Dear Dr. Fisher,

I am again sorry to have delayed reply to your letter of the 20th inst., but am having a very busy time just now. While I quite agree personally that prosperity in the best index we can get of Capability, the Socialists, of course, indignantly repudiate it; and as it is Capability we really mean, I don't see why we should not say so, even if we have to fall back on economic success as its equivalent when arguing from statistical data. However, as I said before, I leave this to you.

As to the general question of agreement, I feel, as I said, that you have gone as far as can possibly be expected of you, considering your own feelings, and I do not want to press you further as you have included the main point of depriving official refusal to allow birth-control instruction at State Health Centres. From my point of view, realising that Birth Control has come to stay and that the only effective method of arresting the 71 Classes to greater reproduction is to relieve them of the burden of supporting the children of these 71 types, I should wish our Society
strongly be advocated; the giving of such information, not only to those who ask for it, but especially to the C3 types, whether they ask for it or not, and I put it in this form in my own statement. I cannot see any excuse or other objection to this, and I feel that if our Society is willing to endorse birth-control at all it would be better to take a strong positive line than a somewhat weakly expressed permissive one.

Again, the latter part of your statement, respecting that the remedy for the dynamic birth-rate is probably to be found in an economic direction to one with which I am in agreement, but your wording appears to lend up to the advocacy of family endowment (quite falsely and far from your point of view), whereas I should lay stress on the relief of taxation, as mentioned above. Although I do not wish to lay stress on hasty evidence such as that mentioned in my last letter, I still feel convinced that any scheme of family endowment, however carefully devised, will sooner or later be located to the advantage of the less worthy types, and I therefore feel that in laying stress on the reduction of the burden of C3 children we are on safer ground.

These are the chief reasons for my still preferring my original statement, but I have no desire to press my special views, and am quite willing for your statement to be forwarded.
As to your other remarks, I appreciate your attitude to some extent, but still feel that you have some special reasons for it, as I have long been familiar with every type of objection and yet cannot place yours. As I understand it, you have no theological or conventional moral prejudice against birth control; you admit the Malthusian doctrine, at least in principle; and you agree that birth-control is likely to spread over the whole of civilization. If that is the case I should have thought that you would have joined with other moderate birth-controlers such as those of our Imperial Council in advocating birth-control but seeking to pursue it on empirical lines, whereas, as I heard you say at the Council, you hate birth-control and are convinced that it will bring about moral and racial disaster. If I felt that, I should oppose it both and wait in every occasion, and I should be deeply interested to learn how far you can go in our direction, and what your fundamental objections are.

It is hardly worth while discussing details, while we are in doubt on principles, that you have raised one or two points of interest. First as to your point that birth-control will mean the extinction of its voters and the survival of the "anti". This would be inevitable if there really were two types or races, one pro and the other unhesitatingly anti, but the second class does not exist. Even the Roman Catholics are now hastening with all speed to adopt birth-control, and it is doubtful
whether there will be any arable in another generation.
As to the economic prosperity of France, of course, I do not pretend for one moment that a few more or less children at the present time would make much difference. But a few more children every year coming in due course into the labor market or inheriting the already partly subdivided land holdings, did make so much difference in the past as to make the French people adopt almost universally the two-child system, and the "marginal theory" of economics shows the great difference between the "little more" and the "little less".

"Your reference to neo-Malthusianism as an "imaginary entity," shows, as I ought to have anticipated, that you have been unaware of the doctrine vilified by the Malthusian league during the long and arduous sentences, through its organ and leaflets. I am therefore enclosing a couple of the reports in one of which its principles are set forth, and this will at least show you that there has been a very definite body of doctrine which has been actively before us for half a century. I quite agree that many modern birth controllers, including the most prominent workers, have gone to extremes which I for one cannot endorse, but that does not alter the fact that there is and has long been a scientific doctrine.

My claim for open-mindedness is literally true, and I have declared on many occasions that Birth Control is in itself only a tool which like other tools can be used for good or evil. I do not like it any more than you do, but up to the present I have been intellectually convinced that there is no escape from it, and I feel fairly sure that even you would not like to see our country return to the pre-Birth-control birth-rate.