

1st. September 1930.

Maj. L. Darwin, Sc.D.,
Cripps's Corner,
FOREST ROW,
Sussex.

Dear Major Darwin,

Thanks for your card. I was especially delighted with the "Times" (Lit. Supp.) review, because of the points he picked out, from Chapter I, and on the inadequacy of the French system. I feel much indebted to him not only for his great good will, but for his ^{penetration} ~~presentation~~ in the distribution of emphasis. I think he can be no one that I know, but I should guess he had been talking about it to Huxley. I should say not a geneticist, and perhaps not a biologist. I am, of course, intensely curious as to who he may be.

Do you think I could interest Bishop Barnes?; he might be very valuable not only in himself, but in respect of family allowances among the clergy. It seems to me most important that the schemes which will undoubtedly be started should be guided by eugenic principles. If you think well of this would my best plan be to send him the book? (He is as you know a good mathematician). I could underline some points in a covering letter.

I should like to discuss further your last letter on family

allowances, and as you will not have a copy, I am returning yours for reference; though I should like it back.

I quite agree as to a sudden introduction of family allowances tending to increase fertility in all classes, and probably most among the prudent. No such change is, however, likely to be so sudden as its introduction in France, and there there was no appreciable increase in the fertility of industrial workers. There may have been a retardation of the fall of the birth rate, but this I think you would class as belonging to the second stage. I conclude that the initial effect is small owing to the continuity of social tradition, but that it might be appreciable in a professional class.

On the second point I am tempted to argue to an opposite conclusion. Family allowances would give to the poorer wage earner almost as good a chance of developing prudential habits as the professional classes now enjoy. I do not see how the professional classes would be much affected in this way since there is little of a gamble in ^{our lives} ~~this~~ times, and they reap pretty much as they sow. Secondly, I doubt if what I have in mind does depend much on the powers of forethought of the individual, but on the standard set by the social group. The professional classes now are individualistic in outlook and ^{choose} ~~change~~ their occupations and their residences, etc., with some forethought according to their circumstances. For the masses I should ^{lay} ~~hang~~ all the stress on the standards set by their neighbours. It is not individualistic

though which makes a soldier ashamed of having a tarnished button. This standard would I think become much more definite and precise under family allowances.

In this country the houses now built will not, I suppose, be largely replaced in the next two generations, and they will certainly tend to standardise the size of family at a low level. Then the health of the wife and some freedom from housework is needed for decency in classes which cannot hire domestic service. Change of residence is not too easy for men tied to their work, and the variety of choice of working class dwellings is very restricted; though it would be by no means harmful if the more enterprising and foresighted secured larger accommodation with a view to rearing a larger family. The point is that if the standard of decency became much more uniform it would through the health of the mother, or the restricted size of the home provide frequent motives for birth limitation under a full scheme of family allowances. I will not of course defend a flat rate scheme for this I believe would be definitely dysgenic.

I have never read Pigou, but I should be much interested to discuss him with you, if you happen to have annotated a copy you would care to lend me.

I am sorry the Twitchin legacy is so troublesome.

Yours sincerely