

Mr. HERNDON. In general, I would say they would be somewhat less. In other words, greater severity of a situation would normally enhance the reaction. The greater the psychological impact and the seriousness of the situation are, one would normally expect, a more significant response.

Mr. Moss. In some cultural backgrounds, a certain amount of untruthfulness is tolerated and not regarded as being sinful, and would, therefore, not place a guilt complex on an individual. So really, in the interrogation of an individual, you would have to know a fair amount about his background to apply this with any precision?

Mr. HERNDON. That is very true.

[Could I add one thing in the light of your comments, that actually in the FBI, the polygraph technique is basically—and I think this is something we should keep in mind—is basically just an interrogation; it is an interview with a person; it is two men discussing certain facts. The polygraph is just an instrumental device to assist the interrogator, but the technique is basically an interview, an interrogation, a trained skilled interrogator attempting to get the truth from an individual in a matter in which we have jurisdiction.

Mr. Moss. I think there should be broad public understanding of this fact, because I think all of us have read from time to time newspaper stories which made it appear that X, who was under investigation, was undoubtedly guilty, because he had declined to take a polygraph.

Now, I have said before, and I would repeat with great emphasis, that, on the basis of my studies so far, I would absolutely refuse to submit to a polygraph examination for any purpose. And there should not be a connotation of guilt attached to such a refusal.

Mr. HERNDON. That may occur in cases where the polygraph is used for precise judgments of guilt and nonguilt, but the Bureau does not use it in that way. We are very firm on that policy. And we insist our examiners keep that in mind in their interpretations of the charts.

Mr. Moss. Thank you.

Mr. Rumsfeld?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I was curious to know what the gentleman means by the phrase "pathological liar"—what he thinks that means. He used it twice.

Mr. HERNDON. I think there are certain individuals who have been described by psychiatrists and psychologists as pathological liars, who, because of their emotional and mental makeup, Mr. Congressman, can deceive or practice deception without any emotional hesitancy or response whatsoever. In other words, they can lie, feeling at ease, and not create any problem to themselves.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Well, to pursue the questioning that the chairman was following, would you not answer "yes" to this question, that different individuals, because of their environment, have developed different levels or different categories of possible untruths that they can tolerate and not be pathological liars, but be something in between, just by virtue of their circumstances, background, and experiences and associations?

Mr. HERNDON. I think that is true. And I think the trained examiners and interrogators consider that, because they consider the mores, background, and social status of the man and they have to