Dear Joshua

They say that only busy men have time to help others. Now I know what it means. I am very grateful. You have caught me out in errors and overstatements, caused me to rethink some things, and even made good syntactical and verbal improvements. Thanks heaps.

Tom Hunter has gone over it all and is equally impressed with your points and maybe a mite more approving of them all than I am!

I have received the AIBS-book reprint of your chapter, thanks. Had already used bits of it in corrected copy you have not seen. In a footnote I am indicating your growing skepticism about the practicability of reducing abortions by genetic engineering and reliance on preemptive abortion. And likewise I am indicating your reservations about the prospects for cloning.

I won't have the reference to William James' remark about how his thesis was first greeted with hoots, then minimized, then applauded, until I get back to my own study in Belmont, another week from now. I'll send it on.

There is no point in my speaking to all of the helpful annotations you made. I've accepted all the corrections and qualifications, and almost all of the reasoning and literary points you make.

As to the Roumanian woman doctor, yes, my understanding all along has been that the Congress in giving her entrance and citizenship knew the facts of her 3000 concentration camp abortions, I first read about it in the Partisan Review in the early post-war years, and have a reference to it in my Situation Ethics, not at hand for rechecking.

Like Tom Hunter, you stumble mentally over the statement that the end justifies the means. It will take more struggle to show folks that saying this does not mean moral anarchy.

You say that the Catholic teaching is that a human being is present after implantation, but I am sure it is after fertilization.

I am interested in your marginal refinements of utilitarian theory and your clinging to "rights" even when they have to be denied in practice. But I think that exploring these matters, fascinating though they are, is not for this book.
I have to question your figures on the exponential growth of cells by doubling. First of all, though, thanks a million for catching me out on my squaring at each step instead of doubling. But you say that we reach 70 trillion in 46 steps and for the life of me all I can get is 17½ trillion. So?

The editors at Doubleday have asked me whether I have offered you an honorarium for writing the introduction and I've confessed I haven't. Is that in order with you? If so I shall tell them it is and you will hearing about it.

I am having your own marked copies of the first draft returned to you, as you requested. You said you'd like them in hand when you do an introduction.

But please note that I will be sending you the completed book in more or less final form by the end of April. You may want to hold off until you see it. But the changes in it so far are only what you have made, really. It is substantially the same only better Englished.∗

Again, thanks so very, very much for taking this much interest in a pretty amateurish peek into your world!

Sincerely

Joseph Fletcher

P.S. I will be back in Belmont in another week.

P.P.S. I am taking the liberty of describing your schema on pp. 16-17 of the AIBS book as the most comprehensive and authoritative one. (But it's a good deal over the heads of ordinary readers.)

P.P.P.S. - Ye, I guess I'm a Commen' Type. By favour too.