

Got a Security Clearance? Now the Feds Want to Spy on You, Too

By Aliya Sternstein National Security Agency leaker Edward Snowden had skeletons in his closet that employee records systems apparently did not share with the NSA, raising the issue of whether cleared personnel should be under continual surveillance. Today, once an employee obtains a security clearance, agencies can perform follow-up investigations every five years or when derogatory information is discovered. The New York Times

last week reported that NSA missed complaints from Snowden's former supervisor at the CIA about Snowden's troubling work habits (the supervisor suspected the technician was inappropriately attempting to access classified files) likely because the systems managing employee clearances only documented major rule violations, not suspicions about personal behavior. In September, former Defense Department Deputy Secretary John Hamre argued in the Washington Post

that someone in Snowden's position should be subjected to continuous, perhaps automated surveillance. Such ongoing scrutiny should apply to anyone with high-level clearances, including Hamre himself, he said. Electronic surveillance of cleared workers is technically possible, according to computer engineers. Federal managers, for instance, could read alerts from spyware installed on an employee's personal cellphone. But spying on the entire cleared workforce would be illegal -- unless new federal rules are issued. Today, the Fourth Amendment, Privacy Act and other civil liberties laws and regulations forbid tracking government employees outside the workplace. Short of asking employees with high level clearances to waive their privacy rights, "the government simply may not conduct surveillance by wiretapping" or remotely activating the "microphone of personal cell phones or computers," said Greg Rinckey, an attorney who specializes in military law and represents national security clearance applicants. Snowden reportedly relied on an encrypted email service, called Lavabit, to hide his activities. The ex-NSA contractor now is wanted by the federal government for disclosing domestic surveillance secrets to the press. According to a Monday Washington Post

story, Snowden leaked to the newspaper documents showing that NSA culls contacts from personal webmail and instant messaging accounts at a rate of more than 250 million lists a year, including many Americans' address books. Any future, authorized e-surveillance of cleared personnel would have to be performed with tremendous care, privacy advocates warn. Otherwise, the process could smear innocent employees or tip off the bad guys. Most of the existing mechanisms for detecting potential insider threats are plagued by false positives and risk wrongful character assassination and other mistaken inferences, said Peter G. Neumann, a computer scientist for SRI International, a nonprofit research institute. He was sharing personal views, not those of his employer or any government agency he has advised. "If someone is browsing on a subject that raises an automatic alert, that person might be trying to solve a crossword puzzle," Neumann said. "If I get a wrong number on my cell phone or a fraudulent scam call, I am falsely linked with the caller, irrevocably." Computer formulas probably are not smart enough to sense that researching club drugs online out of

concern for a child's health is different from researching club drugs to find the best high. "Context is everything, and it is often ignored," Neumann said. He added that any digital surveillance should be conducted "very carefully, with serious oversight and open admission of what [employers] are doing." Openly admitting to employee surveillance, however, could introduce other security weaknesses. "What about the argument that if the government reveals what it is doing, people might be able to work around it?" Neumann questioned. If I am using cryptography because of corporate secrecy, does that mean I am hiding something? No, my employer might be insisting that I use encrypted e-mail. And computerized surveillance alone probably wouldn't stop the next Snowden. He was a system administrator whose job reportedly required accessing and moving sensitive documents. To combat such an inherent insider threat, the government could grant ultimate "superuser" access privileges to the director of national intelligence or other top brass. But that move carries risks too. "This is a

"Great Customer Service" – C.R.

"Great customer service, thoroughly explained all aspects of my case. Thank you." - C.R.

"Cannot Thank You Enough" – R.S. and C.S.

"I cannot thank you enough for all that you did for us." - R.S. and C.S.

“Great Service” – E.S.

I want to thank you all for the great service rendered [to] myself and family. - E.S. on Client Relations Attorney Derrick Hogan

Legal Disclaimer

The results of all client matters depend on a variety of factors unique to each matter. past successes do not predict or guarantee future successes.

"High Regard" – R.E.M.

"Your firm held my best interests with high regard... I thank you for your efforts." - R.E.M.

"Prompt and Efficient" – K.B.

"Prompt and efficient in processing claim, all correspondence handled in prompt and efficient manner." – K.B.

"Impressed" – W.W.

"As a retired heavy user of attorneys, I'm impressed with your concerns and your efforts to stay in

touch with your clients. Its damned good management aligned with top notch expertise.” – W.W.

“Excellent Service” – J.R.

“Excellent service, very professional, and understanding and considerate of clients needs. Attorney was very approachable and there was a very good comfort level.” – J.R.

“Professional & Informative” – J.H.

“Professional & informative... I was pleased with the handling of the case. I was treated as a person, and kept abreast of all aspects of the case. Thank you all.” – J.H.

“Thanks So Much” – J.D.

“Without your Firm, I would not have known of my claim. Thanks so much!” – J.D.

“Gets Results” – F.P.

“Most certainly – The firm gets results!” – F.P.

“Quite Satisfied” – R.W.

“I am quite satisfied with the services your office has provided.” – R.W.

“Exceptional Legal Services” – A.S.

“Your firm, Tully Rinckey, has provided and continues to provide me with prompt, keen, exceptional legal services. After the initial consult, I felt relieved that I had the representation from Tully Rinckey... I have found a new found hope with Tully Rinckey...” – A.S.

“Absolute Best” – R.H.

“My attorney was the absolute best I could ever have hoped for. A pure professional in every sense of the word. She was very mindful of my financial expenditure and still was able to represent me very well in my court case.” – R.H.

“Outstanding Service” – A.R.

“Outstanding service, true professional.” – A.R.

“Top Notch” – V.W.

“My attorney was top notch. Very pleasant and helpful.” – V.W.

“Ideal Choice” – D.H.

“My attorney knew exactly the approach to take and was the ideal choice. She was extremely responsive. She was clear, balanced, and open to our views and feelings. She made it clear she was there for us and ready to answer questions.” – D.H.

“Very Satisfied” – D.D.

“I was very satisfied with the services provided which were completed in a very timely and professional manner.” – D.D.

“Excellent” – B.M.

“Your Firm provides excellent & free service to federal workers and NG/USAR members.” – B.M.