

28 February 2022

**MEMORANDUM FOR HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS  
COMMITTEE,  
SENATOR GARY PETERS,  
REPRESENTATIVE ELAINE LURIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**FROM: Ryan Sweazey, Lt Col (retired), President, Walk the Talk Foundation**

**SUBJECT: Address to Department of Defense Inspector General, 4 March 2022 Briefing to HSGAC**

Dear committee members and members of the DoD Inspector General,

Thank you for taking the time to address DIA/IG's conduct of my Whistleblower Reprisal Investigation. My case, which has now garnered national-level media attention, is sadly another textbook example of an institutionally-backed retribution where the perpetrators brazenly carried out retaliatory acts and were not held accountable for them.

In receiving the notification of my Report of Investigation from DIA/IG on 10 November 2021, I was dismayed by several facets of the report, to include:

- The length of the investigation was an exorbitant 444 days,
- The fact that there was no mention of one of the two reprisal allegations (revocation of follow-on assignment),
- How the IG summarily dismissed the damning timeline of events: the subject having recommended me for a follow-on attaché assignment on 20 November 2019, only to revoke that a mere four business weeks later on 8 January 2020 because, as the subject herself said to me, **verbatim**, while on TDY investigating my reports of wrongdoing: "I can't send you to [REDACTED] after this."
- DIA's Deputy Inspector General, when queried about the second allegation of reprisal (revocation of follow-on assignment, see Atttch 2), stated that the end result of the retributive action benefited the U.S. Government, a supposition which is not only pure speculation, but also one which, per DoD Instruction, has zero bearing on a reprisal litmus test,
- Regarding the first allegation of reprisal (retributively placed in a contentious rater-ratee relationship), the DIA/IG admitted to pre-existing rater bias and violations of Air Force Instructions when feedback was given by that rater, but chose to ignore that in their Unfavorable Personnel Action calculus,
- Further, with regards to the same reprisal, the DIA/IG dismissed disinterested witness' signed statements that my performance report ranked in the bottom quartile of my peer group and instead used their own slanted conjecture to override that testimony, going so far as to cite a new

Air Force Instruction (regarding performance stratifications) that was published nearly a year *after* my performance report was signed,

- Beyond the reprisal allegations, the complaint contained five other allegations which should have been immediately referred to command for action, but were not, forfeiting valuable time in which DIA leadership could have engaged on those issues,
- DIA/IG, in 444 days, failed to interview any witnesses listed in the five non-reprisal allegations,
- Even had the reprisal allegations been substantiated, the length of time that elapsed since the reprisal meant that my life and career path was already irrevocably altered by the time the findings had been published (significant personal financial impacts from not being based OCONUS, 10 months in mental health therapy, a transoceanic move stateside, loss of diplomatic accreditation, eliminated from promotion consideration, eliminated from future prestigious attaché assignments and other competitive jobs, etc.) which no current compensatory measures (records correction, e.g.) could have salvaged.

Ladies and gentlemen, one of the DoDIG's missions is: "**Help ensure ethical conduct throughout the DoD.**" Sadly, under the current construct, military members retain little to no faith in Inspectors' General efficacy in that role. Whistleblower Reprisal Investigations, specifically, are far too lengthy, are sometimes (as was the case with my investigation) not carried out with the IG credo of "integrity and efficiency," and, in the off-chance they are substantiated, offer little to no appreciable recompense to victims whilst rarely holding culprits accountable. The end result is the significant breach of trust that currently exists in the DoD because members of the military do not believe they will be protected from retribution and reprisal by the very system put in place to provide that protection.

Given this, my one question for the Department of Defense Inspector General is this: **What actions will you undertake to repair this breach of trust?**

Thank you for your time and engagement.

Respectfully,



Ryan Sweazey, Lt Col, USAF (retired)  
Founder and President, Walk the Talk Foundation  
[www.walkthetalkfoundation.org](http://www.walkthetalkfoundation.org)

