

St John's College  
Cambridge  
1938 NW 23.

Dear Fisher,

I expect you are swamped  
under with letters of congratulation,  
but cannot restrain myself from  
writing another. You have done a  
great work in bringing sanity into  
biology, and I regard it as a tribute  
to biologists that they have recognized  
it.

I am having a scrap with the  
C. P. S. editorial committee. On the  
advice of their referees they have cut  
out about half of a paper of mine,  
including the part that concerned  
Steven's problem, and are taking

the line that it is only as a personal favour that they can contemplate publishing any of it, on the ground that their referees object to the fundamental principles. I take the line that where there are different possible modes of treatment the only fair thing is to publish both, but as far as possible, usually by suggesting personal discussion, to avoid waste of space by emphasizing apparent differences that come from sheer misunderstanding.

Yours sincerely

Harold Jefferys.

---

The part that deals with Stevens is in no sense an attack on him, but simply takes my usual line that

on a significance test the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$  must be stated in terms of one new parameter, and the chief factor in the test depends on the ratio of the estimate of that parameter to its standard error. As far as Stevens's actual problem is concerned his criterion would give this ratio when the row & column totals are not very different, which I gathered from conversation with him would be the actual case he is considering. But if they differ greatly, as they do in a related problem that has concerned me, there is an appreciable difference.

H.J.