COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS.

CONCERNING PSYCHO-CLINICAL EXPERTNESS.

A great deal has been said recently regarding what constitutes psycho-clinical expertness, and what kind and amount of training are necessary to fit one to make mental examinations of school children.

The purpose of this note is to raise the question whether, in a field of applied science as new as this one, there may not be danger of the critic assuming an unduly contemptuous attitude towards the efforts which are put forth by the average worker, and whether there is not danger also of evaluating over-critically the work of the scientific explorer after methods and principles of mental examinations. The problems, indeed, are so new and difficult that the most cautious and competent worker must progress slowly and perhaps with occasional stumbling.

No one, of course will deny that it is legitimate to call attention to the dangers of amateur mental testing, of taking too seriously the mental diagnoses made by school nurses, teachers and doctors, and of confusing the complex and baffling science of clinical psychology with the mechanical use of the Binet intelligence tests. At the same time it is well to remember that the methods of clinical psychology, even at their best, are still in an embryonic stage of development and that no one, however sagacious or well-trained in psychological technique, can rightfully lay claim to any great degree of psycho-clinical expertness.

The writer would especially protest against the publication of contentious articles by workers in this field whose purpose appears to be that of disparaging the results of others. Some of the articles of this nature which have found their way into print are colored in every aspect by bombast, pretentiousness and shockingly open claims to recognition. Some of them are hardly less than bawling self-

advertisements in which word-coining and word-juggling take the place of scientific content.

Let all of us who are really concerned about the progress of this new and fascinating division of applied psychology be content to work by the best methods now available, correcting and amplifying these as rapidly as possible by positive contribution of fact, and let us cease wasting energy hysterically over the "dangerous" and "pernicious" methods of "incompetent" psycho-clinicians.

LEWIS M. TERMAN.

Stanford University.

EDMUND BURKE HUEY.

The death of Dr. Edmund Burke Huey, at Connell, Washington, which was announced in the last number of this JOURNAL, signifies such a loss to the science of education that it justifies a more complete comment at this time.

Dr. Huey was born at Curllsville, Pa., December 1, 1870. Most of his early life was spent in Pennsylvania and Indiana. In 1891 he entered Grove City College, and after a year there registered at Lafayette College, where he completed the requirements for his degree in Arts in 1905. While in college he was recognized as a student leader not only in the work of the classroom, but in the literary societies, the oratorical and debating contests, in certain lines of lighter athletics, and in college social affairs. His high rank as a student is indicated by the fact that he won prizes in oratory, debating, English, and philosophy, and was graduated valedictorian of his class. The two years immediately following his graduation were spent as a teacher of Latin in the Harry Hillman Academy, Wilkes-Barre, Pa. During this period Mr. Huey further developed his philosophical interests in making a study of James's two-volume work on psychology and several volumes of Wundt in the original. At this time he seems to have definitely made up his mind to devote himself to the field of psychology.

Receiving an appointment to a scholarship in Clark University he entered that institution in the fall of 1897 and continued there until he received his doctorate in psychology two years later. His close application to his work in the University brought him to the verge of a collapse, so that a less determined man would have prob