

In fact, I once met Mr. Shriver briefly. I mentioned the tests, and he said, "Yes, they are spooky," and looked away as if he were preoccupied with more important matters. At that point I did not have the strength and sophistication to persist without feeling like a troublemaker. Nevertheless, I felt that a strong conviction had been charmed into betrayal. One reason Mr. Shriver has received so few complaints is that it would take an exceptional person not to be overcome by his charisma.

The psychological tests, however,

I am still reading from her letter——

Mr. ROSENTHAL. This is a letter addressed to whom?

Mr. FREEDMAN. To me, by a former Peace Corps volunteer, and one who is as gung ho on the Peace Corps as anyone can be. She thinks it is the greatest thing this Government has done in recent years, but she was deeply offended by the tests and wrote to me about them.

The psychological tests, however, raised problems ranging from simple insult to a stripping away of one's privacy and dignity and self-respect. They don't need to know that much about me to assess me as a volunteer. I can assure you from personal experience that many Peace Corps volunteers found their training to be a horror of Orwellian thought control.

That is the end of the quote from her letter.

Finally, we are told that such testing is in the interest of the United States, the interest of the Peace Corps, or "perhaps most important * * * (in the Peace Corps) volunteer's own interest"—and Justice Brandeis spoke eloquently to this issue also.

Experience——

he wrote——

teaches us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent * * * The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding.

We might further observe that it is somewhat presumptuous to suggest that only some Government employees are of such vital importance to the national interest to warrant psychological testing. Are Peace Corps volunteers more important than Congressmen? Are HEW Secretaries more important than Senators? What is the logic that excuses the President's Cabinet from questioning so vital to national welfare?

Indeed, can we really afford to have a President, in the most trying and important job in the world, who is less psychologically and emotionally stable than a Peace Corps volunteer?

If the tests are all we are assured they are, surely not a single public official should be immune.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have gotten our values badly skewed up, when we can be more concerned with screening out an occasional psychologically inadequate employee than we are with the gross affronts to personal dignity that are perpetrated against large numbers of other citizens in the process.

In view of the some of the testimony I have heard, it seems necessary to return to elementary truths: The end does not justify the means. Whatever dubious good may come from dissecting, cataloging, and evaluating the most personal thoughts and beliefs of individual citizens, it will never justify the great injury done to all of us, individually and as a society, in the process.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully urge that this subcommittee draft and propose legislation prohibiting interrogation