

You spoke of Professor Dollard approving your book. Nonetheless, at the same time, he called you an angry journalist, is that correct? Do you think that term and connotation that derives from it implies any suspicion of your objectivity?

Mr. GROSS. He stated two things in the review. First, I don't think angry journalist can be interpreted as negative. The next thing he said, "It was about time someone did it." But later in the review he said, "Mr. Gross brings too much hatred, too much venom to his anger against personality testing." He objected to my title, and thought perhaps I was thinking of bird watching or brain washing. I didn't understand his point, but he objected to that. He made no negative comment about the content or facts in the book. But he was objecting as a psychologist. I'm sure he felt a personal affront to his profession because of my comments and my language, which I think is his due. But, he made no objection to my information and, as a matter of fact, he agreed completely with my point of view.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Are you working on another book on another subject matter these days?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. What subject is that?

Mr. GROSS. I don't know if it is pertinent, but if you like, I am doing an investigation of the medical profession.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me suggest why I think it is pertinent.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is not pertinent to this.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I think it is, Mr. Chairman. Let me suggest why. You made almost sledge hammer accusations, many of which this committee would be willing to accept, accept their credibility and I, for one, would but, on the other hand, if we are going to build a creditable record to be used by Congress and those outside, we have to make it appear that we have inquired, as Mr. Horton indicated quite appropriately, to your credentials to see whether the charges that you make are supported by fact. I, for one, don't doubt that much of what you say is probably true. At the moment, we have an enormous void in the record.

Now, if you were in the position of the chairman and you wanted to offer someone a chance to rebut what you said, whom do you think you would call as a witness?

Mr. GROSS. I would guess any one of the operators of testing corporations, or their chief psychologist.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Are there any outstanding authorities in the United States that, in your opinion, are somewhat more objective than those commercially involved in this subject?

Mr. GROSS. It is difficult to get someone in favor of testing who is not commercially involved. The difficulty is that the academic community—this is a very unfortunate thing—the academic community in some cases is mingled closely with the commercial testing community. For example, some of the testing corporations in New York, Chicago, and elsewhere, have academic people on their staffs and some are owned by academic people. Some psychologists at Columbia Teachers College do testing commercially in addition to their academic work. So, it is very difficult to separate the two. I don't know of any academic person who is an advocate of the efficiency of testing who is not commercially involved.