

interpret some of his comments based on what they feel his position would be.

Mr. RUMSFELD. In other words, they have to, in their mind, determine what they suspect would be the code of this individual; and only if the individual were asked questions that would lead him outside of that code could you utilize the information from the examination? Is this fair?

Mr. HERNDON. I think that is a fair statement.

But you must realize, in addition to the polygraph part itself, the interrogation continues at some length and the agent and the man talk back and forth, and exchange ideas and viewpoints, and the interview continues without the man being on the polygraph itself. That also gives the examiner additional help in getting subjective impressions of the man's comments.

Mr. RUMSFELD. It sounds to me like a terribly difficult responsibility for the interviewer. I am not knowledgeable about this. Unfortunately, I was not on this subcommittee when the previous hearings took place.

But you think of a person in the Army. If he were asked questions about his colleagues, the men he was living with in the barracks, I would suspect he might have a code whereby he wouldn't feel the slightest bit of concern about misleading the person asking the questions about aspects of his associates' activities, unless, for example, it conceivably could at some point endanger the unit, or went to the overall goal of that group of people.

Mr. HERNDON. That is a good assumption. Are you discussing personal screening in this area, or a criminal case?

Mr. RUMSFELD. Criminal case or anything. Individuals have differing codes, if you want to use that word. Politicians probably do. They may be asked "Do you plan to run for some office," and they probably don't perspire when they say "No," if they really are planning to run. This goes on every day, on television, before millions of people.

I just am overwhelmed by the difficulty of the responsibility of these interviews.

Mr. HERNDON. Someone has to do the job of interviewing people, because interviews are the basic tool or technique of an investigator. That is why the interviewers themselves should be people who have good commonsense and have a knowledge of human nature, because as you say, there are codes, there are standards that people will use. We feel the agents we have in the Bureau that we have selected for polygraph interviews are our men best able to sit down and develop a rapport, and understand the man, and get him to volunteer and talk to us as much as possible. It is our job, as investigators, to try to get to the truth of the matter, of the particular Federal offense. We feel with the men we have, with this additional skill we give them, they are in a position to do a better job on behalf of the Government.

Mr. RUMSFELD. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOSS. How long has the FBI used the polygraph?

Mr. HERNDON. Actually, Mr. Chairman, we have followed the polygraph from its very inception, back in the 1920's. We have communications with the original Mr. Keeler, Mr. Larson, some of the people who first started the technique.