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THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON ARE WITH YOU IN THE FIGHT ON THE SUPREME COURT STOP WE WILL CONTINUE TO CARRY ON THIS FIGHT STOP VICTORY IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE WELL BEING OF THE GREAT MASS OF OUR PEOPLE AND A TEMPORARY REVERSAL ON THIS ISSUE MUST BE MET BY CONTINUED FIGHT TO EFFECT THIS REFORM:

DON G ABEL STATE ADMNR WPU

630 38th Avenue

THE QUICKEST, SUREST AND SAFEST WAY TO SEND MONEY IS BY TELEGRAPH OR CABLE
July 27, 1937.

My dear Mr. Abel,

Your telegram of July twenty-second has been received and the President has asked me to thank you for wiring and to assure you of his appreciation of your interest.

Sincerely yours,

M. H. McIntire
Secretary to the President

Don Q. Abel, Esq.,
630 38th Avenue,
Seattle,
Washington.
March 22, 1937

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President
Executive Offices
Washington, D.C.

My Friend:
(That’s what I feel you are)

Enclosed please find copy of a letter which I have sent each member of the Arizona delegation in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Sam T. Adams
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March 23, 1937

Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, President
United States Executive Offices
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

When a group of men—five to be exact—act themselves up as a stone wall and say, "It shall not pass" (quotation not exactly correct) "You, the people, do not know what is best, let us decide" there are just two things the people can do: find a breach in the wall, or go home defeated.

Somewhere I have seen the sentence "Let the will of the people be the supreme law." Now I do not believe the five old gentlemen represent the will of the people. The only sign of progress is change—yes, even change of opinion may denote progress, although some legalists and formalists hold, or attempt to hold a man up to ridicule if he changes an opinion—they seem to think that an opinion once formed and expressed should be as unalterable as the laws of the Hodes and the Persians, but where, if I may ask, are the Hodes and the Persians now?

All of which means, in my humble opinion, that the Supreme Court should be streamlined to fit modern trends.

Sincerely,

Sam T. Adams
Franklin D. Roosevelt
White House
Washington, D.C.

Sir:

With disgust I listened to your speech on the Supreme Court to learn what new bunk and distortion you would hand the people, and I must admit you quite outdo yourself. You fooled the electorate in Nov. but you do not fool them in your present plans to fill the Supreme Court with your benchmen. Any thing as serious as you claim this to be should take years to decide and not decided at the whim of a perversive President.

There were over 16 millions of people who voted against you, and now there are millions more who look upon you for what you really are, a man mad for power. If you are so concerned with laws why don't you demand the laws as they exist be abided by by people like Mr. Lewis and his ilk.

In my opinion this is the most castardly, insincere class hatred proposition that has ever been proposed to the American people.

The "Artery hardening" process is not in the gentlemen of the Supreme Court but in your own head.

I am not an ECONOMIC ROYALIST and we are struggling to make both meet as we have no rich mother to help out on the family budget. You are driving to poverty the backbone of this country.

When you speak of the one third ill housed, ill fed, and ill clad people in this country, you know as well as every one else that this is an untruth for in no country on earth are people as well off and a very large percentage of our poor ill clad, ill housed and ill fed are so because of their lazy, slovenly habits. To my way of thinking you are a rank disturber.

Marion Chapin
February 22nd, 1937

President Franklin Roosevelt,

Dear Sir,

G.W.

might have clipped one over and made himself king or dictator.
Of course you would not do that—but what about after you. I feel fearful for my beloved country.

Miss Jesse Cox P.N.
914 Hewkirk Ave.,
Brooklyn, N.Y.
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
ROCHESTER, N.Y.

February 11, 1937.

Mr. Stephen Early,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Early:

This is not a crank letter.

I think I am reflecting the sentiments of the liberals of all political faiths of this community when I say that the President's proposed plan of judiciary reorganization is unwise as it applies to the Supreme Court. Varying from most others, I do not believe that the President has (and I hope, had) any genuine expectation of seeing his plan go through as proposed. But most people do believe this, and likewise believe in the balance of power represented by the Court.

Regardless of intentions, spoken or unspoken, the reaction to the plan is an unhappy one — and I'd like to suggest what, if practical, seems a very happy "out."

If Justice Brandeis, oldest and liberal member of the Court, could be induced to resign after making a brief statement concurring with the age limit proposals of 70 or 75, the President could maintain the present balance of open-mindedness in the Court by filling this vacancy with another liberal. And if this were done by appointing a Republican, the appointment would not only swing popular sentiment back to Mr. Roosevelt, but the voluntary resignation of Justice Brandeis would put the aged conservative justices in a most embarrassing predicament from which their resignations would be the only escape.

The Republican liberal is, of course, Mr. John Winant, whom the public regards as both able and above suspicion of partisanship.

Although perhaps an impractical suggestion, this proposal is made in all sincerity and the belief that "packing" the court will cost the President much of his just and hard-earned popularity and defeat the very purpose he apparently has in mind.

Very truly yours,