Dear Shewhart,

I am writing to obviate the possible results of a typically Pearsonian piece of mischief-making, attempted in his recent paper in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* (Volume 17, page 204), where he makes believe that the rather severe criticisms that I had directed against the work of Neyman and Pearson, for misrepresenting the logic of tests of significance in the Natural Sciences, was in some sort a criticism of your work in quality control.

This, of course, it was not, and I believe no one reading my paper, of which I sent you a copy, will have gained that mischievous impression. If Neyman and Pearson had followed your example, I should have had no cause to criticize them.

For the rest, Pearson's paper seems to be busily engaged in evading the issue, and especially omits all reference to the numerical discrepancies, which I had stressed, between his method of approach and mine. I think he over-estimates his own share compared with that of Neyman, for when I used to see them together
at University College I somehow got the impression that it was
only Neyman's flattery which made Pearson think he was making any
personal contribution.

In any case, the matter of priority in an erroneous approach
is scarcely worth arguing about, for as Dr. Johnson said, "I will
not dispute the precedence of a bug and a flea".

I am guarding myself in this way against mischief-making, for
on some previous occasions Pearson has been partially successful.

Sincerely yours,