

Here's the argument in 4 paragraphs: the R shouldn't be used in forensics simply because it's so easily rebutted. The rebuttal psychologist now can choose attacks:

1) Rescore the protocol in question so it comes out contradicting the administering psychologist's position, 2) accept the scoring but disagree on the interpretation or 3) denounce the Rorschach (using the now huge lit) as useless, and any psychologist using it as ignorant, incompetent or willfully ignoring lit.

Will the administering psychologist *get* to do surrebuttal to refute these notions? Maybe not. Will the cross of the rebuttal be effective? Unlikely. Will "stealing thunder" work? Pretty risky.

Hence (goes the argument): since the risks of rebuttal are so huge, it shouldn't be used. Why would any attorney *pay* someone to build such a liability into a case?

I hope this helps your understanding of the argument!

rkm