

I was offered a Conditional Offer of Employment by the Central Intelligence Agency this past April, specifically with the [REDACTED]. This was my dream job, and the future looked bright, indeed.

At the time, when I inquired as to what exactly was conditional about it, I was informed that it was conditional upon the successful completion of my security clearance and polygraph. With little to fear (I had held a lower security clearance previously and had a relatively skeleton-free closet), I commenced waiting for my clearance processing to complete. I completed all the paperwork required of me, [REDACTED] and in August I arrived for my polygraph examination.

Now, before I go into the polygraph, I must explain a bit of back-story about this exam. Everybody is a little terrified of the polygraph at first, and so the CIA goes to great lengths to ease the applicants' worries. [REDACTED] who helped me get the job, told me repeatedly that with the exception of major crimes, **the polygrapher does not care what you tell him, as long as it is the truth**. In other words, if you confess to something minor in order to be able to pass the polygraph ("Besides what you have told me, have you done anything bad" type of questions), it is irrelevant and will not affect your candidacy. This sentiment was echoed exactly by [REDACTED], as well as by **the recruiter who interviewed me, the two polygraph examiners** who conducted the examination, and even **the videotape about the polygraph** shown to every examinee before the actual examination.

In the first day of the polygraph, I was nervous, and the examiner informed me that there were a few questions that were still inconclusive. She told me that I would have to come back for a second polygraph the next day. However, it was not so bad, because out of the 20+ people polygraphed in the same group as me, only 2-3 did NOT have to come back. I came back the second day, and we resolved a few more of the questions, but there was one question which we were just unable to resolve. At the end of the day, the examiner told me that he thought that even though we could not resolve that question, all the things I told him should make up for that, and that he would write it all down in a report. He said that if it still wasn't enough, they would **call me back in for a third polygraph**.

A month later, I called my Program Officer (the CIA employee who is my point of contact about my application) because I had not heard anything for a month, and I was informed that **he no longer worked there** and that **I did not have a new Program Officer**. As though that was not strange enough, when I asked the lady if she could tell me anything about my status, she said that even though there should be something there (her words, not mine), my file was empty and displaying as **In Process** and **Not Updated**. At this point I would like to stress that she volunteered that this was strange (her exact words were "**Well, that's odd**") and that this is not a judgment on my part. In any case, she said that she would have to file an **official inquiry** about the status of my file, which would take two weeks. She assigned me a new Program Officer, and told me

to call him in two weeks with my question. I waited the two weeks, and called my new Program Officer on the day I was instructed (**September 6, 2002**). He was not there, and so I left a message. That night, I received in the mail a letter from the CIA stating that they were **rescinding my Conditional Offer of Employment** based on "information that you provided or that was gained as a result of your processing."

My new Program Officer did call me back the next week, but he did not know anything about the rescinding of my COE. As instructed by the letter, I wrote to them requesting details about this decision. Several weeks later (**October 11, 2002**) I received a phone call from a very rude gentleman named Jack. He claimed that the decision had been made because of things said during my polygraph, and when I pressed him about what he meant, he stated quite forthrightly that it was the **information which I provided to the polygraph examiner**, not the failure of the polygraph question, that was responsible. I then asked him about what I had been told over and over about how it **didn't matter what you said as long as it was the truth** and he replied "Well, that's not *exactly* correct" (my emphasis). When I asked him exactly what it was that I said that was so bad (I had not said anything terribly awful or even noteworthy) he repeatedly refused to be specific, until he finally said "OK, let me get your file out" (**he had been telling me all this without even looking at my file!!!**). Side note: to underline his rudeness, he actually said while he was *looking for my file*, "I can't believe you even need to ask."

When he finally found my file, he started reading me sound bite summaries of the things that had been responsible for the decision, and they were a minor as could be. *Some of the things he read to me were things that I hadn't even said I'd done, only THOUGHT ABOUT DOING!!* (after six hours of going over the same question, you tend to confess to anything even remotely relevant hoping that it will solve the problem). In fact, he actually read me things that were incorrect, and when I tried to correct him, he cut me off and said "This is not a debate." When I tried to explain to him that what he was reading to me was five-word summaries of long stories that I had told the polygrapher (and that some were actually mis-typed) he kept repeating this like a mantra, getting more rude and aggressive every time he said it. When I finally realized that I wasn't getting anywhere, I asked how I could appeal this with statements of what I thought was incomplete or outright incorrect information, and he informed me that there was **no appeal** and that this call had simply been a *courtesy*.

I met with [REDACTED] the next business day and asked him if this was true or simply a rude man trying to get me off the phone, and he said he'd look into it (side note: he was as surprised as I at what the man had said about them using the things I'd told them against me, as minor as they were). When he got back to me, he said that the man who had spoken with me was the senior security official, and that there was no appeal process to speak of. However, he suggested that I take this up with the CIA Office of Equal Employment Opportunity. I did so, but after a week of research they decide that this did not fall within their jurisdiction, since I was not denied employment because I was a member of a protected group. I was told my [REDACTED] in the EEO office to contact [REDACTED] in the Grievances office, and I did so, sending her a version of

this letter. A few days later she contacted me to inform me that only current employees could file grievances, and that I should contact the Inspector General's office.

All I am asking for from the CIA is to be given the third polygraph I was promised, to be given the chance to refute these allegations made by people with insufficient information. If I fail the next polygraph and they uphold my termination, then at least I will know that it was based on something real, even if that reality is simply that I have problems passing polygraphs. However, I hope that now that I know what to expect, I will be able to completely pass a polygraph, and therefore give them no excuse to terminate me out of suspicion. Why I did not pass the first polygraph I do not know, although there actually is a possibility of a medical influence (a mild nerve condition for which I take medicine), of which I DID inform the polygrapher at the beginning. I hope to clear any of those possibilities up before taking it again, but so far no one is giving me a chance.

I have never done anything that would be considered even remotely worthy of deeming me "unsuitable for Agency employment," as the letter states. Of the five things the gentleman informed me caused my termination, **only one was a crime, and an extremely minor one at that. Two were idle fantasies, one was [REDACTED] and one was not even a confession, but a statement about a mistake that a previous school had made on my record** (but that I had supporting documentation for and had already mentioned in my application).

If I do not get this position, these incomplete, incorrect results will be an albatross around my neck for the rest of my life, and will be reviewed **every time I try and get a clearance** for a position in the US Intelligence Community. My former teacher ([REDACTED]) has even told me that **the CIA will quite likely never consider me again**, regardless of what they say. The past three years of my life, which were spent preparing me for a career change into intelligence, will have been completely wasted.

P.S. For the Inspector General's office: rather than try to incorporate the new information into this letter, I will simply summarize it here. I actually have a recording of Jack in the Recruitment Center to demonstrate the level of hostility on his part. He called me and left a very rude message on my voice mail after [REDACTED] from EEO called him, and I have saved the message. Also, I believe that my earlier attempts to address this issue have made him even more resistant to compromise, because I found out later that [REDACTED] had simply told him that I did not know why I was terminated (a patent untruth, given that I had given [REDACTED] more information than is included in this letter). I realize that it is fully within the CIA's charter to deny me employment if I am deemed "unsuitable" without questions, but in this case I can demonstrate that ~~the information used for this evaluation~~ was in fact **incorrect** in some cases, and that **it is a grave injustice for me to be denied any opportunity to correct the misconceptions**. It is tantamount to someone mistyping my Social Security Number into the National Crime database and finding out that I am a prolific burglar and then denying my employment based on this and refusing any appeals, despite the fact that it was a documentable mistake. I do not believe that the drafters of

the CIA charter intended for this "deny without appeal" option to be invoked to cover up errors on the part of the Recruitment Center, and it is for this reason that I am so fervently appealing this to every office I think can help me. Also, it only makes the matter worse when the unprofessional behavior of lying to me **not once but twice** is considered. I was told with confidence that they would not hold against me things that I said when explaining the polygraph, and I was told at the end of the polygraph that I would be given a third test if the polygraph examiner's explanation was not accepted. I do not think I am asking for much. I am not asking to be hired despite my polygraph. I am only asking to be given the promised chance of a third test, for which I will be taking my medicine (I had not taken my medicine before the first two for fear that it would skew the results, but further research has suggested that it might have been actually the natural condition that would skew them more). Is that too much to ask?