Dear Dr. Fisher,

Many thanks for your of the 26th ult.

I think Sir Bernard Malhotra's phrase gets over all objections so the statement may now be regarded as settled. I am sorry not to have written before, but am still very heavily pressed with work.

You have put your case against the assumption that reduced taxation would eliminate the reproduction of the professional classes very clearly, and I admit that the contrast between the standard of living for childless couples and those with three or four children is an important factor, although perhaps not so potent as you assume.

A much more important one, in my opinion, is that which is put by Sir George in the Evening Standard that evening—the great fear which such parents feel for the future of their children. I strongly feel that our higher education is not in touch with modern requirements, it is still all that they can give their children, and they are keenly alive to the difficulty of finding openings for them. Relief of taxation for the C3 would not only increase the incomes of this class but would stimulate industry and provide better opportunities and I believe that this would result in a higher professional fertility.
But I do not see that this point in any way affects the necessity of extending birth control knowledge. The educated classes have that knowledge already, and will in no way be affected by its extension, while the provision of birth control instruction at the State Health Centre will not, almost entirely, on the C3 type, on the desirability of their lower reproduction we are all agreed. I can understand your deprecatory attitude of Mr. Harold Cole and Dean Bagi who actually call out for a stationary or reduced population, and may thus encourage the superior types in their undue restriction, but this is quite another matter to the birth control propaganda among the poorer classes. If you confine your opposition to combating the exaggerated claims for a stationary or diminished population on the ground that birth control efficiency are could support our present birth-rate, I should in no way oppose you, and I have already taken this line in our own paper.

But I am bound to add that, in my view, this increased efficiency is only to be obtained by opposing the Socialistic restrictions, an individual initiative and advocating free competition, and I am not sure that you take this view.

Darwinian selection with birth control as a sub-debitio for elimination by death appears to me to be the only practical programme for race improvement.

Yours sincerely,

G.H. Uyaniali