

18th August, 1956.

My dear Frank,

I am at last able to send you a copy of this book, which I do with the feeling that if you do not understand it no-one is likely to. I am sure a fruitful source of misconception in the minds of people like Bill Cochran is that which I tried to remove on page 120, where I notice that 'or' has been substituted for 'of', which does not make the sense any clearer. I have marked another case on page 149, where they seem to have printed a unit for a capital I, and they seem to have scrambled some totally unimportant formulae on page 172, where in number (231) there is \underline{s} , for \underline{s}_2 , and in (232) there ^{should be} ~~is~~ \underline{t}_2 for \underline{r}_2 .

It will be interesting to see just how long a life will remain to the fallacies which have been centered on Behrens' solution, and which certainly deceived Cochran as much as Bartlett. Behrens, by the way, himself seems to be alive and functioning somewhere in Germany, though I do not know on which side of the Iron Curtain. Perhaps he is not even aware of what a

stumbling block his work has become in the minds of Neyman and Pearson!

Sincerely yours,

Enc.