

no effective appeal procedure for our citizens who wish to challenge personality testing as an invasion of privacy, or contest interpretations of the findings in the event they do take the tests.

Remember there was nothing voluntary about these tests when the Special Inquiry of the House Government Operations Committee started its investigation. Persons could not select their own private psychologists and doctors to conduct and evaluate the tests. Government employees and job applicants are far from the cooperative subjects that even the test publishers admit are necessary to make the test results of any real value. They often resent the questions and admit quite freely that their answers were those they thought would get them the job or promotion. They even recognized the purpose of many of the questions on the so-called lie scale. Those who were obvious misfits probably would have been picked up through interviews and suitability checking anyway. Those who gave scrupulously honest answers opened themselves up to all sorts of things. The eccentrics, for example, who often can bring great creativity and drive to their work, were eliminated, I fear, because they raised doubts in the minds of personnel officers. Frankly, it disturbs me when we strive so hard to select persons within set patterns and exclude those who do not fall into those patterns, especially when the reliability and validity of the patterns are an unsettled controversy in themselves.

It used to be that whenever a person took an action, he knew that others might observe it and reach their own conclusions. But when he is forced to reveal his thoughts against his will, he has surrendered his conscience in a very real sense. At that point, man is being judged not by his actions or record, but by his thoughts as interpreted by someone else using fallible instruments of measurement.

It is true that many of the questions contained on personality questionnaires are innocuous. But it is equally true that many of them are not. Numerous questions inquire not only into very intimate sex matters, but family situations, religious views, childhood happenings, and other matters normally the business of no one other than the individual concerned and those persons with whom he may decide to share a confidence. In a free society, it is the individual who should make that decision, not the Government.

I am not saying these tests are without merit. I am sure that in some cases the tests are a useful tool in psychiatric evaluation when they are used in a clinical situation where there is a doctor-patient relationship. This is where they should be used—strictly in a medical determination. What bothers me is that personnel people often are interpreting these tests, and the answers are reposing in some Government file somewhere, all set to follow the person throughout his career or noncareer.

I am often told that personality testers are not interested in the answers to individual questions. This may be true too. But the fact remains that the person taking the test must give a written answer to a specific question. What happens if that answer is ever used for another purpose? Would it in any way harm of incriminate the person? I believe any reasonable man would have to accept my contention that the answers to many of the questions could be used in an adverse manner. So-called confidential files do not solve this problem. Our investigations show that the confidentiality of Government files is a myth. Such files sometimes float from agency to agency. Federal investigators in some instances are given access to information far removed from the subject of their inquiry. Folders sit open for inspection on desks and in the "In" and "Out" baskets of Government agency offices. Outright "leaks" of information occasionally come to light. If a person has been improperly evaluated, the notations in such files haunt him for the rest of his life. On some forms, he must state whether he has ever taken a psychological test. Why? The answer is obvious. One must also understand that whenever doubts are raised in relation to a Federal employee or job applicant, they are resolved in most cases against the employee or applicant. Unfortunately, that is the nature of the thing. Some would say it is only human. So the Government must exercise extraordinary caution when it does anything to raise such doubts.

I often hear the argument that national security and the good of the public service demand the use of such practices as personality testing and polygraph examinations. But when I ask the top officials of Government agencies, their assistants, and the assistants to the assistants, whether they were ever required to take such tests, the answer is always, "No." These are the people who make the great decisions which chart the course of the Nation, and, in some cases, the world. These are the people who have access to the most hush-hush secrets.