

Oct-2. 30

CRIPPS'S CORNER,
FOREST ROW,
SUSSEX.

My dear Fisher

I find W. Mc Dougall
is 59 years old. I am doubtful
if it is wise to appoint a
distinguished professor of that
age to be our Secretary at £500
a year, especially as he has
strong Lamarckian views. However
I may be convinced I am wrong.

I wonder what will happen
about Max Bude. I know he is
writing to Huxley. Poor Huxley!

I see that Huxley & Tredgold
are disputing about our figures.
I am, as a fact, not happy about
them. I think they are based on

figures I gave you out of Goddard.
In those days I did not see the
traps clearly. Perhaps you did.
In our clan it would not be far
from the truth to say that no
f.m. ~~person~~ person is allowed to
breed. It quite true, it would
follow that no f.m. child in our
clan would be found to have a
f.m. parent. This tells nothing whatever
as to what kind of a child a f.m.
person in our clan would have if
allowed to breed. This is a point
Tredgold fails to catch. But my
doubt about Goddard is as to
whether he did not accept ^{amongst ancestors} any
indication of stupidity as a proof
of goddamnedness. I am inclined

to think we may ^{argue} quote the figures
as indicating that if all high grade
f. m. were sterilized, the result would
be ^{at least} a reduction in 17% in the
certified f. m. But I guess there
are many traps. What I

want is some hundred women of
whom all we know is that say
15 years ago they were certified
f. m. & were with child. Then get
these children examined in
every way. Twenty years would be
better. Then we should get a
sample of the population that
we keep out of existence by
sterilizing the f. m. That is what
we want to know. I do not
think we could get this from
Goddard, because we do not
know that when he heard there
was nothing peculiar about the

children he did not decide
to say nothing about them.

I have written you a long
letter & a memo about
prudence, which letter I have
just received copied. And
now I see it in type, I do
not like it!! Probably I shall
send it you soon, in spite of
my feelings.

No answer, unless you
want to persuade me about
the Doughty.

Yours sincerely,

Herbert Davenport

Would it be worth re-summarizing
Goddard?

No hurry about
all this

Sent Oct. 24-30

Cupps's Corner. Front Row. Sussex.

Oct. 2nd 1930



Kept for long before
posting -

My dear Fisher.

I have been reconsidering the problem of family allowances and their effects on prudence. It is a difficult one, and I am by no means sure of my conclusions. But as you ask my opinion, I give it for what it is worth. It is broadly that f. a. will increase the birth rate in all circumstances.

I began by writing out my ideas afresh from the beginning. I then turned to the three papers which I sent you some time ago (about which I want to say something), and then rewrote my memo, which I now send. It is headed memo on family allowances, and fructification.

I also return the three papers originally sent, as I should like you, if you would, to glance at them again. There is no hurry about it, because I doubt if I shall use them or the memo. I have copies of them^{all}, so don't mind much if I never see their faces again. If you look at your marginal notes and my corrections, you will see what I now want to emphasize. I think you got a wrong impression of what I was driving at, and that this set you against it all.

I now learn that the National Executive Com^{tee} of the Labour party referred the question of f. a. to a joint committee of their own party & the Trades Union Congress. A majority of that Committee (9) reported in favour of a flat rate system (5/- & 3/-) out of public funds for all children of non-income tax paying parents at a cost of £70,000,000 a year. A minority (3) were against this proposal, favouring direct assistance of other kinds, but including cash payments for 3 years, ^{or 2} if children leave school at 14. The ^{Trades Union} ~~Labour~~ Party Conference accepted the minority report. The question will be discussed by the Labour Party on Oct. 6. et seq^t. Now you seemed to think that all discussion on flat rate schemes ought to be avoided. But in the face of all this, is that wise? Should we not be ready to show their effects, and how best to amend them? Amendment may often be the best method of opposition, and is certainly often the best means of spreading new ideas. I am not so much opposed to them as you are, if safeguarded rigorously.

I do not see why they need lower wages. Do old age pensioners do so? I think not. All taxation has a bad reaction on trade; but I think I made that point clear.

* When it was turned down, I think by a large majority.

As to remarks on III pp. 6 & 9, I see difficulties in the case of those who rise or fall in the social scale. But are they more easily met by voluntary than by state systems? What are your proposals in the case of voluntary systems? If a man rises in the ranks, it would be Eugenicly beneficial that his family allowances should rise simultaneously. Who is to pay the extra amount? Are you to tax the higher class to encourage increased competition within their ranks? Or are you to tax the less successful in the lower ranks to help the more successful when they have risen? The difficulties with those who fall are even greater. It is not desirable that a man should be made to dread a fall because his allowances would fall concurrently. It is not who is to pay for keeping them up. It is no doubt the least successful who fall, and some dread of the consequences would be beneficial in making them most prone to family limitation.

As to I p 6. Do you think the birth rate began to fall simultaneously in all classes, but has merely fallen quicker amongst the richer? I think Sweden anyhow shows that the rate was more even in the past. I should like to see a study of the birth rate of the poor.

P.T.O.

Your sincerely
 Leonard Dawrie

I send you ² letters from Pearl
which may interest you.
Please return it some day

L D