

March 7th. 1934.

DEPARTMENT OF
ZOOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE ANATOMY,
UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, OXFORD.

My dear Fisher,

Many thanks for your very helpful letter. I have not answered it by return so that I might be able to give it more careful consideration. I feel rather guilty that you have had to put off the meeting, I believe on my account. But you would, I am sure, understand the circumstances, and any date next week would be all right for me.

I found the statement of your opinion in the matter most helpful. I am very much obliged to you for taking the trouble to put it so clearly. After what you say I quite agree that it is desirable to stress the economic side.

The question remains how this should be done, and this is a delicate matter. In my view we must make it quite clear that the issue is economic and not political. That is, it must cut across party politics; we must avoid all possibility of giving the impression that the Society is allying itself with the program of one political party.

Now it seems to me that 3 particularly important points stand out in your letter:-

1. Family Allowances tend to relieve the distress of the poor.
2. That, for this reason, they should give ground for shifting some of the burden of taxation from the direct to the indirect type.
3. It is important to secure non-Socialistic as well as Socialistic support for Family Allowances.

Now my feeling is this. It seems to me that the short passage I mentioned in the pamphlet stresses point 1 to the exclusion of 2, which you made so clear in your letter. Thus many people reading it ^{would} (I personally feel certain) regard it as having a distinct bias towards the socialist program, and be repelled from the project.

You see it brings out so forcibly the idea of yet another burden to be laid on the rich (an element in the socialist program) that 2 (which contains an element of the Conservative program) must be brought out at the same time, and with equal force, to balance it, ~~if~~

DEPARTMENT OF
ZOOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE ANATOMY,
UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, OXFORD.

if the object under 3 is to be achieved and we are to
keep^{free} from party bias. The addition of just one or two
sentences in this passage to bring out point 2^{of fancy} would_λ be *what*
~~all that~~ is needed to make it acceptable all round.

I give you my opinion for what it is worth, as
you kindly asked for it. As I have told you, I am delighted
with the article as a whole.

Yours sincerely,

A. B. S. S. S.
—