July 25-29
Chipps's Corner,
Forest Row,
Sussex.

My dear Fisher,

I am glad all went well yesterday. Of course it may need some compromise to get an agreement, but I hope that such will be obtained. It seemed to me that few if any of the Council had taken the trouble to remind themselves of what now appears in The Outline under the heading of "Family Quotations, Class Feb", and "Superior Stocks". I did not wish to call too much attention to these lest someone should say that they also should be amended.
But you should have them clearly in your own mind, though, I
take it, it is out of your province to touch them.

Please consider whether the heading Family Allowance could
with advantage be changed to Family Insurance. I think that
describe best what you mean.
I should now mind the Government
doing it under conditions which
would however never obtain.
A certain percentage 15% wages
declared, above a minimum
wage, and payments in
proportion to receipts.

Are you joining this new
Family Endowment-Scheme?
So far I am not.
On a different point. I am
probably seeing Delahay soon,
and want to talk heartily with
him, in the hope that he will
be employed under a R-Command.
I think your point is that the
difference between the correlated
with parent and uncle gives a
good test of heredity. I agree
in all cases where Cr. "all dies, at
Count for much. If a father has
become a criminal and the
leader has not, this may be to
a considerable extent in question
of chance; and I think there is
no doubt that being brought up
in a criminal home would make
a criminal. Such an argument
does not apply to mental defect.
Hence I see far greater difficulty
in strictly heredity in regard
to transgression crime than in
The case of mental defect: Do you agree? One other point. Miss Cry, who sees a lot of care papers, is on the whole struck with the absence of the signs of heredity. Probably she sees a good many upper class cases. Take 2 possibilities. Mr. D. is the result of say 5 abdominal all coming together, all recent; or, alternatively it is the result of 5 recent abdominal out of a group of 10 factors coming together. I have an idea that— with the second alternative, mental defect would appear more unexpectedly at an apparently good stock. Think this true? Is there any way of distinguishing the sudden appearance of a group of recent factors damage due to bad environment? Don't argue unless you have some words of wisdom for me.

Your success, Dr. Davis.