I made these notes as they occurred to me after reading the article, looking at the subject rather than any periodical.

The subject is a bit stale now, but the "Spectator" might take 1000 words, and so might the "New Statesman" — more useful. P.E.P. (the journal of Political & Economic Planning) might take more, but unpaid. Ask them. The "Nineteenth Century" might take a full 5,000 words. Also think of the "Fortnightly" and other of the old monthlies surviving. The "Saturday Review" might now consider 1,000 words.

Bar P.E.P., always tacitly suggest that you expect the usual fee — a free article is suspect, and therefore unlikely to be accepted.

An article that gives a knowledgeable analysis of the situation is always more acceptable than one which is merely an expression of opinion. Methods of dealing with the situation are best insinuated, at first, in the equivalent of a stage aside.

See the Fam. End. Scty's literature on the Teacher's — 1933ish

How far is upper-class fertility checked by postponement of marriage till the woman is into the thirties, and therefore past period of greatest reproductivity? Isn't it due to the abnormally long apprenticeship forced on professional men, who can seldom reach security, or even a reasonable income until well into the thirties?
Contrast with the unskilled labourer, who reaches highest earning capacity, and therefore marriage, at 20.

Remedies - I. Unblock the ladder of promotion (a) by death of the elderly - shortly coming inevitably - (b) by earlier retirement.

II. Family Endowment has a chance of evolving an immediate response in this respect, e.g. - the bank clerk who does not now marry until after 30, might do so at 25 if assured that children would not lower his standard of living (underlined words more important than "income").

III. Present joint assessment of husband's and wife's income for Income Tax purposes is a definite penalization of marriage, especially affecting the professional classes in their early years.

................

Recommend keeping off the subject of "death duties" altogether, as it raises too many hares, while to oppose the splitting up of large estates on eugenic grounds is apt to expose the eugenist to charges, however unjustified, of being a Tory in disguise.

If necessary to mention the subject, simply say that there should be no "estate duty" but only "inheritance duties", and that the latter should be payable out of income.

................

Give more details of the approaching fall in population, with details of causes. - See Kuczynski & Enid Charles.
Promotion of genetic infertility.

Quote Wagner-Manalau (see ANKIN Eug Rev. 1932-34ish)

Is there any reasonably possible way of checking the social advantages of the infertile heir of big (relatively) money? I doubt it. And it seems a mistake to scare Tories by even mentioning Bolschic methods, especially if you've just raised the ANKIN of the socialists by clinging to large estates.

But we can 'level up' those who are not heirs, e.g. by the sort of suggestion advanced in these notes. But the only really effective measure is simply - the creation of a eugenic conscience. Create such a fashion among the aristocracy, and the rest will follow. The fashion of attaching prestige not to ancient pedigree or wealth, but to biological fitness and readiness for parenthood. Be candid about that.

Remember that infertility is largely psychological, not biologically; that contraception, etc., is only used by those who don't want children at the moment. Above the starvation line, strict economics is only one of the factors in the really important psychological criterion of Social Prestige. Make ability and a good family of healthy children another factor - & the job is done (as it is by the Chinese system of Ancestor Worship).