

18th February, 1955.

My dear Frank,

Thank you for your letter of the 17th, which I was very glad to get. I have just sent the stuff, with your dates, to George Barnard, and hope he will be able to click on one of them.

I have missed what is in your mind on your 2x2 table, or bunch of 2x2 tables; let me know about it in advance of our meeting, as it may, or may not, provide a good illustration of some points we may need to get down to in detail.

On page 21 I had in mind that if samples were provided with known parameters, one could, using any selection of them *even from a single population* ~~or any one of them~~, repeatedly verify the relation between statistic and parameter. This, of course, would give the true probability for the totality of cases, though not necessarily for any chosen value of the statistic, since the selection of parametric values would have arbitrarily imposed an a priori probability distribution.

It is the probability in the aggregate of all cases that one relies on, together with the recognition that no sub-set can be discriminated giving a different frequency ratio. And

this, I submit, is exactly all you have in throwing dice.

Sincerely yours,