

July 17-29  
CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

I have been muddle headed  
over this amendment business, and I  
don't feel certain what way decided.  
In the old Outline there are 3  
paras - Family Limitation of the  
Low Fit, Superior Stocks, Conception  
Control. I understood it was only the  
last which was being altered. But  
then <sup>Birk</sup> Family Limitation is rather  
like the first heading. (That  
attempt I sent you overlooked some  
already in the outline, and maybe  
I don't much like my own draft  
now). Now the change which is

now suggested, if I understand  
it, leaves out your 3 reasons for  
contraception control, in fact all the  
non-Sexual reasons. It leaves out  
about-immoral purposes. In other  
words is something to be said for the  
omission. If a man, after taking  
contraceptive precautions, commits rape,  
it is the rape we condemn, not the  
contraception. What we want to  
say is that an immoral act  
cannot be made moral by the use  
of contraceptives. But it may not be  
worth saying. Then comparing the  
new version with the old printed

version, ~~and~~ the words and campaign  
are left out. In fact the changes are  
all, as far as I see, to lessen the  
strength of the case for contraception.  
If that is so, the objection to the  
change should come from Dwydale  
and Co; whilst if you make it  
clear that the change is not your  
proposal, I don't see that you  
need object. In fact can you  
accept the change and have done  
with it? I like the old wording  
in print best, but as I mainly  
drafted it, that is natural. I  
should leave out only after justifiable,  
and I should like to put in  
unemployment as a ground  
for limitation, as that seems to  
me much the best population

regulators. But I don't want  
to raise questions, as I think if  
my views are correct, they will  
probably be accepted in time.  
If Drysdale is going to object, then  
I wish you and he could get  
together beforehand, and circulate  
some compromise. In short - I  
don't feel very useful over this  
business.

Yours sincerely,

Samuel Dawson

I do feel that any wording  
should be circulated before  
it should be accepted.  
~~Therefore~~ Change <sup>should</sup> ~~that~~ - be small  
to be accepted, even if circulated.