e.c. F. oller

Maynarket, S.W.1

13th January 1954

Dear R.A.F.,

Thank you for yours of the 11th, but I am left wondering what to suggest to the Research Section Committee next week. Perhaps we can have a word about that before or after to-morrow's Council meeting; I am inclined to complete my screed anyway, and propose to the Committee that they should consider it and something of Miss Creasy's for our May meeting, possibly cancelling the one planned for March. I shall still hope to persuade you to read my draft, when I have finished it; for one thing, I would not want to use the word 'fiducial' in any new context without first referring to you.

I understand that Miss Creasy embarked on her investigation of her own free will, regarding it as an exercise in the manipulation of fiducial probabilities that would lead her to the usual result. When she arrived at a different one, she should of course have been told to find the flaw in her argument. Instead, she was unfortunately encouraged by her then colleagues at Oxford to believe that her new limits were somehow more fiducial than the vene ones. I think that she is now disabused of that idea, but on the face of it, her mathematics leaves the reader wondering why an approach that is valid when we are considering the difference of two means should not also be applicable to a discussion of their quotient. The point seems to me to be an interesting and not unimportant one, and George Barnard told me last night that he thinks that he can has an explanation.

Perhaps I am silly to worry about Miss Creasy in all this, but I would like to see her publish some modest soft of note out of her work: for one thing, I do not think that she feels particularly happy or secure, as yet, in her new post at Bedford College; and for another, she and David Finney began by thinking that she had upset some earlier work of mine, and I would hate either of them to have the least excuse for thinking that I had in any way suppressed her.

Yours sincerely,

Edpa Filler