

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1969

Sirhan Expert Wanted 'Vivid' Report

By DOUGLAS ROBINSON
Special to The New York Times

LOS ANGEES, March 18—A psychologist who has been testifying in behalf of Sirhan B. Sirhan said today that he had taken language from a psychiatrist's book on crime to make his own report "more exciting and vivid."

The psychologist, Dr. Martin M. Schorr, told the jury trying Sirhan for the murder of Senator Robert F. Kennedy that the material he had used was concerned solely with "describing the paranoid mechanism" and was taken only to make his own diagnosis "more readable." "I am not the best writer in the world," Dr. Schorr testified. "I was well aware that I was taking this material out of the book."

Dr. Schorr has been the center of a legal storm here since it was discovered last week that parts of his final report on Sirhan's mental state bore a strong resemblance to language appearing in a book entitled, "Casebook of a Crime Psychiatrist" by Dr. James A. Brussel of New York.

During two hours of grueling cross-examination this morning, Dr. Schorr repeatedly denied that he had "copied" language from the book.

Denies Copying Diagnosis

He also rejected a prosecution contention that he had used Dr. Brussel's diagnosis of two other criminals to form his own conclusions about Sirhan's mental condition.

And he stressed that the material he had taken from the book was used to "apply only to what I had written earlier on Sirhan in less illustrative language."

Dr. Schorr added that he had used portions of other books in his four-page final report on Sirhan. He did not identify the additional books.

Dr. Schorr's testimony today was somewhat different from what he said last Thursday when the matter of similar language was first brought to his attention.

At that time, the psycholo-

gist acknowledged that he had read Dr. Brussel's book last year and said that "when I see a phrase that fits in with my thinking, subconsciously and sometimes consciously it becomes part of my thinking."

Today, Dr. Schorr told the court that he had an "extensive" library of technical books and that he used the language in many of them in his diagnoses of patients to whom he has administered a series of tests designed to measure personality and emotional stability.

Asked if he considered Dr. Brussel's book a technical work, Dr. Schorr replied that he regarded the author as "very good."

Praises 'Vivid' Language

"He tells his story in vivid, illustrative language," the psychologist said. "It's an exciting kind of writing and he's an exciting author."

In his book, Dr. Brussel devotes the first two chapters to psychological examinations of George Metesky, the so-called "mad bomber" of New York City, and to a man who murdered a Queens woman in 1957. It is from these two chapters that Dr. Schorr took some of his material.

John Howard, an assistant district attorney, tried repeatedly to get Dr. Schorr to admit that his diagnosis of Sirhan was based on Dr. Brussel's diagnosis of the other criminals.

However, Dr. Schorr stubbornly rejected this contention and insisted over and over again that his report on the defendant was based only on his own "inductive logic" after he had studied the test scores.

The psychologist, who was nervous and more subdued than he was in earlier appearances on the witness stand, was admonished several times by Superior Court Judge Herbert V. Walker to answer specific questions rather than give rambling, qualifying answers.

Late in the morning, Emile Zola Berman, one of Sirhan's attorneys, read Dr. Schorr's first report to the jury. The nine-page document was filled

with dry psychological jargon and contained a minimum of illustrative language. The theme of the report was that Sirhan was a "paranoid psychotic."

Another Psychologist

During the noon recess, Mr. Berman was asked whether, in his opinion, the jury had been swayed by Dr. Schorr's testimony about using material from Dr. Brussel's book.

"I don't think it will have any effect on the jury," Mr. Berman said. "We've explained everything to them pretty thoroughly and I think they understand."

Dr. Schorr was excused as a witness at the outset of the afternoon session after six days on the stand. He was followed by Dr. Roderick Richardson of Los Angeles, another clinical psychologist, who also gave Sirhan a battery of tests in his jail cell.

Dr. Richardson, in his report, essentially supported Dr. Schorr's findings on Sirhan's mental state. The defendant, he said, was of "bright-normal to superior mental endowment" and was "paranoid and schizophrenic to a psychotic degree."

Dr. Richardson described Sirhan as "someone who has a deep distrust of others, a poignant sense of alienation and isolation, who feels abandoned and alone." The defendant, he added, exhibits a "tense anxiety amounting to terror."

The psychologist went on to say that Sirhan demonstrated "very severe mental and emotional disorders." In this state, he testified, the defendant "could not know the difference between right and wrong."