

Sept. 5 22

CRIPPS'S CORNER,  
FOREST ROW,  
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher.

I think I see the points you mention in your letter. You urge that we must - (A) look to the relative effect between classes, and (B) to effects within each class; and you incline to consider (B) most important.

As to (A), which I have had mostly in mind, I agree that we must consider what volume of persons will be affected. It is only a first step in the process of thought - to concentrate on the Seattle class. As to income tax reform, it might be easier to induce

Parliament to give allowance which would produce some effect to that class than to a richer class. No doubt income tax reform would affect the whole class of income tax reformers. As I am arguing is that, rather than concentrate attention on the summit, we should, if we concentrate at all, do so on the fertile land. I think we readily agree.

As to (B) I have thought of this problem much less. You speak of the 'weather' in this connection. But if I understand you rightly, since we are dividing classes by wealth, it would be better to speak of those rising in

wealth and those getting in wealth, in  
any wealth run. If the N.S.W. plan is,  
as I believe, to make contributions  
depend on income and receipts on the  
size of family, I should myself support  
the evil effects of (A) to outweigh any  
benefits from (B). On the whole  
point my ideas are rather half  
baked. If you cover all the cost of all  
the children in the state, I think the  
result would be highly ingenious; but  
it would be so by reintroducing all the  
cruelty of natural selection. We want  
the results of selection without all this  
cruelty, or extinction by death. You  
want those who are <sup>situated</sup> able to  
be as certain to rise out of a  
wealth class if they have many  
children as if they have few. I  
agree; but I don't see that we can  
go back to unrestricted multiplication

in order to secure this result.  
Moreover if large families are to  
be of no hindrance to parents, I  
think we must go further than cover  
their cost. Early marriage work in  
many ways often hinders a man in  
his career. This is all very well, &  
possibly erroneous. But I wanted  
just to show that your letter has  
made me think.

I am struggling on with my book, very  
slowly & not very happily. I begin to  
think 72 is too old for the job.

I am not certain about the  
Galtion finance. I believe his salary  
is £1000 a year. He may pay  
someone out of his own pocket. I  
doubt it.

Yours sincerely,  
D. Darwin