My dear Fisher

Many thanks for the
prompt way in which you have
dealt with my chapter. As to
what you say about the
population question, when I wrote
the paragraphs in question I had
not seen Bowley's contribution
to "Is unemployment inevitable".
If I understand him aright, he
thinks the increase will cease
between 1931 & 41, but that
between 1921 and 31 there will
"an addition of 900,000 males of
working age" after allowing for

Emigration. But we must
remember the point you always
insist on. If 25% of this generation
produce 50% of the next, that
50% will come from our largest
families. Won't this tell in time?
It is another point rather, but I
understand that a good deal
of emigration of more fertile
stocks is going on into France.
Anyhow we have 1.000.000
unemployed now, and even if
half are unemployable, I don't
want 500000 more men (with
families to match) to feed. East's
"Mankind at the Cross Roads" is
verbose but worth reading on

this topic.

I am just looking at Stevensons paper on population questions in the States of 1920. I find it very hard reading. If I understand things right, the difference between the crude death and birth rates gives a measure of multiplication. If a population marries earlier in life, that shows itself in the birth rate, to the extent it should do, and ∴ age at marriage need not be taken into account. He gets at fertility in some way, I think, so as to make it a measure independent of age at marriage. But I find my head, always bad at statistical

questions, is getting worse!

Yours gratefully

Leonard Darwin