My dear Frank,

Thanks for ringing me up yesterday. I shall be immensely interested to see what you think of writing about Lindley, for his review had so many misapprehensions, and what to me is most conspicuous, so much capacity for ignoring parts of the book which must have been new to him and subversive to much that he has thought and taught. In fact the best answer to him might be quite in the nature of a fresh review of the book from the point of view of one ready to appreciate advances in my own thought, and the removal of confusions on a few perfectly definable logical points, having received no explicit examination in much of my previous work to which they are relevant, such as the point about the semantics of the word 'probability' which, as it were, has peeped into view occasionally in my own writings and those of others, but which, recognized explicitly, played havor with what Neyman and Wald have taken for granted. The consequences in fact go rather far, and I rather hoped when I wrote it that you would like the introduction to Chapter V with its incidental comment on Gurdell's theorem, which has been emphasized very much as a high point in recent axiomatic theory.

I shall be quite accessible in the States at Michigan State
University, East Lansing from early October to early December,
and through Chester Bliss or Besse Day almost indifferently during
the other periods.

I told Gale here that I had mentioned to you that he had a problem that might be worth discussing from the point of view of exploring the capacity of a good electronic computer. I think he will have thought enough about the thing to make a talk with Healy perhaps, or with Lipton, useful later.

Sincerely yours,