

June 29. 33.

CRIPP'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

Dear Fisher.

I am very sorry to hear that you are in bed, and hope that your forecast of a quick recovery is correct. I think it likely that I am a bit muddled about family allowances, but the confusion is partly due to my careless writing. Take doctors making £1000 a year. You hold, I gather, that they all should have the same family allowance. If so I agree with you; for this puts them on a social equality. I presume that those doctors who have risen more quickly will on the average be younger and have less children. If this be so the quick risers will be paying

Somewhat towards the slower risers allowance; but I see no harm in that.

If the [£]1000 a year doctors subscribe somewhat to aid the family allowance of the £500 a year doctors, there might be no harm in it. It may be that the graduation of salaries is too steep, and that this would rectify matters. Taxing the rich for the poor may be right, but it is always somewhat dangerous.

Ordinary family allowance systems may be regarded as non-parents paying out and parents receiving. From this it follows that if ^{it is} ~~it is~~ accepted as just, there should be no objection to parents getting, not merely getting rebates or income tax, but also actual doses. But I fear it would be hard to make this acceptable.

Returning to our doctors, they naturally fear the possibility, in regard

to the prospects of their children, or
death or failure of health. This is
now, I gather, their worst fear, and
many I know insure against the cost
of education of each child by payments
from its infancy. Are such payments
eugenic or dysgenic? At first sight
we may be inclined to say eugenic,
as getting rid of fears of the future.
But if ^{the} payments, as is usual, vary
with the size of the family, and if
non-parents contribute nothing, I
suppose the result is dysgenic. And
if the commonest form of ~~the~~ safeguarding
the family education is dysgenic,
does it not want looking into?
Could such a risk anyhow be
covered by family allowances? I
put this as a question; but I want
no answer. I am only writing down
my thoughts.

On another topic which we
talked about, will it be ever possible
to sufficiently reduce the fertility of

The social problem group without
some definite pressure being applied?
I believe not, and on the whole I
believe it will be best to face that
conclusion at once. At all events
we should go so far as to say
that purely voluntary sterilization
must be judged by its results, and
that experience may dictate
the necessity of further measures in
future.

Returning to family allowances, I
am sorry I gave you the trouble
of writing that letter when sick.
Don't trouble again, even if you
disagree; because, as I said before,
I shall try to keep clear of the
controversy as regards details.

No letter yet from Goddard.

Very truly
yours
recoy

Henry D. Darius