

Article 43 pages + 2 numbers of illustrations (drawings)

America Consulate Stubli
Suffolk 9.19.25

P. A. Supt P. A. Neubelhi
America Consulate
Hamburg, Germany.

Dear Doctor Neubelhi:

I have looked over your manuscript and am returning the copies with some suggestions for change. The suggestions have to do chiefly with brevity. You have put in much detail that is practically similar to what is in German and which I believe would be better covered by merely referring to German because the German tests & methods are known to everyone who does moral tests and it would detract from the att. attractiveness of your article to compel persons to read through all around what they already know. It is also to be borne in mind that the Bureau has a limited amount

2

if funds for publication.

In connection with the above Dr. Reichenbach's article will probably be out before yours. He uses the same tests and he will either include these details or omit them. If he includes them another printing of them by the government would be out of the question. If he omits as I think he will you should also omit.

I have made notations on one of the carbon copies which you can see.

The idea, expressed on page 7, of substituting your mathematical tests for test 3 you & Stanford revision is an error and should come out. The Stanford Tests were standardized for certain people of a certain age and while it is found on others could not be substituted for them without an entirely new revision of the Stanford Scale.

Instructions about repeating digits, pages 1 & 8, except the first paragraph showing the rate.

3

merly state that the procedure or instructions
were similar to that given by Turner or
something to that effect.

Rewrite the first paragraph under remarks
page 8. It does not seem to express exactly
what is meant (see note)

On page 9. you state that the Birrell
Simon designs were scored according to the
Stanford revision method and omit the samples
~~from~~ on the next two pages because it appears
that your methods were approximately the same.

Refer at the top to the number and year of the test.
The Swastika design is a less familiar thing
so I would show me only what it is but
also the samples for scoring.

You state on page 13 that all answers
were recorded and graded according to the
Stanford Revision and an examination of your

examples shows this to be true, therefore omit the few pages of examples because it, the scratch, is a restatement of what is in Perriman's book & will make this more reading to practically all who read the article.

On page 23 you probably did not give instructions for the word justice that way. It has the suggestion of the answer you probably used the method on page 14 of the instructions (Broadway) It is better I think.

I wonder whether the examples are necessary except for the two words given in Perriman. I do not feel sure however about taking part out and leaving the other. See note on page 25

Your setting of the absurdities (26 + 27) is similar to Perriman. I would therefore say so and omit the examples.

The same applies to the three Stanford words (differences) fly, store, wood etc. In these cases there is a question about taking part out and leaving the remainder

The heading page 32 is incorrect. In question of orientation is involved in these tests. They are tests of intelligence as used here. One is descended or he confused & not who merely ignorant of the time.

The previous remark, page 34, is out of place in an article like this and should be omitted.

I would omit the procedure about the weights pages 34 & 35 & merely say that the test was given according to the Stanford Revision procedure.

I would also omit the samples of correct and incorrect drawings of the diamond & the back & field test and refer to Terman.

In connection with the above suggestions it is feasible that I telling you that it would be well to record answers carried line which seems strange to Americans, that I led you to include examples that I now advise you to eliminate.

6

Your examples however do not seem to vary from the old Turner standards. If there is a slight difference it could be just as well cover by saying that variations more or less to cover differences created by differences in customs & habits of the people etc.

Your article contains very much valuable material and I hope you will be able to rewrite it quickly and send it to me again.

Sincerely yours
Lawrence Hall.
Aug 20