

Your association says that dependent on the scale of an evaluation that one particular answer to one particular question might not be very important, but an individual's response to a particular question that may follow him for the rest of his career is important. There have been people who have lost jobs as a result of a refusal to answer some questions regarding their personal life. Some of these people have now been restored to their positions. I am not sure what part of the record you have read, but the fact of the matter is that if you think, it is serious enough to make these suggestions, which we welcome, by the way, and welcome very much, it was serious enough for Chairman Macy, John Macy, to define what the problem was and to lay down guidelines to correct the problem which this subcommittee is quite satisfied with.

As far as the Peace Corps is concerned, they overnight eliminated 195 questions out of 460, all related to the area that this subcommittee was interested in. So there was a problem, a very serious problem, that you yourself recognize, that the association recognized.

We have never been opposed to psychological testing per se. We have been strongly opposed to the use of personality testing as a way not only to determine a person's attitudes, but to determine how a person might think at some future date to some given situation. We feel that this is wrong to determine whether a person may join a union or intends to join the NAACP. The type of questions, thousands of these questions that have been thrown back and forth in Government circles without any great check being placed upon them—and I am happy that you indicated awareness of this problem and a desire to cooperate to protect the privacy of individuals.

This has been the very purpose of this inquiry, not to impede science, not to slow down scientific research, but rather to accept it, to accelerate it properly so that the beneficiaries of scientific research will at some time be able to benefit from the research rather than be condemned to a status of nonperson at some foreseeable future which seemed to be the path we were on in this particular area of interest.

Mr. Cornish?

Mr. CORNISH. Dr. Brayfield, how do you feel about the question of consent given to taking a personality test which is possibly intrusive? I am talking about the situation outside the clinical situation.

Dr. BRAYFIELD. This is the research situation?

Mr. CORNISH. Yes. I know the association, for example, has given great time and consideration to the question of confidentiality in testing, and I think rightly so. But has the association really directed itself to the issue of consent as well as confidentiality?

Dr. BRAYFIELD. I wish there were a simple response. If there were, the problem would probably not be very significant.

The fact that there is no simple response does indeed indirectly attest to the significance of the question. I think I would sort out my views in the following way: (1) I very much doubt that you can write a general prescription that would cover the issue; (2) and this is a basic question—I think that you have to weigh the relative values as does an investigator in the more generally established and recognized areas of medical research, as to the values to be derived from the research being undertaken; and (3) I think, as has been the primary concern of your committee, that you have to weigh the question of the