Dear Foster,

Your letter caught me during a cycling tour in Dunsley. I have written the enclosed as you suggest. The other matter is dealt with in a letter of mine to Nature this week. Does it not happen that this one could go better as a letter or a note?

You seem to have gone through the same cycle of opinion about Neumann's paper, but at an earlier stage. I didn't know that there was any stimulus from behind in his heavy Polish. I hope the seismologists at
Berkeley don't try to learn statistics from him - though Byrdy is there it is pretty hard to bluff.

I had a curious paper to refer to recently where a man did a lot of rigorous mathematics proving that something or other held "almost everywhere"; on inspection it appeared that the points not included in "almost everywhere" included all that could possibly arise.

I am wondering whether more attention shouldn't be given to the median. Its uncertainty seems much less sensitive to the form of the law than that of any other simple statistic, e.g. significance tests for it are easy. The kind of case where it may arise is where there are
only 8 in 10 observations admitting much to indicate the character of the law. The mean of all in the mean of the estimates may have little value, but there's always something to be said for the median. I have seen cases where the law is pretty certainly not normal, but whether it is $e^{-\lambda}$ ($\lambda > 0$) or rectangular or $(1 - \frac{2}{\lambda}) (\cos \lambda(x))$ there is no evidence therein.

Yours sincerely,

Harold Jeffreys