

2nd July, 1951.

My dear Bessie,

It was nice to have your letter of June 6th, and later your press cuttings.

What a number of different issues seem inevitably raised by any controversial action such as that of MacArthur. I find it very difficult to find any basis for logical coherence amid a welter of such arguments as: This man had his aircraft bombed out on Batnan a few hours ~~after~~ the attack on Pearl Harbour, OPPO HIS JUDGEMENT ON A political question in China nine years later should be discredited. And on both sides this kind of thing seems to go on.

I understand that on one or two occasions in the past ^{as a political candidate} MacArthur has allowed his name to go forward as far as the party chose to take it, which I believe was not far. I suppose it to be axiomatic that in this he was exercising the unchallengeable right of any American citizen. Equally, that the administration under which he was serving has a right to claim that he should not engage in party propagandist activity aimed at discrediting it. If injured in this way it has, of right, the remedy of removing him, and leaving him free to do his worst as a private citizen opposed to the government. Is that the position, or is he not even now a private citizen, by reason of continuing salary (or pension, whichever it is properly regarded as being)?

I know it is impossible in this wicked world, but I

could wish, if the above is the root of the matter, that the dismissal had not been politically prepared by trying to make him a scapegoat for the occasional spasms of public disappointment arising from the successive transformation scenes staged by the Russians in Korea and China. The Russians are skilful at making propaganda value of events, and I think the Kremlin would be very happy to think that the American public would always tear down a competent commander provided reverses occur in his command.

I am too far away to know, but I suppose the administration have very handsomely beaten off the political attack. I only hope that they may now feel sufficiently strong, in public support, to develop a coherent and rational Eastern policy.

Horace Gray has sent me Neyman's review of my collected papers in the Scientific Monthly. Though everywhere spiteful, it is interesting psychologically that his dislike becomes urgent at just those points where his own work owes most to mine. E.g. his theory of Testing Hypotheses regularly uses the sample space, which I introduced in 1915. Rather than admit this he ascribes the innovation to Pearson in 1910, who used indeed Euclidean *hyperspace*, but for a different purpose!

Likewise he hates Likelihood, not in spite of, but because of the fact that the "power function" of his testing theory is in fact the likelihood function disguised.

I am glad to know of the Cleveland meeting; at some time

you must tell me more about it.

I had not heard of Shewhart's accident. I hope your further news is good.

Last year I published a little book called the "Theory of Inbreeding". It did not offer to be a history of the subject, but aimed at giving compactly a competent method of investigating the genetic effects to be expected of inbreeding. My two American reviewers so far are, however, very angry with me for not giving whatever credit may be due to Sewall Wright's theory of path coefficients; It seems to me to be hard enough work to work out and explain carefully what may be helpful to others, without feeling under an obligation to examine and criticise what others have done towards (perhaps) the same end. If better methods have been available before, I hope they may be used without scolding me. I believe many of my *results* are new, and hope my method may be helpful, and more thorough than anything I have seen.

Forgive me for all this whine. What with Neyman and Lush I feel a little irritated!

Sincerely yours,