

March 6th. [1926] J.H.B.
Gunby Hall,
Burgh le Marsh,
Lincolnshire.

My dear Fisher,

I understand you have left it to me whether to post the enclosed to the Morning Post. This places me in an awkward position. I think your letter is a very good one and temperately expressed on the other hand I have been brought up with a very strong distaste for controversy & I would do a great deal to do anything to avoid such

Lawes Agricultural Trust.

Director:
SIR JOHN RUSSELL, D.Sc., F.R.S.

R. A. FISHER, M.A., Chief Statistician.
WINIFRED A. MACKENZIE, M.Sc. (ECON.)

Rothamsted Experimental Station.
Harpenden.

MARCH 5th., 1926.

Sir,

It cannot fail to be a matter of grave concern to all who are interested in the future of our race that the Dean of St Pauls should find himself opposed, on humanitarian grounds, to the policy of eugenical sterilisation; more especially since in the opinion of many of us who have long studied the subject, this means affords the only practicable remedy for some of the saddest afflictions to which mankind is subject.

"Mutilation" is a hard word, and in certain cases may be a hysterical word. The dentist who pulls out a tooth may be said to mutilate the patient, and certainly this is a more severe operation than the simple section of the duct which is sufficient to render a man sterile. The horrible associations of the word mutilation are inappropriate because the patient voluntarily undergoes the operation; and we do not urge the legalisation of eugenical sterilisation save with the consent of the patient. To this vital fact the Dean makes no allusion, and it has evidently entirely escaped his attention.

Drawing a tooth is a nasty business, but if it cause us suffering we do not hesitate to submit to its loss without a feeling of degradation. Much less should such be felt if the suffering is spared not to us but to our innocent posterity.

R.A. Fisher,
Secretary, Eugenics Education Society.