

1st September, 1954.

Dear John,

Thank you for your letter which I do not, however, understand as I do not believe Owen has ever published in Sankhyā. It is a good idea and I must get him to do so. (*Understand to have now*)

I do not suppose you will understand my point of view, but I should like to know whether, since many Americans have been seriously influenced by Neyman, whether you accept his doctrine of the non-existence of inductive inference or inductive reasoning, and the impossibility of making probability statements about numerical values in the real world, such as the distance of the sun.

As you know, I consider that the American consumer, especially in the mathematical departments, has been sold a pup in the Neyman and Pearson theory of testing significance, principally owing to the absence of direct contact with the natural sciences of people like Neyman and Wald.

It would not be surprising if there were a theoretical ambiguity in Behren's problem, since there is no sufficient set of estimates appropriate to the three parameters, i.e. the two variances, and the distance between the means. The amount of information dropped, however, must be quite minute, and any

ambiguity of a serious magnitude, e.g. such as the difference between my solution and that <sup>one</sup> of Bartlett and Welch, could not be explained in this way.

Yours sincerely,