

reliability is 0.26 it means that you can come out completely different just by taking it the second time. You react differently to the pictures. You tell a different story, and the tester then gives a different interpretation. It is a very loose discipline.

I think it is very unfortunate that the psychologists, rather than the layman, have not taken the time and effort to explain all of the technical fallacies and problems in these instruments. Good doctors will always tell a patient or his family the extent and value of the therapy. If a person is dying of cancer of the stomach and the doctor knows the patient is not going to live, he is not going to claim that the patient will recover when he won't. He will tell the truth.

I think it is incumbent upon testers, and psychologists, people who make tests, and those who use them to tell the truth about their claims. Often they do not.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Horton?

Mr. HORTON. In your last statement, it is along the lines I wanted to follow. You, of course, have made some statements here, and I don't mean to be critical of them, but I just want to get the background for them. You have expressed some opinions and these, of course, are your opinions.

Mr. GROSS. Right.

Mr. HORTON. And the last thing you said, what is the truth? What do the psychiatrists say about these various tests and what is their opinion with regard to the statements that you have made? In other words, are you expressing an opinion which is shared by the majority of psychiatrists, if you will, or is this an opinion which is in controversy? Is yours an opinion that stands alone? Do all psychiatrists think all of these tests are no good?

Mr. GROSS. It is a very good question. I will give you a fair appraisal of the professional attitudes toward the tests. When my book came out, it was viciously attacked in the psychological journals. Fortunately the New York Times gave it to John Dollard of Yale, who maintains a rather independent attitude toward the field and tries to be objective. Because he was reviewing for the Times, I suppose he assumed the difficult responsibility. The review stated that my book was accurate, et cetera.

I have read you the paragraph from the review where he agreed that the tests were worthless. However, the psychological journals attacked the book viciously. They gave it begrudging credit for its extensive research, but stated that I brought a tremendous amount of personal venom and hatred to my opinion on testing which, therefore, was colored. Of course I anticipated this.

The psychiatric community, however, and this is my appraisal of it, had a different attitude than the psychological community. The difference between the two communities are the fact that psychologists are not medical doctors, while the psychiatrist is a medical doctor.

The psychiatric community, by and large, approved my point of view, that the use of tests to determine mental health was a dangerous procedure.

Dr. Lawrence Kubie, who is now here in Washington, I believe at the University of Maryland Medical School and connected in some way with the Government—I believe with NIH but I am not sure—previously was professor of psychiatry at Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, and one of the foremost psychiatrists in America.