

Declaration from Former Federal Aviation Safety Agent Rodney Stich To The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States

Date: April 12, 2004

I, Rodney F. Stich, declare:

This April 12, 2004, declaration is sent to Thomas H. Kean, Chairman of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, by certified mail.¹ The purpose of this declaration is to place *another* declaration into the commission records from a former government agent concerning the documented misconduct in government offices that played key roles enabling terrorists to seize four airliners on September 11, 2001.

The members of this commission are circumventing the primary areas of blame for the events of 9/11. This standard tactic of controlled investigations has repeatedly prevented exposure and correction of serious corruption in government offices, enabling the continuation of catastrophic effect upon the United States. The members of this commission are intent at showing “mistakes” were made that led to 3,000 people being killed rather than reveal the criminal actions that made 9/11 possible.

The basis for the statements in this declaration is based upon my many years of experience as a government agent and subsequent investigations, which included the input from large numbers of other present and former government agents.²

During my activities as a federal aviation safety agent I had been given the assignment to correct the conditions causing the worst series of airline crashes in the nation’s history. In this assignment I acted as an independent counsel, conducting hearings and receiving evidence, which *proved* the existence of deep-seated corruption within the government’s aviation safety offices related to a series of fatal airline crashes.

The standard coverup of corrupt and criminal misconduct following that proceeding caused and enabled numerous catastrophic blowback consequences. These included years of preventable aviation tragedies—of which the hijackings of four airliners on September 11, 2001, were only the most recent and prominent consequences.

This declaration highlights the *primary causes* for the success of the hijackers on 9/11, including the:

- Culture and deep-seated misconduct within the government’s aviation safety offices that blocked the federal government from performing its aviation safety responsibilities.
- Coverups and obstruction of justice relating to these federal offenses.
- Intelligence failures exacerbated by the deep-seated corruption that subverted the function of government agencies, and especially in the U.S. Department of Justice and the Central Intelligence Agency.
- Failure of key people in government to act on intelligence.

Four Areas of Primary and Secondary Blame for Events of September 11, 2001

The *primary blame* for the success of the hijackers on 9/11 was the misconduct of people in certain government aviation safety offices that created the conditions enabling hijackers to seize four airliners and hijackings of the prior 50 years, all of which were easily preventable. The deep-seated corruption within the FAA were addressed in a 4000-page FAA hearing record during which I acted as an independent counsel.

The tragedy-related corruption was charged in various judicial filings during which I sought to report the federal crimes to a federal judges under the mandatory requirements of the federal crime reporting statute, Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. I sought to report these matters to members of Congress, all of whom refused to receive evidence and for various reasons engaged in coverup.

Secondary primary blame for the events of 9/11 were the coverups and obstruction of justice that blocked present and former government agents—including me—from reporting these federal offenses The most heavily documented evidence of the felony coverups and obstruction of justice were the actions by federal judges and Justice Department lawyers to lawsuits that I filled under the federal crime reporting statute seeking to report these matters. Their obstruction of justice were federal crimes per se.

Subordinate and contributing blame for the events of 9/11 were so-called “intelligence failures” by people in Justice Department offices and the CIA. These “failures” were undoubtedly influenced by the widespread corruption in these two government offices.

Contributing subordinate blame arises from the failures of politicians and members of Congress to act when insiders provide information of corruption in government offices.

Another contributing subordinate blame arises from the “controlled investigations” that covered up and obstructed justice in prior areas of misconduct involving politicians and government officials.

Much of this information is detailed in my various informational books and in charges made in my various filings in the federal courts

Further Details Supporting These Charges

Corrupt Culture in Certain Government Aviation Safety Offices

The misconduct in certain government aviation safety offices that repeatedly blocked the federal government from meeting its aviation safety responsibilities is reflected in the following conditions that I and other government agents discovered, that are stated here as examples:

- Refusal of FAA management personnel in certain segments of the FAA to take, and to block, authorized and required actions on known and reported major aviation safety problems, safety violations. Some of these actions were criminal violations that resulted in great aviation tragedies.
- Included in the types of obstructionist actions by FAA management, that blocked federal safety agents from carrying out their aviation safety duties, were the following:
 - Pressure, threats, and retaliation against federal aviation safety agents for attempting to report and correct major safety problems.
 - Removal and destruction of official records reporting safety problems, safety violations, and criminal violations.
 - Placement of unqualified people in key positions for political gains, including the office of FAA administrator, and who are not capable of recognizing threats needing corrective actions, and are not capable of controlling rogue elements within the agency. A typical example of this was the failure of the politically-correct FAA administrator and other FAA personnel to order the simple and inexpensive preventative measures to block hijackers from taking control of an airliner. There were numerous reports, shortly prior to 9/11, by the White House, the FAA, the Department of Transportation, the Justice Department, and the CIA, of planned hijackings, for which every one of the people in control of these offices could have ordered the simple preventative measures³ that would have prevented terrorists from taking control of the four airliners.
- Examples of how the government’s aviation safety responsibilities were sabotaged by people in the government’s aviation safety offices, that I and other federal aviation safety agents discovered, reported, and tried to correct, included the following:
 - *Airline training and competency check programs* at certain airlines that were a farce, which allowed untrained and unsafe crewmembers to continue in airline operations. These programs did not meet the intent or the specifics of federal aviation safety directives. This documented misconduct was especially prominent at United Airlines, which had some intriguing blowback and “butterfly effects” related to September 11, 2001.
 - *Falsified records* at certain politically powerful airlines, to falsely indicate federally required pilot and flight engineer training and competency checks had been performed, when in fact they were not performed.
 - *Falsified records* indicating that federally required maintenance practices had been accomplished, when in fact they were not accomplished.
 - *Dangerous piloting techniques, such as high sink rate approaches*, that went uncorrected. One example of the deadly consequences was a pilot that I reported having a high sink rate approach. Despite my report of his dangerous piloting

- technique and the federal directives requiring that he receive corrective training, FAA management refused to require it. Several months later, due to this dangerous condition, the plane crashed at Salt Lake City, causing forty-three people were cremated alive. I was removed from my duties for six weeks when I reported this common problem of other senior pilots at United Airlines.
- *Dangerous flight engineer problems* at a politically powerful airline that was involved in several accidents and near accidents.
 - *Dangerous practice of pilots descending too low* during visual and instrument conditions, which I reported. Two consequences of this known and unaddressed problem were airliners that crashed into Lake Michigan and during an approach to the Cincinnati Airport.
 - *Airline refusing to provide government-required pilot training and then falsifying government required records* to conceal this practice. The results were poorly trained and qualified pilots at a major airline and numerous crashes attributed to this misconduct.
 - *Refusal to require backup flight instruments at a major airliner*, that resulted in numerous near-crashes and in one crash that caused over 100 deaths before changes were finally ordered.
 - *Airline hijackings that were easily and inexpensively preventable*. I and other inspectors reported the urgency of inexpensive and easily accomplished preventative measures that FAA management was authorized and required to order be taken. FAA management refused to order the measures that would have halted the deadly practice of airline hijackings that have occurred for the past 40 years throughout the world. The continuation of this refusal to act and retaliation against inspectors making reports of the necessity for these corrective actions made possible the success of 19 hijackers on September 11, 2001.
 - *Many other problems*, which I repeatedly reported, and detail in my various government and non-government writings and reports, and in informational books that I have written.

Complicity of Political National Transportation Safety Board Members

I and other federal aviation safety agents reported the serious internal FAA problems, including criminal acts related to several prior airline crashes, to various members of the National Transportation Safety Board (and its CAB Bureau of Aviation Safety predecessor). Instead of responding as required by law, they covered up for the federal offenses, which enabled the preventable crashes to continue. In response to the resulting crashes, they falsified their official accident reports by omitting material facts that absolved them of blame and covering up for the misconduct in the FAA. The deadly problems continue to this day—and were primarily responsible for the conditions enabling terrorists to hijack four airliners on 9/11.

Complicity of FBI and Other Justice Department Personnel

Starting while I was a federal aviation safety agent, and while acting as an independent counsel, I made my charges of deadly federal criminal misconduct related to several prior airline crashes known to FBI agents and several U.S. attorneys, along with the head of the Department of Justice. I encountered the standard refusal to receive evidence that implicated federal personnel.

I encountered Justice Department block when I circumvented the block and appeared before a federal grand jury in Denver while I was a federal agent. I encountered their blocks when I filed federal actions under the federal crime reporting statute seeking to report the Trojan-horse-like corruption in government offices. In 1986, Justice Department prosecutors charged me, a former federal agent and witness, with criminal contempt of court for attempting to report criminal activities, including those that created the conditions enabling terrorists to seize four airliners on 9/11.

I had notified FBI chief Robert Muller of the criminal activities while he was in the U.S. attorney's office in San Francisco and then after he became head of the FBI, followed by the usual coverup. The same notification was sent to U.S. Attorney John Ashcroft and prior U.S. attorneys. They refused to receive the evidence that I and other

former government agents sought to report related to other areas of corruption implicating government officials and other government personnel.

Justice Department personnel prosecuted the head of a multi-agency task force⁴ that focused on the drug operations of people in the New York-New Jersey areas, including the Jersey City terrorists who the following year bombed the World Trade Center in 1993. The prosecution of that agent halted the investigations and sent a message to other government agents not to proceed with the investigations. That obstruction of justice tactic enabled the Jersey City terrorists to proceed with the bombing of the World Trade Center a year later, in 1993.

This typical retaliation against government agents is endless, and includes the false imprisonment of another FBI agent, one of my many sources. He was falsely charged to silence his exposure of CIA involvement with organized crime drug smuggling, illegal funding of Iraq during the 1980s, and other offenses.

The same culture was shown by the FBI's support for organized crime in the Boston area, with William Bulger and others, wherein FBI agents—with Washington approval—provided the names of government informants to organized crime figures, causing the informants to be murdered. I have acquired information from organized crime insiders that the same conditions existed in the New York City area, showing the widespread culture in the FBI, which obviously is not compatible with protecting U.S. interests. Considerable other evidence is available to show the depravity of this culture. I offered this information to members of Congress and the Justice Department; none responded.

Complicity of Many Members of Congress

For several years prior to September 11, 2001, I repeatedly notified members of Congress (some by certified mail) of the serious corruption that I and other government agents had discovered in the government's aviation safety offices and within the Justice Department and the Central Intelligence Agency. I repeatedly requested that they receive testimony and evidence from me and other former and present government agents. Our offers were repeatedly ignored. It is this group in Congress that shares peripheral blame for the events of 9/11.

The serious matters that I sought to report included, for instance, reports of (a) surface to air missiles being acquired by terrorists, made possible by actions of FBI and CIA personnel; (b) suitcase nuclear devices being smuggled from the former Soviet Union through Lithuania, and which will surely be used in American cities at some future date; (c) drug smuggling into the United States by people acting under cover of government positions and covert operations; (d) Soviet spies in the FBI and CIA offices, made known prior to their discovery; (e) retaliation against FBI agents seeking to report criminal activities of CIA personnel; and (f) other matters inflicting harm upon national interests.

No one ever denied the validity of my charges. Nor would they be in a position to have done so. Initially, when the corruption was related primarily to the FAA, some members of Congress admitted the gravity of what I charged. Some refused to act on the excuse that these matters were not in their area of responsibilities. (Tell that to the families of the 3,000 dead on 9/11!) The matters *were* in their areas of responsibilities. They also had the option of requesting the General Accounting Office (GAO), the congressional investigative body, to receive my evidence. They also had a responsibility under the federal crime reporting statute to receive my evidence of federal crimes.

The "Butterfly Effect"

Ironically, if any of the recipients of these charges had acted when this information was presented to them, it is very probable that the corruption within the government's aviation safety offices (and elsewhere) could have been halted and the conditions enabling hijackers to seize airliners for the past 50 years corrected. It is the "butterfly effect" of these covered up areas of misconduct that continue to undermine the United States in many areas, including protection against terrorist attacks.

Initial Actions to Report Corruption in FAA: Acting As Independent Prosecutor

My initial attempts to report and force correction of the misconduct resulting in a series of preventable airline crashes⁵ occurred while I was an aviation safety agent. I exercised remedies in law that permitted me to act as an independent counsel. For six

months I conducted hearings, obtained testimony and documents, and in a 4000-page hearing record proved the existence of deep-seated corruption within the FAA (and at United Airlines) related to a continuing series of fatal airline crashes.

Possibly because of the gravity of the scandal and the many related deaths, the FAA Administrator's office and FAA lawyers covered up the evidence.

The continued coverup of these corrupt activities caused me to resign from the FAA in a letter refusing to work under such corrupt conditions. The deep-seated culture and resulting airline tragedies increased in severity thereafter. I then supported myself by investing in real estate, an endeavor that eventually increased my assets to \$10 million, and would fund subsequent activities to expose the corruption in government offices.

Using Federal Criminal Statutes and the Judicial Process

The continuing preventable airline disasters caused me to use two federal statutes to circumvent the coverups: Titles 18 U.S.C. § 4 and 28 U.S.C. § 1361:

Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Misprision of felony. Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361 gives any citizen the right to seek a court order requiring a federal official to perform his legal duty (in this instance, his aviation safety duties) and to halt his or her unlawful conduct.

Title 28 U.S.C. § 1361. Action to compel an officer of the United States to perform his duty. The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any action in the nature of mandamus to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform a duty owed to the plaintiff.

The first of several federal filings⁶ occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Federal district and appellate judges admitted the seriousness of my charges, but upon motion by Justice Department lawyers, the judges dismissed the filings before I could provide evidence. These dismissals, by obstructing justice, caused the corruption and related crashes to continue.⁷ In the case of a multi-district litigation in Los Angeles involving the crash of a DC-10 associated with FAA misconduct, the chief plaintiff counsel approved my filing of the amicus brief.

Circumventing the Coverups Through Publicity

Seeking to circumvent the vast coverups, I sought to provide information to the public and generate outrage and responsible reaction. I published the first of several editions of *Unfriendly Skies* in 1978, and started appearing as guest and expert on the first of over 3,000 radio and television shows. As a result of these activities, many other government agents⁸ contacted me over a period of years, providing me information and documentation on areas of corruption⁹ in government offices that they had discovered. I detail some of these areas of corruption in subsequent print and e-books.¹⁰

Continuation of Earlier Judicial Obstruction of Justice

In 1986, based upon the additional information of corruption in government offices that I and other former and present government agents had discovered, I again exercised my responsibilities to report the federal crimes under the federal crime reporting statute. Federal judges repeatedly refused to receive the information that they were required to receive as part of their administrative duties under the clear wording of Title 18 U.S.C. § 4. Justice Department lawyers blocked every effort to make these reports.

Federal judges¹¹ combined their obstruction of justice with terminating my civil rights. They started issuing unlawful and unconstitutional orders permanently barring me access to the federal district and appellate courts. These orders continue in force at this time and are being repeatedly enforced by federal judges, especially in the Ninth Circuit and Washington, D.C. district and appellate courts.

Felony Retaliation for Reporting Criminal and Subversive Activities

As information and evidence of additional criminal activities continued to be discovered, I again exercised my responsibilities under the federal criminal statutes to report the criminal activities to a federal judge. Federal judges and Justice Department

prosecutors then expanded their deadly obstruction of justice tactics by charging me with criminal contempt of court for filing papers in the federal courts. They charged that the prior judicial orders permanently barred me from filing any papers in the federal courts and my attempt to report the federal crimes were therefore criminal contempt of court. From 1986 to 1995, I was constantly under either literal house arrest or *imprisoned* for attempting to report criminal activities under 18 U.S.C. § 4.

Ironically, at the age of 67, a multi-millionaire, using my assets to halt these deadly activities, federal judges and Justice Department prosecutors prosecuted me, and sentenced me to federal prison for six months, which included two months in solitary confinement. While in prison, federal judges issued unlawful and unconstitutional orders seizing and liquidating the \$10 million in assets that funded my exposure activities. These retaliatory acts were criminal offenses.¹² When I filed objections to the seizure and liquidation, federal judge Edward Jellen charged me with criminal contempt of court, and again sentenced me to federal prison.

There is some irony in the fact that a former federal agent, who sought to report and halt the conditions that enabled the deaths of 3,000 people on 9/11, would suffer such massive personal and financial retaliation.

Latest Obstruction-of-Justice--Prior to September 11, 2001—by Federal Judges

My last attempt, prior to 9/11, to report the corrupt activities was a lawsuit¹³ filed in the U.S. district court at Reno, Nevada. Several issues were raised in that lawsuit, all of which were associated with the judicial actions to block my reports. They included (a) the attempt to report the criminal activities under 18 U.S.C. § 4; (b) the attempt to have ruled unconstitutional the orders permanently depriving me the right to access the courts and the termination of my civil and constitutional rights; and (c) the attempt to have ruled invalid the judicial seizure and liquidation of the \$10 million in assets that funded my exposure of the criminal activities, and peripheral defenses.

Continuing the judicial obstruction of justice, the federal judge¹⁴ acting on that legal filing, blocked the reporting of the criminal activities, and blocked my other causes of actions related to the obstruction of justice.

I then filed an appeal with the Ninth Circuit court of appeals—where the obstruction of justice had commenced in the late 1970s and continues to this day. Ninth Circuit appellate judges¹⁵ ruled that the prior injunctions permanently barred me from filing papers in the district and appellate courts, including the mandatory requirements to report federal crimes to a federal judge, the right to defend myself, including the right to file appeals. That ruling was *made after the 3,000 deaths occurred on 9-11*.

Continuing Post 9/11 Judicial Obstruction of Justice

I submitted to the U.S. district court for the Southern District of New York, on August 8, 2002, a filing¹⁶ under the federal crime reporting statute, seeking to report the criminal activities that I charged constituted the primary blame for the conditions to exist that enabled hijackers to seize four airliners on 9/11. By law, those papers *must be filed* upon receipt if they are in proper order and the filing fee paid, which did exist.

The federal crime reporting statute and the gravity of the charges by a former government agent and witness demanded that federal judges promptly receive the information. Federal law even requires that the charges stated in federal filings be accepted as true¹⁷ at that stage of the pleadings.

In violation of federal criminal and civil due process law, the papers were blocked from being filed. Not until I wrote letters to the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court complaining about the matter that the complaint was finally filed: 13 months after being received.

Dismissing the Complaint Simultaneous With Its Delayed Filing

Compounding these irregularities, Chief Judge Mukasey simultaneously filed a five-page sua sponte dismissal order—that required weeks to prepare—with the delayed filing of the papers seeking to report the corruption related to the events of 9/11. His dismissal order addressed (and misstated) charges stated in the Complaint that had not yet been made a part of the judicial record because of the 13-month delay in filing!

The refusal to file the papers (a) violated federal rules for filing such papers; (b) blocked the reporting of criminal activities to a federal judge that had already played a key role in the

terrorist hijackings of 9/11; (c) delayed and prevented corrective actions to be taken, enabling a continuation of the prior catastrophic consequences; (d) obstructed justice; (e) prevented the relatives of the 3,000 victims of 9/11 to have the guilty punished for their wrongful conduct and prevented them from discovering the primary blame responsible for their grief; (f) continued in effect the years of corruption, the cover-ups, the obstruction of justice, and the consequences that will surely result in further tragedies as the history of such activities plainly reveals.

Irregularities by Justice Department Personnel in the Court of Appeals

Following Judge Mukasey's highly irregular dismissal order, I filed a timely notice of appeal, and in accordance with the briefing schedule, filed the appellant brief by the January 12, 2004, briefing date. The brief to be prepared by the U.S. attorney, and due to be filed by February 12, 2004, was never filed. I then filed a declaration of filing irregularities and a motion to order that the U.S. attorney file the brief and for sanctions.

The failure of the U.S. attorney to file the brief was "understandable." After charging Martha Stewart with obstruction of justice and conspiracy, he had to continue the pattern of obstruction of justice and conspiracy that are documented in judicial records—and that made the events of 9/11 possible, or address the corruption and the coverups that would open a literal can of worms, the gravity of which is unparalleled in the nation's history.

Judicial Coverups in District of Columbia: It Never Ends

An earlier post-9/11 attempt to report the corruption related to the events of 9/11 was made in the U.S. district court, District of Columbia, where another 9/11 tragedy occurred. U.S. District Judge Henry H. Kennedy, Jr., dismissed the June 12, 2002,¹⁸ filing almost as soon as it was filed, continuing to violate federal criminal and due process law.

Judge Kennedy sought to support the dismissal—and the coverup—on the argument that former CIA legal counsel and federal judge Stanley Sporkin issued an order in 1991 permanently barring me from filing any papers in the federal courts. That 1991 order was made in a filing where I sought to report the criminal activities that I and my group of other former government agents had discovered—including those that made 9/11 possible.

I filed a notice of appeal and paid the filing fees with the District of Columbia court of appeals. Court of appeal judges¹⁹ dismissed the appeal on January 16, 2003, holding that I had been permanently barred from filing papers in district and appellate courts, rights which are guaranteed to other people, including murderers. In effect, they approved the obstruction of justice and termination of all due process defenses guaranteed by the laws and Constitution of the United States.

I then filed a motion for an en banc hearing, which was denied by order dated March 26, 2003.²⁰ The judges of this powerful Washington Court of Appeals upheld Sporkin's order permanently depriving me the due process right to federal courts, the right of federal judges to obstruct justice, and to be protected against the consequences of their criminal acts.

Complicity by Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court

From the late 1970s to the present date, the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court had been repeatedly advised through legal filings and certified letters of the crimes, the national security consequences, and the felony misconduct of judges over whom they had supervisory responsibilities. They also had a duty under the federal crime reporting statute to receive the evidence of federal crimes that I reported to them.

The only partially favorable response was an October 28, 1991, letter from Justice Bryon White, which was a form of apology for not being able to help. He wrote, "As a single Justice I can be of no help to you. I am returning the petition."

My Background, Experience, and Credibility for Making These Statements

I held a key air safety position in the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).²¹ I had been given the assignment to correct the conditions responsible for the worst series of airline crashes in the nation's history. During this assignment I discovered and documented corrupt and criminal activities that caused and enabled a number of airline disasters to occur. These discoveries—and the standard coverups in government—caused me to exercise the law in a manner that enabled me to act as an independent counsel, the purpose of which was to create a government record showing the relationship between the misconduct and a series of fatal airline crashes. I had been a Navy Patrol Plane

Commander in World War II; I had been an international airline captain for many years, including considerable experience in the Middle East. I was a focal point for other government agents and insiders to provide me with insider information and documentation on matters that continue to inflict great harm upon the United States, its people, and national security. My credentials are very unusual. I had been a guest and expert on over 3,000 radio and television shows since 1978. I have nothing to gain, and everything to lose—much of which has already occurred—for trying to do my duty as a citizen and former federal agent.

Responsibility of Every Member of 9/11 Commission

Rather than continue the standard practice of coverups through “controlled investigations,” this commission must address the deep-seated uncorrected problems that created the conditions enabling terrorists to seize four airliners on September 11, 2001. This includes:

- Understand that the successful hijackings of four airliners by terrorists on September 11, 2001, were primarily aviation disasters for which the primary blame was with people in the government’s aviation safety offices; that the preventative measures were known for many years; that people in the government’s aviation safety offices had the authority and responsibility to order the simple and inexpensive preventative measures; that they refused to perform this mandatory duty and obstructed others who sought to carry out the government’s aviation safety responsibilities.
- Obtain testimony and evidence from myself and some of the many other former government agents that have provided information and evidence to me of criminal and even subversive activities.
- Understand that so-called “intelligence failures” include corruption in certain government offices.
- Understand that the refusal to act on known threats is the same deep-seated culture that I discovered while I was in the Navy a year prior to Pearl Harbor, and is caused by many factors, including coverups and refusal to face facts.
- Address the documented hardcore corruption by a large number of federal judges and those who aided and abetted them, in blocking the reports of criminal activities that relate not only to the events of 9-11 but to other activities inflicting great harm upon national security. Prima facie evidence of these judicial crimes is in judicial records. If the matters detailed in this statement are not fully exposed the same deadly consequences affecting major national interests, including national security, will continue as they have for so many years.

Deadly Consequences if Obstruction of Justice Continues

It is my belief that this commission is engaging in a coverup, seeking to place the blame for the events of 9/11 on the more innocent “intelligence failures” and failure to act, rather than the hardcore criminal and subversive activities of key government personnel. By this conduct the members of this commission have an equal, and in some cases a more prominent role, in the continuation of corrupt and criminal activities, and that they will share blame for continuation of the catastrophic consequences.

Were it not for the complicity of much of the media and the self-serving coverup of much of Congress, the members of this commission would be at risk of exposure.

Executed this 12th day of April 2004.

Rodney F. Stich
Fax: 925-295-1203
POB 5, Alamo, CA 94507

¹ Certified mail # 7002 0860 0003 9592 7242, dated April 12, 2004.

² The agents and other insiders who provided me information and documentation on corrupt personnel and activities in government offices include those from the FBI, CIA, Customs, FAA, Secret Service, DEA, and former drug traffickers and organized crime figures.

³ The simple and easily accomplished preventative measures that would have been put into place within 24 hours, and which would have halted the 9/11 hijackings were (a) removal of the cockpit door keys from the cabin flight attendants—which enabled the terrorists to enter the cockpit; and (b) orders to cockpit flight personnel to keep the cockpit doors locked whenever passengers are on board.

⁴ Justice Department prosecutors charged the head of a multi-agency drug task force with criminally violating the civil rights of one of the suspected drug traffickers, which then halted the investigations into the drug-related money operations of the Jersey City terrorists, and sent the message to other government agents to ignore the threat; the drug smuggling of CIA personnel; the unlawful arming of Iraq during the 1980s; and many other offenses that contributed to great harm upon national interests.

⁵ In those earlier days airline crashes were occurring every few months.

⁶ *Stich v. United States, et al.*, 554 F.2d 1070 (9th Cir.) (table), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 920 (1977)(addressed hard-core air safety misconduct, violations of federal air safety laws, threats against government inspectors not to report safety violations and misconduct); *Stich v. National Transportation Safety Board*, 685 F.2d 446 (9th Cir.)(table), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 861 (1982))(addressed repeated criminal falsification of official airline accident reports, omitting highly sensitive air safety misconduct, making possible repeated crashes from the same sequestered problems); Amicus curiae brief filed on July 17, 1975, in the Paris DC-10 multi-district litigation, *Flanagan v. McDonnell Douglas Corporation and United States of America*, Civil Action 74-808-PH, MDL 172, Central District California.)(addressing the long standing FAA misconduct, of which the cover-up of the DC-10 cargo door problem was one of repeated instances of tragedy related misconduct); *U.S. v. Department of Justice*, District of Columbia, Nos. 86-2523, 87-2214, and other actions filed by Stich seeking to expose and correct the powerful and covert air disaster misconduct.

⁷ The frequency of airline crashes today are far less frequent than when I was given the assignment to correct the problems. However, this reduction in the number of crashes is due more to on-ground and in-aircraft safeguards. The basic problems in the most critical area of the government's aviation safety offices still exists, being why the obvious, simple, and inexpensive preventative measures were not taken as required by law.

⁸ These included agents from the U.S. Department of Justice, including the FBI; Central Intelligence Agency, Drug Enforcement Agency, Federal Aviation Administration, and other federal and state agencies.

⁹ Among the dozens of courageous present and former government agents who contacted me during the past 18 years have been agents of the FBI, CIA, DEA, Customs, INS and other federal and state agencies. The information and documentation that they have provided me shows that the *secondary* blame for the success of the 19 hijackers was far more than an intelligence failure in certain government agencies. Rather, a level of corruption that remains unaddressed and which will remain until there is a full-blown investigation (which will never occur). However, the information I acquired shows a degree of criminality and subversive misconduct implicating people in key government positions.

¹⁰ I also wrote numerous not-for-profit informational books and appeared as guest and expert on over 3,000 radio and television shows since 1978. The books include one or more editions of *Unfriendly Skies; Defrauding America; Drugging America; Blowback, 9/11, Lies, and Coverups; Terrorism Against America.*

¹¹ Among many federal judges participating in the series of orders obstructing the reporting of these crimes were Marilyn Patel, Milton Schwartz, Levi, Stanley Sporkin,

¹² Inflicting harm against former federal agents and witnesses are felonies under Title 18 U.S.C. §1510. (a) Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery, misrepresentation, intimidation, or force or threats thereof to obstruct, delay, or prevent the communication of information relating to a violation of any criminal statute of the United States by any person to a criminal investigator; or Whoever injures any person in his person or property on account of giving by such person or by any other person of any such information to any criminal investigator—Shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.”

18 U.S.C. § 1512. Tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant.

(b) Whoever knowingly uses intimidation or physical force, threatens, or corruptly persuades another person, or attempts to do so, or engages in misleading conduct toward another person, with intent to—

(3) hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

(c) Whoever intentionally harasses another person and thereby hinders, delays, prevents, or dissuades any person from—(2) reporting to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense

18 U.S.C. § 1513. Retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant.

(b) Whoever knowingly engages in any conduct and thereby causes bodily injury to another person or damages the tangible property of another person, or threatens to do so, with intent to retaliate against any person for – (2) any information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense.

¹³ Reno, Nevada, Nr. CV-N-00-0152-ECR-PHA. March 24, 2000.

¹⁴ U.S. District Judge Howard C. Reed, Jr.

¹⁵ Ninth Circuit appellate judges James R. Browning, Andrew Kleinfeld, Ronald Gould. Order dated April 12, 2002.

¹⁶ U.S. district court, # 03 CV 7405

¹⁷ Federal courts must accept as true the allegations in the complaint and supporting affidavits as true. (See, e.g., *Gardener v. Toilet Goods Assn.*, 387 U.S. 167, 172 (1967). If plaintiff's allegations state a claim for which federal courts can grant relief, the court must accept jurisdiction. The United States Supreme Court stated in *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24 (1980). Also, FRCP 8(d) states: "Effect of Failure to Deny. Averments in a pleading to which a responsive pleading is required, are admitted when not denied in the responsive pleading."

¹⁸ U.S. district court, District of Columbia, Nr. 02cv01172, filed June 12, 2002.

¹⁹ District of Columbia appellate judges Douglas Ginsburg, David Sentelle, and A. Raymond Randolph.

²⁰ Denial for en banc hearing was made by judges Douglas Ginsburg, Harry Edwards, David Sentelle, Karen Henderson, Harry Randolph, Judith Rogers, David Tatel, and Merrick Garland.

²¹ Prior to my experience in the government's aviation safety offices, I had been a Navy patrol plane commander during World War II, and an international airline captain.