

Author's Response

Sir:

I'm glad that Mr. Moran took the time to respond in writing with his opinion; more of us should address the fundamental concerns of our discipline in a public forum. He obviously did not like my book review, but it is just that: my review, my opinion. I didn't miss the point of Inman and Rudin's book, I just didn't agree with it or the way it was presented. Others, like Mr. Moran, will read the book and think it is wonderful; to each their own, as the saying goes. I won't delve into the generalist vs. specialist argument that Mr. Moran is so passionate about. I think that dichotomy is a will o' wisp that leads us astray from addressing the basic issues in all of the forensic sciences, not just criminalistics.

In that regard, however, I will defend myself. I take issue with Mr. Moran's implication of me as, among other things, a specialist who has "no clue of the value of applying a deep generalist back-

ground of experience/understanding to an area of forensic science specialization." Over the years, I have competently performed analyses in the areas of gunshot residue, hairs, fibers, fabric, ropes, paint, shoeprints, glass, anthropology, scanning electron microscopy, and energy-dispersive analysis, and I have processed items for latent fingerprints and worked many crime scenes, both local and national. I am neither a specialist nor a generalist: I am a forensic scientist.

Perhaps ignoring labels is the first step we can take to getting beyond this type of mindset and working towards a unified discipline.

These opinions are mine alone.

Max M. Houck, M.A.
FBI Laboratory
935 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, D. C. 20535