

Stephen (aka Stefan) A. Mitchell (36), 6126 8 Avenue NW, Seattle, the directors of Council House Inc., Seattle, [801-02a] and their attorney Maureen L. Mitchell, Short, Cressman, Burgess (SCB), Seattle, [<http://www.scblaw.com>] have indulged in yet another assault on press freedom to cover up malfeasance by censoring the op-ed article *Tall Structure Terror* [801-05]. They have obtained an extension to an antiharassment order (19 Apr 01) [806-00] against this reporter by bringing several contempt motions that relate to an article published more than a year ago. They have used a time-warp strategy to lead a disingenuous and biased judge by the nose.

This action typifies Mitchell's ongoing paranoia and hysteria supported by Judge James A. Doerty, Superior Court, State of Washington. Doerty continues to deny due process of law [806-00] and arbitrarily accepts unsupported evidence concocted by Mitchell, a Council House resident, Felipe Jacques, and an attorney, Maureen L. Mitchell.

In keeping with the international hysteria associated with the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center (WTC) (11 Sep 01), Mitchell has accused this reporter of provoking someone to kill him by publishing the article. This reporter does not wish to trivialize the WTC disaster. As a survivor of the European holocaust (that included the London blitz and its subsequent V1 and V2 attacks causing 90,000 civilian deaths) he knows the horror of six years of terror. Subconsciously, that experience probably caused him to delay publication of his "prophetic" article until a time least likely to instill fear into Council House residents.

Doerty based his finding upon Mitchell's hysteria and subornation. He claimed that the article contains "repeated inflammatory rhetoric connecting Mitchell and his directors with concepts like Islamic terrorism and racism are a violation of the antiharassment order issued April 19, 2001 in that it causes the victims to reasonably feel under surveillance".

He further claimed "that the [other] articles including this information were authored prior to the antiharassment order does not matter because they were posted on the internet after the order" - knowing that he made a false and misleading statement. He continues to refer to Mitchell and his supremacist cohorts as "victims" of press reports. Moreover, Doerty allows Mitchell to harass this reporter with contempt findings and other restrictions. They include probably unprecedented censorship of his web site that violates both the First Amendment to the US Constitution and the Washington Constitution.

Doerty has never defined "victimhood" yet continues to use that term to describe media terrorism - publication of names, ages, and addresses, that form part of legitimate journalism practice. Doerty also falsely claimed that this reporter had published social security numbers. Recently (10 May 01), while reaffirming journalism practice in a web site case in Washington Superior Court,¹ Judge Robert H. Alsdorf found that publishing names, home addresses, and ages, obtained

from public records does not victimize those mentioned. Moreover, this reporter has not connected unnamed “victims” with Islamic terrorism as claimed.

Rishel, a Council House “security” employee and Islamic convert, openly sympathized with Islamic terrorists and voiced a wish to go to Afghanistan to fight with the mujahideen. Mitchell and Audrey F. Dunbar (32), 14504 Madison Way, Lynnwood, a Mitchell assistant responsible for running the computer laboratory, knowingly did nothing to protect residents from him. That counts as news. Moreover, Mitchell, with full knowledge of Rishel’s sympathies, gave him master keys to the building. Rishel did not return them. That also counts as news.

This reporter informed Donald R. Silverman MD, 3718 48 Avenue NE, Seattle, now President, Council House Inc., of the incident in a letter (18 Jun 00) and published the article (08 Aug 00). Silverman apparently took no action. This reporter then sent prepublication copies to all the Council House directors (19 Nov 00) but none of them made any comment. Then he released the piece to the mainstream press. He uploaded it to the web site (12 Dec 00) after a deliberate delay to hold residents harmless. Both Doerty and Mitchell ignore these facts to create mass hysteria that prejudices this reporter and has cast an aspersion upon his ethics following the WTC disaster.

The “prophetic” article predates the antiharassment order by more than four months and the WTC disaster by nine months. Mitchell has immorally used the recent WTC event to draw attention to the article for his own malevolent purposes then filed false testimony.

Ironically, Dunbar issued a written directive after WTC (19 Sep 01) stating: “In light of what has happened in New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania we need to be alert. We have never experienced bomb threats to our building. We hope we never do”. She then said that Council House would start a program for disaster control.

To use the Court’s own expression, it continues to use “red herrings” to try to prove a point. The article appeared on the internet before the date of the order as both Doerty and Mitchell know. Mitchell printed a copy before the hearing (20 Mar 01) and Doerty placed it in the court record. If the Court had examined the article more carefully (with an unbiased disposition) then it would have seen that it bears a publication and edition date.

December 1999, government had warned vulnerable ethnic groups to take precautions against terrorism. For Mitchell and Council House directors to continue to employ an avowed Islamic terrorist sympathizer in a predominantly Jewish community after such a warning ranks as neglect and dereliction. Although the article contained information of vital concern to Council House residents he delayed publication for several months to avoid instilling any fear into them. When Mitchell and the Directors, informed of the danger through their attorney, did nothing to secure the building, this reporter informed the FBI (19 Jun 00).

Mitchell has used a time- warp strategy that distorts the flow of time to move events from one time period to another. He has misled the court into thinking that this reporter indulges in literary terrorism. Instead, this reporter exposed Mitchell's incompetent and neglectful management of Council House that put residents in potential physical danger. Mitchell has not only tried to kill the messenger but also to burn the prophet at the stake using subornation as an accelerant. Now read the article and form your own opinion regarding censorship. Does the censorship protect the public or does it protect the self-interest of Mitchell and his directors? [801-05]

Nmesis.

1. City of Kirkland vs. William Sheehan et ux. et al. State of Washington, Superior Court, King County (01-2-09513-7 SEA).

© Copyright 2001 by Paul Trummel

All Rights Reserved: 05 Nov 01/07:08 PST

Edition: #801-05a-01-1108-1655

Feedback: webmaster@contracabal.org