Oct. 2, 30
Cripps's Corner,
Forest Row,
Sussex.

My dear Fisher,

I find W. McDougall
is 59 years old. I am doubtful if it is wise to appoint a
distinguished professor of economics to be our Secretary at £500
a year, especially as he has strong Darwinian views. However,
I may be curmudgeoned and wrong.

I wonder what will happen about Mac Bude. I know he is writing to Muckey. Poor Muckey!

I see that Hesley & Prendergast are disputing about our figures.
I am, as a fact, not happy about them. I think they are based on
figure I gave you out of Godhead.
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 is allowed to 
bread. 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 
author about Godhead is as to 
ammess of ancestor 
whether he did not accept any 
indication of stupidity as a proof 
of finding...
to think we may quote the figures as indicating that if all high grade soap were sterilized, the result would be a reduction in 17% in the certified firm. But I guess there are many traps. What I want is some hundred women. When all we knew is that say 15 years ago they were certified firm, it was like child. Then got these children sterilized in every way. Twenty years would be better. Then we should get a sample of the population back. We keep out of evidence by sterilizing the firm. That is what we want to know. I do not think we could get the same Goddard, because we do not know how. 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 of 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 some, in spite of
my feelings.

No answer, when you
went to Foremost me about
the Dingley.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Would it be worth re-simulating

Goddard?
No hurry about all this.

Cupper's Corner, Forest Row, Sussex.
Oct. 2 1930
Knew 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 so will increase the birth rate in all circumstances.

I began by writing out my ideas after 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 ...'

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 in the memo. I have copies of them, 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 emphasise. I think you got a wrong impression. I thought I was driving at, and that this set you against it all.
Now, learn that the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party refused the question of a joint Committee of their own party and 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 7/- if children leave school at 14. The Trade Union Congress accepted the minority report. The question will be discussed by the Labour Party at the N.E. Ct. on Oct. 6th. Day 12. Now you seem 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 being often the best method of opposition, and of certainly often the best means of spreading new ideas. I am not so much opposed to them as you are, if safeguarded cognisantly.

I do not see why they need lower wages.

Do old age pensions do so? I think not.

All taxation has a bad reaction on trade; but I think I made that point clear.
As to remarks on III pp. 6 and 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 cynically 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. If we who are to pay for keeping them up, it is to direct our least successful who fall, and the dread of the consequences would be beneficial in making them most prone to family limitations.

As to I pp. 6. Do you think the birth rate began to fall simultaneously in all classes, but has merely fallen quickest amongst the richer? I think Stevenson anywhere shows that the rates were more equal in the past. I should like to see a study of the birth rate of the poor.

Yours sincerely,
Leonard Daudri
I send you a letter from Peabel which may interest you. Please return it some day.