as "Jason." The message says the sender is working with the I-1600 group, reports hearing about accusatory messages from me, and challenges my characterization of the initiative as Republican. I identify the exchange as involving Jason Call; the screenshot alone does not independently establish every part of that identification or the surrounding conversation. [P7]

This is more specific than saying nobody spoke to me. Someone did respond. The response visible in that frame concerns the character of my criticism and the initiative's politics. It does not, by itself, contain the statement that federal workers' compensation protections were forbidden from the agenda. My broader account needs the complete exchange.

Another preserved frame shows a comment under the name of Tracey Carlos's precinct campaign. The writer describes working for L&I and handling workers' compensation. That is evidence of what the displayed account said. It does not establish that any later political disagreement was an official agency act.

A further frame preserves a hostile reply to my advocacy, including profanity and an allegation that I was harassing people. That hostility is visible. The image alone cannot settle the sender's identity, all earlier interactions, or whether an organization authorized the reply. I can describe the exchange without assigning it a larger origin the evidence does not establish.

Together, these records show why complete context matters. My demands were expressed with anger; some responses addressed that anger. The question I want readers to keep in view is whether the policy request received a substantive answer as well.

The video transcripts complicate my account in another useful way. Some recorded exchanges include encouragement to help elect a candidate before expecting the desired change. Other passages include favorable responses to federal oversight. The transcripts are machine-generated, and exact quotations and speaker identifications require comparison with the audio. I will not turn a rough transcript into polished words someone may never have spoken. [P9]

The existence of a supportive answer matters. It challenges the broadest version of my accusation that everyone refused to hear the issue. It also creates a question that a political movement ought to welcome: after the expression of support, what action followed?

An answer on a program can be a beginning. A referral can be a beginning. So can a promise to discuss the matter later. I want to follow those beginnings into a record of organizing and legislation. The argument concerns that distance between being acknowledged and obtaining an enforceable protection.

I do not need every frame to prove the same thing. A campaign page shows a public platform. A direct message shows a particular exchange. My commentary shows what I understood and how I felt. Keeping those roles distinct makes it possible to ask a harder question than whether somebody was rude: did the movement make an enduring place for this demand?

11 The answer about jurisdiction

The heading on the order is direct: "Order of Dismissal — No Subject Matter Jurisdiction." It concerns my complaint against Representative Julio Cortes. The Washington Legislative Ethics Board received the complaint in January 2026 and dismissed it in March. [P8]

I had alleged that requests for written responses were refused and that communications were intimidating, dismissive, or coercive. Those are allegations, not findings the board adopted. The board concluded that it could not use the ethics law to direct how the legislative office handled constituent work.

The order also contains criticism of me. It says my communications were not always clear, sometimes concerned matters outside state legislative oversight, and regularly contained profanity. Readers should know that. I do not get to demand that an institution preserve my complaint while removing its explanation of how it understood my conduct.

I am angry. My messages show it. I have written in language people may dislike. I also want a substantive answer about the protections I am asking them to pursue. Those two facts can exist in the same record.

A legislative office can set reasonable communication boundaries. Staff do not surrender their own safety or dignity by taking a public job. The democratic question is what usable route remains for a constituent's substantive request when an office objects to the constituent's manner of communicating. Can the request be submitted in a defined format? Can someone identify which part is within the office's authority and which office can address the rest?

The board's legal conclusion does not mean it found every disputed act appropriate. It also does not establish that Cortes committed an ethics violation. It tells us that this complaint did not fall within the board's subject-matter jurisdiction. That limit should be stated accurately, even when it is unsatisfying to the person who filed.

The mail archive takes this history further back than the current dispute. A January 2007 message from Senator Murray's office, addressed to me, described her support for a 2006 comprehensive immigration proposal. The message distinguished that proposal from amnesty and described conditional legalization. This is evidence of a response and of the position the office communicated. It is not proof that Murray personally read my original message. [P10]

There is also a December 2023 reply from Legislative Ethics Board counsel Jennifer Strus (Jennifer.Strus@leg.wa.gov) explaining that an ethics complaint needed the designated form. The preserved thread includes an Attorney General's Office response explaining that its L&I division represented the agency and could not advise me as a private citizen. It pointed to Project Help, the ethics board, and the state auditor. Those were real responses with stated institutional limits. [P10]

I want readers to see the route: a request, an explanation of limited authority, a referral, and eventually a complaint dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. The documents do not prove that everyone shared an intention to block me. They show why receiving correspondence can still leave a person without the substantive remedy being sought.

For me, the experience exposes a recurring difficulty. My workers' compensation problem touches a state system. My requested minimum standards require federal legislation. My family lives in a legislative district, but the immigration rules I want changed are federal. The offices and complaint bodies have separate powers. My family lives with the combined consequences.

The answer cannot be that every institution must exercise authority it does not have. I am asking each institution to identify the work it can do and the next responsible destination. A referral should be specific enough to use. A policy disagreement should be clear enough to challenge.

There is also a distinction between casework and lawmaking. A state representative cannot grant immigration status. An office's ability to write a support letter, make a referral, or advocate for federal reform raises different questions. If I ask for a letter and receive a refusal, the book should preserve the exact request and explanation before deciding what that refusal demonstrates.

I have compared my stepson's situation with an account I heard from Bob Hasegawa (bob.hasegawa@leg.wa.gov) about helping a Dreamer. That comparison expresses why I felt betrayed. It does not establish that the cases, legal circumstances, or requested actions were identical. The necessary evidence is the correspondence and the actual help each office was asked to provide.

A representative's birthplace does not decide whether the representative served my family well. The response does. I want the same standard applied to every office: what did you receive, what could you do, what did you do, and what reason did you give?

My complaint did not obtain the remedy I sought. The dismissal remains part of the record. So does the question that brought me there: who accepts responsibility for connecting a constituent's need to a meaningful political response?

Mary Fosse and the protection-order ordeal

The ordeal involving Representative Mary Fosse belongs in this book because it changed how I experienced political participation. In an August 2026 constituent message preserved in my records, I described criticizing her as a political operative and said that my political communications became part of harassment or protection-order allegations against me. That is my account of the dispute; the preserved email is evidence of what I reported and requested, not independent proof of every allegation. [P12]

I also disclosed something difficult: I did not appear to defend myself in that proceeding. I wrote that I feared escalation into criminal consequences. I could not afford a lawyer to defend the civil case.

That absence belongs in an honest account. It does not, by itself, tell readers what evidence the court received or why it ruled as it did.

Beau Forte, a Green Party activist who tried to help me get a hearing within the movement, is part of this story too. My understanding is that Jason Call brought a civil harassment case against him, and that Beau represented himself and won. The court file and disposition need to be obtained before I describe the precise claims or the legal reason for that outcome. [P13]

Beau also told me that Call discouraged him from hearing me. That is what Beau reported to me; I did not hear the instruction directly. If a movement's answer to an injured worker is to discourage others from listening, I believe that movement has lost its way. That is why I want this exchange examined alongside the court cases, without treating different disputes as interchangeable.

I believe my demands for injured-worker protections and immigrant-family security were treated as a problem to contain. I want that belief tested against the complete communications and court record. What conduct was alleged? Which messages were submitted? What findings did the judge make? What restrictions were imposed, and what opportunities existed to contest them? Fosse's account and the reasons given by the court must be examined alongside mine.

The complete petition, exhibits, service records, hearing record, and order were not reviewed for this manuscript. I therefore do not present this chapter as a finding that Fosse lied, that the court punished me solely for criticizing her, or that the order was unlawful. Those conclusions cannot be supplied by the title of my email or by the strength of my anger.

What I can describe is the consequence I reported: fear and the cost of representation affected my willingness to take part in a proceeding that concerned my own speech. That experience belongs beside the policy demands I was trying to raise. I want real threats and harassment addressed, and I want political criticism assessed on the actual evidence. My request is for a full, fair examination of the record and an answer to the worker's underlying demands.

12 Our families are not campaign material

Three generations of men doing manual work in my family have been affected. That is how I experience these questions: through a family history of work, injury, and insecurity. I want political leaders to hear that history before asking for our support again.

In *The People Left Off the Table*, I described taking my son to Green Party meetings and joining an overpass action. I wanted him to see that an ordinary person could bring evidence to a political movement, ask for help, and keep pressing for a change in the law. Those episodes are my recollections, preserved in that earlier book. They explain why being redirected hurt beyond the immediate policy disagreement. [P11]

I was trying to teach my children that participation mattered. They did not need their father to win every argument. They needed to see people answer the argument. When the conversation became about my anger while the federal proposal remained unresolved, I worried about the lesson they were taking home. That family history is part of what I bring to Sanders and the left today: hear the worker, explain your position, and show what follows the promise.

My father-in-law was an undocumented worker. I helped him as a lay representative after an on-the-job injury. I believe he was worked to death. That is my family's account and my belief about what happened; I am not presenting a verified medical cause-of-death finding in this manuscript.

His story is one reason I cannot separate the worker from immigration status. A person may be essential to an employer and precarious in the law at the same time. When that person is injured, the household may face economic and immigration fears together.

I expected leaders who speak for Latino communities to take families like ours seriously. I still expect it. Shared identity does not guarantee agreement, and nobody owes me agreement simply because of identity. The public claim to represent workers and immigrant families does create a fair basis for asking whether our needs appear in the actual agenda.

An organization can tell a moving story about a worker while failing to ask what remedy the worker wants. A camera can carry testimony to thousands of people. The person in the recording may still have little influence over the platform that benefits from the testimony.

My videos return to that question. The September film "Senator Sanders: Where Are Our Federal Rights?" connected worker testimony to the demand for national compensation protections. Its transcript distinguishes new narration from archival speech and attributes disputed workplace accounts to the people giving them. The purpose was to follow the story into a policy demand. [P5]

To Cortes, Carlos, and the political organizers I approached, my question about priorities remains: if you can organize for Whole Washington and Medicare for All, what prevents you from also pressing Rick Larsen and Patty Murray for injured workers' federal protections and broader immigration relief? Supporting the healthcare campaign is a political choice you can explain. So is the level of effort devoted to the other demands.

That is the standard I want movements to adopt. Before using someone's suffering to promote a campaign, ask what the person wants changed. After the campaign uses the story, explain what it did to advance that change. Keep the person's voice present when strategists decide which demands are practical.

There will be disagreements. Some workers will prioritize organizing a union. Others will prioritize treatment, housing, disability benefits, immigration relief, or a combination. The movement should make room for that complexity. There is no single approved way to be harmed and no single approved remedy that settles every need.

This also requires restraint from people telling stories, including me. I cannot claim that another worker endorses my entire program merely because our experiences overlap. I can describe the connection I see and invite that worker to speak for themselves.

The people at the bottom are capable of understanding policy. We know the difference between a sympathetic response and a changed rule. We know when an office is offering a concrete step. We also know what it feels like when our story is welcomed and our question is avoided.

I want families to be participants in reform. Our role should continue after the speech ends, after the video is shared, and after the election is won.

13 The business advantage I want examined

When I say the business side can win while workers lose, I am asking readers to follow the distribution of responsibility. If a work-caused loss is not adequately met by the responsible compensation system, someone else may have to absorb it. A household can lose savings. A spouse can supply unpaid care. Public support may become essential.

The federal government has already documented this problem. The Department of Labor's 2016 report, *Does the Workers' Compensation System Fulfill Its Obligations to Injured Workers?*, warned that inadequate state benefits put injured workers at risk of poverty and shift costs away from employers onto workers, families, and communities. It discussed the expanding role of other safety-net programs, including Social Security Disability Insurance, while workers' compensation protections were shrinking. This is evidence for investigating who pays when compensation fails. It does not prove that any particular healthcare proposal eliminates workplace rights or that a named politician intended the shift. [S23]

That connects the two demands in this book. A fair legalization policy can broaden lawful participation in the system that funds disability protection. Adequate workers' compensation can reduce pressure to make families and other public programs absorb work-related losses. I want both responsibilities on the table.

That is the concern about cost shifting raised in the 2015 congressional warning. It should be examined with evidence rather than treated as a slogan. A payment from a public program is not, by itself, proof of misconduct in an individual compensation case. Different systems have different eligibility rules and coordination provisions. [S3]

The public question is whether the overall arrangement fairly allocates the cost of work-caused harm. We need data that can distinguish lawful coordination from avoidable transfer, legitimate denials from erroneous denials, and quick correction from prolonged failure.

I want lawmakers to commission that work with workers involved in defining the questions. An accounting exercise focused only on insurance premiums will miss costs borne by households. A study of medical payments alone will miss lost earnings and caregiving. A measure of average processing time can conceal a group of people waiting far longer.

The possibility of a business advantage is not proof that every advocate intended it. People can support a policy for humane reasons and still overlook an important consequence. The proper response to that warning is to examine the design, make the responsibility explicit, and correct the gap where evidence shows one.

My criticism of single-payer advocacy is strongest when it stays there. I should not claim that a healthcare bill automatically abolishes compensation rights without showing the provision that does so. I can insist that a healthcare campaign explain how it protects those rights and joins the fight to improve them.

I want employer responsibility discussed without treating employers as a single undifferentiated group. A small employer and a multinational corporation can have different resources, but a worker's basic protection should not depend on the employer's ability to navigate the system. A fair law should provide reliable benefits and clear financing, with compliance expected from everyone it covers.

I also want professional incentives examined. Who selects an examiner? What information does the examiner receive? How are errors tracked? What is the response to a pattern of substantiated complaints? Those questions can be investigated without assuming the answer in advance.

The phrase “business agenda” has to lead to an identifiable policy consequence. My central concern is an arrangement in which protections for institutions remain strong while an injured person bears an unreasonable share of the harm. Show the financing. Show the outcomes. Let workers question both.

14 What an answer would look like

I want a public commitment specific enough that injured workers and immigrant families can tell whether it is being kept.

For workers’ compensation, my proposal begins with enforceable federal minimum protections. Congress should examine timely medical and psychological care for covered occupational harm, adequate wage replacement, rehabilitation, permanent-disability and survivor benefits, fair evidentiary procedures, accessible appeals, and protection against retaliation. The legislation would need to define coverage and enforcement clearly. These are proposed reforms, not a statement that all these national guarantees already exist.

I want a permanent national commission with meaningful injured-worker and family participation. Its budget and authority should allow continuing public work. Its reports should identify state shortcomings, assess the burden shifted elsewhere, and recommend corrective action. Congress should have to confront the findings publicly.

I want a credible route for reviewing medical evidence and professional conduct. An injured person should be able to obtain and challenge the material used against a claim. A substantiated error should be corrected where it affected decisions. Established misconduct should lead to consequences through the appropriate legal or professional process.

For healthcare reform, I want an explicit commitment to preserve compensation benefits and employer obligations, together with an explanation of payment coordination. Care should proceed promptly while institutions resolve financing disputes wherever the law can make that possible. Workers should help design the transition.

For immigration, I want broad legalization and family-unity legislation. I want lawmakers to examine the continuing effects of the 1996 framework, including separation caused by inadmissibility rules, and to explain the families covered by each proposed remedy. I want sanctuary protections connected to that federal campaign.

For political access, I want affected people at the witness table. Participation should be accessible to people who cannot travel, cannot sit through a long meeting, need an interpreter, or communicate most effectively in writing. A movement should not mistake a barrier to participation for a lack of interest.

Here is what I ask each leader to provide: a written statement of support or opposition, the bill or action they propose, the institution responsible for the next step, and a date when the public will receive an update. If an action is blocked, explain the obstacle and the alternative action being pursued.

A senator's reply should identify Senate work. A House member's reply should identify House work. State officials should identify both the state protections they can improve and the federal changes they will advocate. Parties and movement organizations should identify platform, organizing, and accountability commitments.

There is room for disagreement over design. There should also be a place where that disagreement happens in public, with the people living under the systems able to participate. I am tired of being told that the question belongs elsewhere without being shown where a responsible answer will come from.

15 I use AI and I want the public to have a voice

I use AI, and I love what it helps me do. That belongs in the open. For an injured worker with years of records and something urgent to say, help with organizing and writing is meaningful. A person should not need a campaign staff or a publisher's invitation before trying to make an argument the public can follow.

I asked whether the left's fear of AI is partly fear that the people being led will become harder to control. That is a political question about power. I cannot report an answer hidden inside someone else's mind.

Sanders and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez announced an AI data-center moratorium proposal in March 2026. Their stated concerns included democratic oversight, workers, privacy, and the public costs of infrastructure. Those are positions that can be examined on their merits. The announcement does not establish that their purpose was to prevent constituents from criticizing them with AI. [S19]

I can take risks seriously and still insist on public access to useful tools. A worker concerned about job loss can also use AI to understand a benefit letter. A family concerned about surveillance can also use a drafting tool to make a request clearer. People have more than one interest in the same technology.

My question to Sanders is therefore concrete: will your proposed safeguards preserve practical access for disabled people, workers, families, and independent critics? Will the people using these tools to examine government and employers have a meaningful voice in writing the rules?

Fear is not owned by one political party. A warning deserves scrutiny when it comes from a Republican, a Democrat, a socialist, or a technology company. What harm is supported by evidence? Which provision addresses it? Who gains control under the proposed rule? Who pays? Those questions apply to the industry as well as its critics.

I do not want another powerful institution deciding that the people at the bottom are incapable of questioning it. That includes the companies building AI. A product that helps me today still deserves scrutiny over privacy, reliability, cost, and control. Loving a useful tool does not require surrendering judgment to its owner.

This manuscript shows why judgment matters. The introduced House Medicare for All bill contains a provision preserving workplace rights. That has to appear in a book criticizing the movement's treatment of injured workers. A tool that simply repeated my angriest formulation would help me publish an error. Reading the actual provision makes the demand more precise: preserve what exists and fight for the federal protections still missing.

AI can help sort an archive. It cannot make an absent reply appear, establish that an email was personally read, or turn my account into an adjudicated finding. It can help prepare questions for a public official. The official's answer must still be recorded accurately.

When I say I want other overlooked voices heard, I am making a commitment about access. I do not claim those people have appointed me to speak for all of them. Let them use the tools, tell their own stories, disagree with me, and shape the agenda themselves.

That is the challenge I want on the table: build protections against harm while keeping the public's ability to investigate, create, organize, and criticize. A movement that believes in ordinary people should be willing to answer scrutiny from ordinary people—even when the document they bring was made with AI.

16 We call foul and we keep the record

I began with a demand to Senator Sanders. I end with an invitation to everyone who has been told that their urgent need must wait behind the campaign's chosen issue.

Keep asking the specific question. Keep the complete reply. Preserve the context when somebody disagrees. Correct your own account when the evidence requires it. The point of keeping a record is to make the truth harder to evade.

My own record includes pain, anger, persistence, help received, referrals, unanswered questions, and allegations that remain unresolved. I do not need to flatten it into a story in which every person acted the same way. The pattern I am challenging can be tested through particular events and policy choices.

I want critics of this book to answer its strongest claim. Universal healthcare alone does not settle the injured worker's compensation needs. Sanctuary alone does not establish a mixed-status family's secure legal future. A movement can defend both immediate protections and the further reforms people need.

I will accept a correction that makes the record more accurate. I will welcome legislation that meets the need, even if it arrives from someone I have criticized. The purpose of calling foul is to change what happens to people, not to preserve an argument forever.

Senator Sanders, AOC, Representative Jayapal, Kshama Sawant (Kshama.Sawant@seattle.gov), the Green Party, Our Revolution, Whole Washington, Washington's elected officials, unions, and community organizations: tell us what you will carry forward. Answer the worker who can no longer work. Answer the family that lives here and still cannot plan a secure future together.

When a report is wrong, the person harmed needs correction and a remedy. When a benefit system fails, the person waiting needs support. When a law keeps a family in insecurity, the family needs a political movement willing to change the law.

That is the work I want measured. That is the promise I want kept.

We call foul. Put our rights on the table and give us a part in writing what comes next.

Sources and reading record

The numbered sources support the specific public facts cited in the chapters. The P-series identifies my own records, which support my testimony and advocacy history. The underlying original correspondence and recordings remain important where my essays summarize an earlier event.

S1. Scott D. Szymendera, Congressional Research Service, Workers' Compensation: Overview and Issues, R44580, October 2017 edition. Preserved report in my archive. Used for the structure and history of compensation; this historical edition is not a complete account of later state amendments.

S2. Joe Baca, H.R. 635, 111th Congress, introduced January 2009. Official introduced bill and metadata. Sections 8 and 9 proposed reporting and termination of the proposed commission. My permanent-commission demand goes beyond that temporary design.

S3. Senator Patty Murray, October 2015 announcement of the Murray–Scott–Sanders oversight letter. Official announcement.

S4. Sanders, 2025 Medicare for All proposal, section 801. Published legislative text. A proposal, not an enacted compensation remedy.

S5. Washington HB 1445, introduced 2025 version. Official bill text. Used for the proposal's scope and printed sponsors; this manuscript does not claim a review of every later version or an enacted repeal of Title 51.

S6. Lizz Giordano, Cascade PBS, August 2025, The controversial medical exams that help decide WA workers' comp. Reporting includes worker allegations and institutional responses.

S7. Washington L&I, Medical Examiners' Handbook and Report Healthcare Provider Fraud. Complaint routes are evidence that accountability mechanisms exist, not proof of adequate outcomes in every case.

S8. Washington Attorney General, Immigration and Keep Washington Working Guidance and Civil Immigration Enforcement in Washington.

S9. William J. Clinton Presidential Library, IIRIRA archive description. Used for the 1996 signing history.

S10. Immigration and Nationality Act, section 212(a)(9)(B), codified at 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(9)(B). Official 2020 U.S. Code text. Historical statutory source for the bars discussed; the manuscript gives no individual eligibility or travel determination.

S11. Sanders, 2019 State of the Union response. Contains advocacy for a path to citizenship.

S12. Jayapal, 2025 American Dream and Promise Act reintroduction announcement.

S13. Senate HELP Committee majority staff, 2024, The Injury-Productivity Trade-off. Report, Appendix B, printed page 152.

S14. Amazon, Response to Senator Sanders's workplace-safety report. Included so readers can examine the company's position.

S15. Associated Press, January 2019, Ocasio-Cortez campaign workers' compensation fine. The report attributes confirmation of the lapse and payment to a New York Workers' Compensation Board spokeswoman.

S16. H.R. 3069, 119th Congress, introduced House Medicare for All bill, sections 801 and 1102(c). Official text. Used for reimbursement coordination and preservation of workplace rights; this is introduced legislation.

S17. Representative Pramila Jayapal, Immigration oversight. The office describes shadow hearings; this manuscript does not characterize them as enacted immigration relief.

S18. Washington Court of Appeals, Division II, Office Careers v. Department of Labor & Industries, No. 60252-1-II, April 2026, published opinion. Opinion reproduced by Justia. Primary judicial record; the findings described should not be generalized into a criminal fraud verdict or a finding about unnamed legislators' motives.

S19. Sanders and Ocasio-Cortez, March 2026, AI Data Center Moratorium Act announcement. Cited for their stated proposal and reasons, not evidence of an undisclosed motive.

S20. Social Security Administration, Office of the Chief Actuary, 2013 response to Senator Jeff Sessions on Senate Bill 744. Explains payroll-tax participation after work authorization and future benefit eligibility. Historical proposal analysis, not an estimate of every legalization policy.
https://www.ssa.gov/oact/solvency/JSessions_20130709.pdf

S21. Congressional Budget Office, 2013, CBO Releases Two Analyses of the Senate's Immigration Legislation. The approximately \$175 billion figure combines estimated direct spending and revenue effects with discretionary costs for the committee-approved proposal over fiscal years 2014–2023.
<https://www.cbo.gov/publication/44345>

S22. Government Accountability Office, 2018, Immigration: Progress and Challenges in the Management of Immigration Courts and Alternatives to Detention Program, GAO-18-701T. Reports fiscal-year 2013 average daily costs and limitations in program-performance data.
<https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-18-701t>

S23. U.S. Department of Labor, 2016, Does the Workers' Compensation System Fulfill Its Obligations to Injured Workers? Executive summary, on inadequate benefits and costs shifted to workers, families, and communities.
<https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/files/WorkersCompensationSystemReport.pdf>

P1. Darren Fonzseu , August 2026, Consolidated Washington State Tort Claim attachment. Personal filing containing testimony, referenced records, and investigative allegations. It is not an adjudication. Private identifiers and clinical details are excluded from this manuscript.

P2. Darren Fonzseu , June 2026, Sanders the Sheepdog and the Northwest Single-Payer Trap. Earlier advocacy essay, revised and qualified in this manuscript where necessary.

P3. Darren Fonzseu , July 2026, Our Revolution Promised a Revolution. Personal account and discussion of video records. The underlying unedited recordings were not all reauthenticated for this first manuscript.

P4. Darren Fonzseu , August 2026 constituent-email delivery record, Injured workers are not selfish—restore the bargain, preserved in the author's files. The message requested federal standards, a commission, reporting, a memorial, and a hearing.

P5. Darren Fonzseu , September 2026, Senator Sanders: Where Are Our Federal Rights? and preserved transcript. The script-based accessibility transcript identifies archival speakers and synthetic narration; the video remains the primary audio record.

P6. Darren Fonzseau , September 2026, Evidence and editing record. Identifies source limits, unresolved originals, and distinctions between political criticism and proven intent.

P7. Screenshots preserved in the author's August 2026 evidence folder. Frame 13 shows an account identifying an L&I role; frame 14 shows a campaign page; frame 15 shows the I-1600 message; frame 16 shows a hostile reply. Preservation dates, video publication dates, and dates of underlying messages are different. The book does not infer a message's original date from a screenshot filename.

P8. Washington Legislative Ethics Board, Complaint 2026 No. 3, In re Julio Cortes, March 2026, Order of Dismissal for No Subject Matter Jurisdiction. Preserved two-page order. Both scanned pages were read for this manuscript.

P9. Author's preserved video transcripts part one and part two. Machine transcription contains errors. Used to identify exchanges for further audio verification; no new exact attributed quotations are drawn from uncertain transcript passages.

P10. Original-message records in the author's recovered Thunderbird mailboxes: January 2007 Murray office response in "old mail"; December 2023 Strus response in "INBOX," including the forwarded Attorney General's Office reply. The research record retains mailbox positions and message hashes. A targeted automated scan examined 21,710 messages across four recovered mailboxes and selected candidates for review. This was a search of a recovered archive, not an exhaustive human reading or a complete search of the live Yahoo account. The first extraction prioritized plain-text bodies, so absence from its results does not prove no message exists. Private addresses, telephone numbers, and unrelated correspondence are excluded from the public manuscript.

P11. The People Left Off the Table, the author's earlier book. The preserved 62-page public edition and the opening of the local audiobook narration script were reviewed. Chapter 4 supplies the author's recollections of political participation with his son; the prologue develops the linked demands for healthcare, injured-worker protection, and immigrant-family security. The earlier book records the author's testimony and political argument; it is not independent corroboration of allegations about others. Public audiobook: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cjpV0DYjc6k>. Preserved text: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cZHYnjLnEn-WAproNGtxvhH-Sht-lxRg/view>.

P13. Author's clarification during preparation of this manuscript: his account of Beau Forte's efforts to help him, his understanding of the Call-Forte case outcome, and what he says Forte told him about Call. This is first-person testimony and secondhand reporting; the underlying court disposition and complete exchange remain to be verified.

P12. Author's preserved August 2026 constituent-email and forwarding record, When Political Dissent Becomes Harassment: I Call Foul. Contains Darren's account of the Fosse-related proceedings, his nonappearance, and his request to examine the complete court file. The delivery record does not establish personal reading by an official, the court's findings, or the merits of the allegations. Private contact details are omitted.
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1T9-xQA_jFRLIIVpRFERRCOUn04ZzYztO/view

Reporting still to be completed

This manuscript establishes a documented argument and identifies its limits. Before describing it as a completed investigative exposé, the outstanding reporting includes the complete Fosse-related court file and response, the Call–Forte court file and disposition, the complete original Call and Vega exchanges, the stepson support-letter request and reply, Hasegawa’s relevant correspondence, full audio checks of disputed quotations, and records showing what particular officials received and did. Each named office should have a chance to answer a precise account of the conduct attributed to it. No new requests for comment were sent in producing this draft.

The population affected by compensation and immigration systems is much larger than my household. This manuscript does not calculate how many people were harmed by a particular politician’s inaction or attribute millions of individual injuries or deaths to that cause. Establishing scale and causation requires separate evidence. The need for that work does not erase the concrete failures and unmet needs described here.