

24th November, 1954.

Dear Hanson,

Thanks for your letter. I am glad you feel that the meeting on Monday was a success. You will, I think, see what I meant in trying, in letters to you previously, to guard against the meeting becoming merely a clash of ^{parti-pis} party-free contentions. I agree with you that it would have been a pity if you had intervened from the Chair. You probably saw how eager some members of the Statistical Department present were to counter any suggestion that my paper on randomisation in card play was the earliest on minimax procedures. It may very well be, as I said, that von Neumann was writing about it earlier, but I fancy it was all in German at that time. In any case it would seem that I was the only person present available to mention my own paper.

I am very sorry to hear that Braithwaite has decided not to open the discussion in January, and I suppose it was evidence of friction, as in Goode's attitude, which made him unwilling to join in what might have been a dog-fight. As you know, he has already seen the typescript of my paper. I do not see why you should not open the discussion yourself, and, if you wish to, I could of course send you the paper in advance.

As to reporting, two young men associated with this department are L. Payne and Henry Bennett, either of whom might be willing to undertake the task, though I have not spoken to either. Alternatively, of course, Cambridge is very well off for mathematically minded scientists in physics, geophysics, chemistry, etc., any of whom could give an intelligent and unbiased account, though, of course, a feeling for the finer points is rare and, as the history of the theory of probability shows, most people find logical distinctions unaccountably difficult. I was surprised to see Bernard at Monday's meeting, and sorry to have missed him when the meeting broke up.

Sincerely yours,