19th January, 1955.

Dear Hanson,

Many thanks for sending me your review of Braithwaite's book. I am, of course, baffled by its metaphors, but perhaps I can get the general drift. I can assure you that modern statistical techniques, wherever they may be used, did not originate in industry or in actuarial work, but in biometry in chemical laboratories, experimental farms and such places, where the improvement of natural knowledge is pursued. Of course, in doing scientific work one may occasionally carry out a preliminary screening of material entirely in the spirit of a seed-testing station passing a batch for acceptance. I am concerned, though, that this sort of procedure should not be mistaken for the means by which new scientific ~~information~~ advances, or improvements in theory, are actually accomplished.

Still, I have dinned this in for an hour or so, and you doubtless have heard quite enough about it. I recall that one young man wanted me to start again at the beginning and tell him wherein my methods and ideas differed from Neyman's. Of course, one difference is that my work is not a mere parasitic restatement

of the methods and arguments available before my arrival.

Why do you speak of Wald as though he had a theory of his own on deciding between hypotheses? Was that not the core of Neyman and Pearson's celebrated work on the "theory of testing hypotheses", in which they were carrying out a formality of deducing, by a very circuitous path, the properties of statistical estimates from those of tests of significance based on such estimates?

Sincerely yours,

Enc.