

AMOS R. E. PINCHOT
COUNSELLOR AT LAW
101 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK
TELEPHONE ASHLAND 4-5228

COPY OF OPEN LETTER

The Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

April 26, 1937

My dear Mr. President:

I suppose that an effort to persuade a leader, in a position of great power, to reconsider his course is about as near to futility as anything a man in his senses will try. Nevertheless, the issues you have raised, especially since the November election, are so important and so very far-reaching as to warrant frank discussion by any citizen, whether he is in private or public life.

I need not argue that such discussion is a proper and indeed a necessary function of citizenship, in any country with a democratic government and a democratic tradition of life. For convenience and clarity, I am writing this open letter in the form of a series of brief notes.

The immediate occasion for writing, however, is to urge you, in all earnestness, to consider, and to reconsider, the connection between your judiciary bill of February 5th, and your proposal to revive the N. R. A. and impose on the life of this country a federally managed economy.

Mr. President, a managed or regimented economy such as you propose cannot exist, and does not exist, in any country where dictatorship has not been set up. It cannot live side by side with democracy. For it requires an amount of force and a degree of control over peoples' lives that is utterly impossible under democratic government.

What has happened in Europe makes it clear enough, that, if a leader pursues the path of bureaucratic regimentation of industry and agriculture, he must go forward into dictatorship, whether he wants to or not. And you, Mr. President, will either clothe yourself with a dictator's power, or you will abandon managed economy. No other courses are open to you.

In these days very few people believe in a laissez faire policy. That policy has, to a large extent, been discarded. It is one thing to provide relief for helpless people. It is one thing to legislate against sweatshop conditions, to prevent child labor, to check monopoly and regulate transportation and utilities. But it is a very different thing to go on from that point to a government which decrees wages, which fixes the price of farm and factory products, which regulates the character and acreage of crops, and controls investment and the volume of production – in short, to a personal government that places the fate of labor, industry and agriculture in a bureaucracy controlled by one man.

This, Mr. President, cannot be done in a democracy, and it should not be done. And, what is more, it cannot even be seriously attempted by any ruler until he has first captured the courts.

We are familiar with the kind of coercion Stalin has had to use in order to control the farms and industries of Russia. We have seen almost the same coercion used by Hitler and Mussolini. And it is significant that, though Stalin in his new constitution grants to the Russian people an elected legislature, he retains, in Section 49 (b) of that document, his grip on the courts. No matter where he may be, the man who desires a dictator's power must first bring the courts to heel. For, in no other way can he remove the barriers that stand between him and autocracy.

Section 2-A.

Mr. President, your proposed judiciary bill opens the path to autocracy in two ways. The first and most important is to revamp the Supreme Court. And, fortunately, this is receiving the attention it deserves. But the second way has been very little discussed. And, so far as I know, it was not brought to the attention of the Judiciary Committee until April 13th, when Federal District Judge John C. Knox dwelt on it in his testimony. In fairness to yourself, it is impossible to believe that you fully realize the kind and degree of power which Section 2 (a) of your bill places in your hands.

As Judge Knox points out, this section means that the government may arrange things so that only the new district and circuit court judges, whom you will appoint, will be transferred to other districts in order to try cases in which the government may be especially interested.

Today, in order to effect such transfers, not only the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court must consent, but the senior judge of the district from which a judge is transferred and the senior judge of the district to which he is transferred. Thus, three men must consent. And this arrangement is a needed check to the power of the government to have a case adjudicated before its chosen judge. But, under your bill, the matter is in one man's hands.

Consequently, if the office of Chief Justice becomes vacant, and then is filled by you, your appointee will be able to block the transfer of any district or circuit court judge, and will be able to have one of your new judges assigned to a particular case.

Judge Knox, a most able and experienced jurist, who, by the way, has been a life-long Democrat and a good friend of your administration, says that this section "exhibits a consistency of purpose that is of sinister aspect to every man who, on principle, is opposed to the use of stacked decks of cards." The sort of power that this bill would put in your hands is so alien to

the American tradition of an impartial judiciary that it is hard for me to imagine that you either know or approve its purpose.

Obviously, it will destroy respect for the federal courts. And it is in line with the corrupt administrations of the Stuart kings, who removed fair judges and put their own on the bench in order to serve their ends and buttress the power of the crown. Senator Borah points out, in a recent speech, that rather than go before such a tribunal Essex took his own life in the Tower of London.

Mr. President, your bill came from the White House. It came with a message signed by you, asking for its enactment on the plea that its object was to modernize the courts and promote efficiency. But, since that time, its real, and I think sinister, purposes have gradually come to light. We are loath to attribute these purposes to you. But who were the men who drafted the bill? And why have their names been kept secret?

The men who drafted the Declaration of Independence, which set our feet on the road to democracy, signed their names to it at considerable risk to themselves. Why should the names of men who have drawn a bill which, if passed, will turn this country back toward autocracy be so carefully hidden from Congress and the people? I repeat, Mr. President, that the country should be told who these men are.

Managed Economy in Italy

Since your re-election you have given the country to understand that managed economy is to be carried far beyond its present point. Let us see, therefore, what managed economy has done for other nations.

On the 5th of September 1920, when the Italian sit-down strikes had developed a national crisis, Benito Mussolini, then editor of "Popolo d'Italia", a Milan newspaper, wrote: "The

Fascists have no reason to change their attitude which has been one of sympathy toward the claims of the workmen;" On September 10th: "It is natural that the industrialists should ask that the workmen should relinquish the factories before negotiating, but one cannot ask that the workmen should abandon the plants without guarantees;"

And on September 28th: "Could the occupation of the factories have been avoided? Perhaps. But who can assure that the strong method would not have started a fire infinitely more dangerous to control?"

Intentionally or not, Mussolini encouraged the strikes to a point where they gave him a plausible excuse for setting up a dictatorship. And, like all dictatorships, his included the control of the courts and the legislature, the abolition of local self-government, and, above all, an economy managed and controlled by the central government. The results of his course, Mr. President, are a matter of record.

The Results of Managed Economy

Twelve years after the march on Rome, and fifteen after the founding of the Fascist party, Italy found herself in a distressing condition. Consumption of food had declined to a point lower than before the World War. Wages were the worst in Europe, and strikes and labor unions were outlawed. Many of Italy's richest industries were on the rocks. Production had moved steadily to lower levels. Credit was prostrate and the total taxes collected from the people were over half the national income.

Notwithstanding Mussolini's ability and his many bureaus, boards, commissions and agencies reporting to Rome, a crisis had arrived to which the only answer was war, civil or foreign. All of Mussolini's planning and regulating, his control of the courts and the legislature, his liquidation of unions and opposing minority groups, his concentration of power in the

executive, and his abolition of home rule, he carried out in the name of emergency, and with the promise that, when the emergency was past, he would turn the government over to his constitutional successor. But he found that the task of creating and administering a planned economy was a long and hard one. He could not step down and leave it unfinished. And, it was but a few years later that, in an interview with an American journalist, he declared that his successor had not yet been born.

Is The New Deal New?

Those who imagine that managed economy is something new and progressive should read the history of the Bourbon kings. Far from being the order of the future, managed economy is a regressive step toward Bourbonism, which has no place in the life of a modern nation.

Louis XIV centralized the power of the government in himself and, as Woodrow Wilson writes, France “lay in the pigeon-holes of the king’s bureau.” He put in practice many of the things which the New Deal has done, or proposes to do. “No detail was too insignificant to come within the usurpation of the king’s government...No labor of supervision was too overwhelming for the central government to undertake.”

By a process of subduing and assimilating, he spread a network of regimentation over France. He created swarms of new bureaus and bureaucrats. He regulated prices, wages and the quality of goods. He discouraged production, spent hugely, and burdened the poor with numberless indirect taxes. And this continued throughout the Bourbon reigns and up to the revolution. Then came Napoleon who took over the Bourbon bureaucracy and re-established despotism.

The paradox in the story of the Bourbons is that, at once paternal and blind, they ruined France by trying to do too much for it. Meantime, England, with her freer and more fecund economy, left France far behind.

Wages, Production and Employment

I am far from denying, Mr. President, that wage increases are greatly needed. Yet, experience teaches us that, unless higher wages are accompanied by higher production, the wage gain is almost immediately cancelled by a corresponding rise in the cost of living. It is a self-evident truth, if there is such a thing, that only by increasing the volume of production is it possible to raise real wages, to provide more employment, to bring to the people that abundant life of which they have heard so much and experienced so little.

In an eloquent and moving passage in your second inaugural address, you pointed out that, despite the progress of the last four years, one-third of our people are still ill-housed, still ill-clad and under-nourished. And this estimate, I believe, is no exaggeration.

But, if our people need better housing, as they certainly do, we should produce more houses for them. Yet, from September 1930 to March 1936, England built 1,226,000 new dwelling units – 80% without government aid. In about the same period we built 352,000. Again, if the people are ill-clad, our factories should turn out more clothes; and if they are ill-nourished and hungry, our farms should produce more food.

Full employment and fair access to the necessities and simple luxuries that make life healthful and comfortable, and create a decent standard of living, must all wait for higher production. There is no other source from which they can come. And no packing of the courts and increase in your already vast executive power is required either to stimulate industry, or to

attack the illegal processes by which monopoly is destroying competition, raising prices and lowering production and employment.

Today, Mr. President, American production is far below the 1929 level. And since that time our population has considerably increased. The government, itself, has recently shown that production must rise to twenty percent above the 1929 level, before enough goods and services will be produced to restore the 1929 standard of living, meager as that standard was. But, so far, the government has made little or no effort to increase production. In fact, production seems to be the one thing in which it is supremely uninterested, its emphasis always being on redistribution.

Redistribution of Wealth

Mere redistribution of wealth, which is so heavily stressed by the intelligensia of the federal administration, is no doubt an admirable reform from the point of view of equity and justice. But it will not considerably help the wage-earner, or the consumer – who seems as usual to be starring in the role of Forgotten Man – unless production expands. What is required, Mr. President, is not mere distribution of wealth, but more wealth to distribute.

If, in 1936, all the profits of all the corporations in the country had been distributed to the employees, in the form of wages, this would only have raised the family income of these employees by about \$150.00 a year. Also, if the gainfully employed people in the country had each received a wage equal to the average paid by the General Motors Company last year, this would have taken the greater part of the national income.

These are things which neither politicians nor labor leaders like to talk about. On the contrary, most of them give the people to understand that redistributing wealth and passing wage laws will lift the incomes of wage-earners and consumers in general, irrespective of production.

Unfortunately, this is not the case. And to give people the hope that redistribution will solve the problems of poverty seems, to me at least, an unwarranted and heartless deception.

How to Encourage Production

There is no mystery about encouraging production. It can be encouraged and increased in several ways that are familiar to almost everyone. In the first place, breaking down monopoly and restoring competition will, in itself, lower the price of goods and enlarge the demand. Yet, the federal administration has made no real or consistent attempt to break the power of monopoly, although the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and many reports by congressional committees have again and again pointed out the means by which monopoly can successfully be attacked.

As President Wilson and Senator Borah have so often said, until the government deals courageously with the monopoly question, which goes to the heart of production and consumption, as well as employment, it is futile to imagine that the buying power of the people will have any sustained rise.

Yet, instead of attacking monopoly, the policy of the government has, in the main, been to nurse it along. Prosecutions under the antitrust laws have been few and far between, and half-hearted at that. The N. R. A. gave monopolists and official license to combine and overcharge. Apparently, far from regarding competition as a means of insuring fair prices, the administration has classed it as a duty relic of horse and buggy days.

Mr. Tugwell, late economic bell-weather of the New Deal, was frankly for rooting out “the last vestige of competition.” Mr. Stuart Chase, who now seems to represent its philosophy – which, so far as I can gather, is scientifically induced scarcity – sees no place for competition in

his, oh-so-modern, world. And Secretary Wallace founds his economic church on the cooperative commonwealth.

Meanwhile, the lesser ideologists, some of whom are deeply grieved by any disrespectful reference to Marx or Stalin, are engaged in lifting the country out of darkness with their typewriters and promoting the new formula which, like Russia's, is a mixture of socialist and fascist dogma. It is notable that all good socialists dislike competition and defend monopoly. For the socialist assumption – and it is a fairly good one – is that, if let alone, monopoly will bring so much poverty and suffering to the people that they will rise, shake off their chains and destroy capitalism.

A second means of encouraging production is to give it, as the governments of European democracies have done, the high place it deserves in the economy of an industrial nation. These governments have taken the more constructive attitude of cooperating with industry, instead of seizing every excuse to attack it. And, on the whole, industry has responded in good spirit. Moreover, the regulatory practices which these governments have employed have not been hastily devised and suddenly imposed by government decrees. They have been worked out patiently through the course of years in cooperation with industry itself.

In the third place, Mr. President, our government can stimulate production by discontinuing the rapid and baffling changes in policy which have tended to hold enterprise and re-employment in check. The fact is, that industry can adjust to almost anything, right or wrong, provided it can count on it in advance and make plans accordingly.

But, with the existing, and it seems justified, feeling that the government frowns on enterprise, especially if it is profitable; with the policy of the government growing more unpredictable from day to day; and with our young ideologists ready and willing to burn the

house of industry in order to singe its profiteers – no man, unless he is uncommonly courageous, will waste time and money expanding business or developing new products. On the contrary, he prefers to sit tight till ___ conflagration dies down.

Our Rate of Recovery

Mr. President, production does not thrive on uncertainty, or on fear, or in handcuffs. And the proof of this is not hard to find. The United States has had a slower rate of recovery than any democratic nation in the world. Our index of production is below the average of the world. And our relief rolls are proportionally the largest in the world. We have half of the total reported unemployment in the world. And this is unfortunate. But it is not surprising. In fact, in view of the government's shifting policies and attitude toward business, the remarkable thing is that our recovery has not been slower.

No one who knows anything about American business will deny that, for years, many leaders of industry and finance have been sowing the wind by their reactionary attitude toward the public and toward labor. They have evaded the anti-trust laws, they have raised prices and exploited the consumer. They have stood for long hours and low wages, and they have done little toward solving the problem of unsteady employment. They have taken from the consumer all that was possible, and given to labor as little as they could.

But all business men are not corrupt, or callous, or stupid. They do not all have hoofs and horns any more than all labor leaders have wings. And to class every man who produces goods, employs labor and makes a profit as at best a suspect, is no favor to labor. Nor does it help the consumer or the government. For the government can tax largely only when the production of taxable wealth is high.

Yet, for reasons, which I fear are as much political as philosophical, our ideologists have fanned hostility toward all producers of wealth, good and bad. The government has herded the sound and the scabby sheep into one corral. And, so to speak, it has sat on the top rail and stoned them impartially with unconcealed enjoyment.

Liberalism in Washington

Meanwhile, it is being assumed in Washington that every measure, proposal or bill which is labelled “liberal” or “labor” is in reality in the interest of the public and in the interest of labor. In this mecca of advanced thinking, the opinion of social workers and Greenwich Village philosophers, who have little understanding of production and distribution, is accepted as the last word of wisdom.

Most of these people are well-meaning. And many of them are able, highly intelligent and patriotic. But the fact remains that the thinking of a considerable number of them – especially those who occupy official or unofficial posts of authority – has its roots in countries where there is no tradition of democracy, and where the best the people can hope for is benevolent despotism. And, above all, they cling to their faith in Soviet Russia, which is the millennium of social workers.

Though one cannot but feel sympathy with the kindly intentions of these professional breast-heavers and friends of the masses, let me say that, the sooner they return to their settlement houses and classrooms, and employ their leisure in making blue prints and discussing ways and means with which to counterbalance the havoc they have wrought, the better it will be for the country, especially including labor.

And let me add that, after watching their performances for four years, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that one resourceful industrialist, hard-boiled though he may be, who

produces goods and services at fair prices and gives employment to labor, is worth several carloads of these well-meaning folk. And if he gains a profit, even a large one, it will not make much difference in the net result.

After all, Mr. President, we live in what is still a capitalist nation. It is pre-eminently an industrial nation. Also, it is a nation whose economy is predicated on that thing called the profit system. And, till this is changed, and we cross the magic line into socialism or fascism, or whatever it may be, the notion that there is something sinful and outrageous about making a profit is sheer nonsense.

It may be heretical, and it is certainly unfashionable, to say that the profit motive is useful as an incentive to hard work and invention, and as a means to achieving a better standard of life. And what the country needs, even more than ideologies and yearnings for the cooperative commonwealth, is the application of a little old-fashioned, country common sense.

The Powers of the Executive.

Mr. President, you have more power today than any man has held in a democracy. Your powers are the more formidable since they are largely permissive powers, which you may use or not use at your discretion. These powers are at least adequate for every legitimate purpose. Farm leaders and liberal leaders in your own party are agreed that, at present writing, the government can do all that is necessary for agriculture, and that the only thing it cannot do is to control the character and acreage of crops.

Such a crop control, when attempted under the A. A. A., only served to prove that the government's guess is generally as bad as the farmer's. It accentuated the effect of the drought, and forced us to import enormous quantities of foodstuffs, thus raising the cost of living.

Monetary Powers

As we now realize, the collapse of 1929 was chiefly caused by unwise credit inflation and the reckless expansion and speculation which went with it. One of the fair indictments against the Republicans, during the terms of Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Hoover, was that, instead of trying to check this inflation and expansion, they nursed them along until they were beyond control. Today your administration may be congratulated on the fact that, by the Banking Act of 1935, the government clothed itself with every known power with which to regulate the flow of money and credit, and combat inflation. These powers should be used under the direction of Congress. But let that pass, they exist. They are in the government's hands and they are adequate, so far as monetary powers can be adequate, to control credit and price inflation.

The government is quite rightly concerned about the danger of a price inflation which may prove hard to control, despite the monetary powers conferred by the 1935 act. But there are two means of avoiding such a catastrophe. One is to use, as you are using, the powers given you in that act. The other is to encourage and expand production, and thus make goods and services more plentiful. This, in itself, will help to keep prices down.

The N. R. A.

The Wagner labor relations act has been approved by the Supreme Court. There remains the question of the N. R. A. Here, it is true, your administration was blocked when the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional. And, though you did not mention the N. R. A. in your campaign, it is clear that the chief purpose that lies behind your Supreme Court bill is to change the court so that you can revive the N. R. A.

Mr. President, as I see it, there is little reason to doubt the statement that the decision of the court declaring the N. R. A. unconstitutional was, by all odds, the best break of luck the New

Deal has had. Furthermore, I am convinced that the ending of the N. R. A. prevented a serious economic breakdown which might well have discredited the administration.

As the Brookings' report points out, the only consistent recovery movement, since the collapse of 1929, came after the N. R. A. was invalidated. And the figures of the American Federation of Labor show that the end of the N. R. A. marked the beginning of a major increase in employment.

The N. R. A. was set up mainly at the instance of big business, as a means of shelving the anti-trust laws and raising prices. It did raise prices. But it lowered consumption and production, and it slowed down re-employment. Also, it tended to embarrass your policy of lifting the purchasing power of the farm population. On the whole, the N. R. A. was an expensive failure which was paid for by about every class of the American people, except the monopolists and a few strong labor unions which were able to enforce the codes. It had no tendency to increase the total wage of labor.

The Mandate of November 3, 1936.

Mr. President, on February 28th, Mr. Arthur Krock, in an authorized interview with yourself, published in the New York Times, stated that you are convinced that the large vote you received on November 3rd, is proof that the people of the United States desire to place their fate in your hands for four more years.

And, since February 5th, when you sent your bill to Congress asking for power to add six new justices to the Supreme Court, you have repeated, in substance, what you said to Mr. Krock. Your supporters have joined you in the claim that your "unparalleled vote" is a mandate from the people entitling you to do whatever you may deem necessary for the good of the country –

irrespective of your platform and pre-election pledges. This, I think, is a fair statement of your and their position.

Let us examine this so-called mandate. Let us see if your November vote was unparalleled or even unusually large. And, to this end, let us compare your vote with the vote of the preceding three presidents, namely Mr. Harding, Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Hoover.

In 1936, you received 62% of all the votes cast by the Democratic and Republican parties. In 1920, Mr. Harding received 63% of the combined vote of the Democratic and Republican parties. In 1924, Mr. Coolidge received 65%. And in 1928, Mr. Hoover received 58%. In a word, your 1936 vote was not really a large one. It was, in fact, a little below the average of the last four Presidents.

It may also be said that you were opposed by a moribund Republican party, that was discredited by the depression and linked to reaction and Mr. Hoover, who was unquestionably the most unpopular figure in American politics. You had at your disposal a vast number of appointments and enormous funds to allot. The federal public service had been increased by you to over 800,000 people, and the state services to over three times that number. Voters among the twenty million people on relief were given to understand that their benefits would be cut down or cease, unless you were returned to office.

You had a propaganda service which only lacked a Goebbels to equal Hitler's. And, with propaganda and patronage, Mr. Farley organized the doubtful states with a skilled and liberal hand. And, finally, you had the benefit of the world-wide economic upswing of 1936. On the whole, it would seem that the real wonder of the November election was that, in spite of these advantages, the head of the Democratic ticket did not poll more votes.

But, irrespective of the vote, Mr. President, it is hard to see how there can be claimed a mandate, either to pack the federal courts or to revive the N. R. A., since you kept these issues hidden under a bushel throughout the campaign. I have a list before me of occasions when your opponent invited you to declare whether you intended to revive the N. R. A., or to move against the courts or the constitution. Yet neither of these most vital and far-reaching subjects was broached by you until after the polls were closed.

Do you think that was fair play to the men and women who would have voted against you had you disclosed your intentions? Are the people in a democratic country entitled, or not entitled, to know the real issues in a presidential campaign, especially since they are the most important ones that have been raised in three-quarters of a century. Or, as in Italy and Germany, must they cast their votes in the dark – and be thankful they can vote at all?

The Supreme Court

Justice Hughes and Justice Brandeis have disposed of your statement that the purpose of your Supreme Court bill is to increase judicial efficiency. As to the charge that the older justices are decrepit in mind and backward in spirit, it has been noted that you have in your cabinet a Secretary of the Navy seventy-five years old, a Secretary of Commerce seventy years old, and other gentlemen who are nearing the dangerous age of seventy. So that today it is generally agreed, both by the opponents and the supporters of your bill, that its real object is to revamp the Supreme Court so that it will lock-step with a Congress which has been taught to lock-step with you.

Judicial review of acts of Congress may be a good thing, or it may be a bad thing. I am not arguing that. But certainly, for the Supreme Court to pass on the constitutionality of acts of Congress is in no sense usurpation. For the Federalist's papers, written by framers of the

Constitution in order to persuade the states to adopt it, declare, with perfect clarity, that it is the duty of the Supreme Court to pass upon the constitutionality of acts of Congress. And again, that such a power is needed in any country which has a written constitution.

There is one point, however, which I think does deserve emphasis and repetition. It is that, the moment the court is packed and dominated by men who see eye to eye with you – that is, with men who believe that the Supreme Court should not override acts of Congress – from that moment any law which Congress may enact will be untouchable and sacrosanct, so far as the court is concerned.

Even if a law is drawn with the clear purpose of annulling the rights of free speech, press and assembly, or freedom of religious worship, it will be untouchable. Even if its aim is to abolish the present structure of democratic government, in part or in whole, it will be safe from review by the Supreme Court. And the only possible review or check will be your own veto, should you care to impose one.

Mr. President, I need not press the point, for it is plain enough to anyone who has read your bill in the light of your speech of March 9th. But, let me say that, if your bill goes through, any law that may be enacted in periods of hysteria, as were the infamous reconstruction laws which harmed the southern states almost as much as the Civil War itself, and any laws which may be written in the White House and rushed through Congress, in the name of emergency, or under the whip of patronage and Mr. Farley's threats of reprisal at the next election, will become, for better or for worse, the law of the land. And there will be no recourse.

That, as I see it, Mr. President, is what your bill means. And, if that is not a far step into dictatorship, I, for one, do not know what that word means. Certain opponents of your bill have, from time to time, been saying that they do not think you aspire to dictatorship. Others say that,

while dictatorial power may be well used by yourself, other men may take advantage of the precedent you are seeking to establish, and may use this power as unwisely as have the dictators of Europe.

With this reasoning it is hard to agree. For, as I have watched your steady and unrelenting drive for more and more power, which has reached its climax in this attempt to control the Supreme Court, I am forced to conclude that, whatever your undisclosed purpose may be, you desire the power of a dictator without the liability of the name. And I am also convinced that, in a world in which so many nations have drifted into autocracy, with such appalling results to their peoples, it is the duty of the people of this nation to resent and defeat every slightest move away from democracy and toward personal government.

Mr. President, I do not doubt that your ultimate aims are of a nature that you can justify in your own heart. But I cannot believe that you realize, to the full, the significance of the means you are taking to reach them. No illusion has brought to credulous peoples so much disappointment, and suffering and sorrow, as the illusion that a man clothed with great power will or can use it for the common good. And nothing is revealed more clearly by history than the fact that, with all its faults, democracy is the one hopeful form of government that has been devised by men.

Sincerely yours,

Amos Pinchot

AP:GH

P.S. I enclose (a) tables showing our government's financial condition as contrasted with that of twenty-one so-called sterling area nations. These nations, following England's lead, have stressed high production and careful spending. They have very little unemployment and are, for

the most part, free from the twin curses of fascism and communism. *They have balanced their budgets.*

And (b) a reproduction of an editorial published in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, which are most friendly to your administration, showing how the burden of taxation in this country has been borne mainly by the poor.