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February 28, 1934.

MEMORANDUM FROM

THE PRESIDENT

FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Many thanks for yours of the 24th.

I think you are absolutely right about the Federal Incorporation Statute. It should go over to the next Session.

In regard to the Unemployment Insurance Bill, I have told Miss Perkins and Bob Wagner that I have no objection to its being reported by the committees, but that I do not think the adjournment of the Session should be held up by it. As you say—it will require a good deal of overhauling and would necessarily cause much debate.
Dear Mr. President,

Two of the things which you have asked me to help with: the unemployment insurance bill and the Federal incorporation statute seem to me so much in need of prolonged study and discussion that I feel they ought to be put over until another session for legislative action. Others will urge action on them immediately. I know Mr. McNary will want the unemployment insurance bill pressed.
But I have been over it carefully and I know that it is very superficial as it is now and would need an enormous amount of work to bring it into shape. There ought to be a good sized committee to work it out and it should take several months. I thought I would tell you, therefore, that it seems to me we ought not to push either of these bills at this session. You will of course take this opinion for what it is worth.

As ever,

Reg T.
Dear Mr. President,

I enclose (1) the story in the Times (2) my letter which was printed in the Times (3) Sulzberger's letter to me (4) my last letters to him. The whole affair is calculated to make me more than ever sure that our enemies not only do not mean to give us a fair shake but mean to use any tactics which will serve their purpose.

I do hope you have a happy Thanksgiving. Several hundred thousand families are having a happy one because of you; you are entitled to one yourself. As ever,
November 21, 1935

Dear Mr. Tugwell:

I have your letter which, as you probably noticed, was printed in The New York Times of November 20th. There is little that I can say other than to express my regret at the unfortunate manner in which the material available was presented in the offending story. It was unfair to your administration, and as such is deeply deplored.

I feel certain that I need not assure you that this article does not represent the policy of The Times. The articles we have run about the Resettlement Administration are sufficient evidence of that -- such articles as your own contribution in the Magazine of July 28th, and the manuscript by Frank George which was published in the Review Section of October 25th.

We should be pleased if you would prepare another article for us in which what has been achieved might be plainly indicated. Thus, probably, some good might come from an otherwise regrettable incident.

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) Arthur Hays Sulzberger

Rexford G. Tugwell, Esq.
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture
Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.
Mr. Arthur Hayes Sulzberger,
President and Publisher,
The New York Times,
Times Square,
New York, New York.

My dear Mr. Sulzberger:

Thank you for your extremely decent letter. Perhaps I am more sensitive than I should be by now to misrepresentation of an organization calculated, I hope, to do an immense amount of good in almost non-controversial ways. Your paper has hitherto been entirely fair. Otherwise I suppose I should not have written you at all. I still do not understand how reporter, head-line writer and make-up man could have joined in the particular enterprise without some policy direction.

Now also is one to understand, even in your printing of my note to you, why this essentially handsome act should include further misrepresentation. I spoke of administrative expenses of roughly ten per cent. Your paper professes that by saying that WPA has administrative expenses of five per cent, and FHA of one per cent. Neither are comparable, as the slightest investigation would reveal, so slight indeed, that I feel certain whoever wrote the piece in question could not have avoided knowing it.

We are, you see, left in almost as bad a position as before. It is clearly represented that the RA is twice as inefficient as WPA and ten times as inefficient as FHA. However, you have gone further to correct an injustice than I perhaps had any right to expect, the world being what it is. I appreciate it and I thank you.

We shall be glad to take advantage of your offer to print a piece describing our activities. If I say I shall get in touch with you as soon as we can get it together.

Yours sincerely,

[Administrator]
TELEGRAM

The White House
Washington

Editorial Philadelphia Record 11-27-35

HITTING BELOW THE BELT.

Republican newspapers are laughing fit to die over Rexford Tugwell's rural Resettlement Administration.

They make front-page stories out of the "fact" that Mr. Tugwell has a staff of 12,089 to create 5,012 relief jobs.

They point out that salaries for the staff come to $1,750,000 monthly, as compared with salaries of $500,000 for the relief workers.

That is amusing, but it would be more amusing if it were true.

The Tugwell group's major task is to lend $140,000,000 to 350,000 destitute farm families to enable them to get on their feet again.

Another major job is to buy up $40,000,000 worth of submarginal farm land.

Both jobs require large administrative staffs and comparatively few relief workers.

The relief workers are being used to construct "satellite cities" near large urban centers, a small part of the Tugwell program.

We think the Tugwell program is largely waste motion and that not enough housing is being undertaken by his group. But that's no excuse for "comparing" the number of administrative officials engaged in making loans and buying land with the number of relief workers in another department engaged in building houses.

That's about as sensible as adding the number of chambermaids at the Bellevue-Stratford to the waiters and cooks, and then proving that the hotel has four employees for each customer in one dining-room.

Chalk up a foul punch. 

-------
December 5, 1935

Dear Dr. Tugwell:

I was pleased to receive your letter of December 3rd with your article enclosed, which we plan to use in our Magazine Section of Sunday, December 15th.

May I take this occasion to tell you that I too did not like the lead to our correcting story to which you referred in your letter of November 27th, and that those responsible have been advised to that effect? I can assure you that it continues to be the policy of The New York Times to have its columns objective.

Faithfully yours,

/a/ Arthur Hays Sulzberger

Dr. Rexford G. Tugwell
Resettlement Administration
Washington, D. C.

AHS:R
The President,
The White House.

Dear Mr. President:

This is in reference to the news coverage on THE NEW YORK TIMES article attacking the Resettlement Administration administrative set-up.

The news stories and editorials based on the original NEW YORK TIMES story (published November 17) have appeared in newspapers all over the country. An analysis of the clippings at hand shows that editorial comment far exceeded news articles, and in most cases used the misleading TIMES figures as a basis for attack on the Administration. Also, that the editorial comment on the Administrator's reply was almost unanimously unfavorable in the clippings which were received.

Geographical distribution of the story, to date, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern States</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake States</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Atlantic States</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Atlantic States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central States</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie States</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific States</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Western States</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain States</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pacific States</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other clippings continue to come in, so these figures are not definitive.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Administrator.
TUGGOWELL HAS STAFF OF 12,069 TO CREATE 5,012 RELIEF JOBS

Pays His Aides $1,750,000 a Month While Workers on Projects Get $300,000.

138,000 JOBS GOAL IN MAY

But Officials State Chief Work Is in Plan for Rehabilitation.

By FRANK L. KLECKHOFF

WASHINGTON, Nov. 19.--WPA will have to supply much of the added 5,012 jobs which must be provided between now and Dec. 31, it was stated today by Harry L. Hopkins, WPA Administrator. The 14,000,000,000 work relief program is to reach its goal of 2,500,000 employees by that date.

The 138,000 jobs will be created by the relief-rehabilitation program which is being carried out by the WPA. The program will provide jobs for those who have lost or will lose their jobs because of the depression. The program will also provide jobs for those who are unable to work due to old age or disability.

The program will be financed by the federal government, and the states will be responsible for the administration of the program. The states will be given the money necessary to carry out the program, and they will be responsible for the employment of the workers.

In addition to the direct employment of workers, the program will also provide for the training of workers in skills which will be in demand in the future. This will provide a skilled labor force for the future.
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TWO TUGWELLA AIDES TO ONE RELIEF JOB

Continued From Page One.

under which 200,000 farm families are already receiving loans and grants to put them back in sound financial condition, and under which an additional 270,000 will be helped.

About 20,000 parents will be employed by Mr. Tugwell's organization with the $21,000,000 set aside for the construction of four "satellite" cities in "green belt" areas outside of large cities, these officials added. About 6,000 relief workers, they said, should be employed by late December on the $6,000,000 Sound Brook, N. J., project, located thirty minutes from New York City.

The $45,000,000 land purchase program under which submarginal land will be bought up and devoted to recreational and conservation purposes will employ another 20,000 to 25,000 relief workers.

200,000 Jobs Last Week.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 16.—The latest WPA figures showed today that 290,184 persons got jobs in the week ended Nov. 8. At the last count, 2,063,320 persons were at work. 1,490,861 short of the administration's objective.

Nevertheless, Mr. Hopkins is proceeding with his intention of shutting off all direct Federal relief to States by Dec. 1, and so date has cut off twenty-six States from the so-called "gile.

Controller General McCord yesterday released $179,000,000 of the last $200,000,000 set aside for public works under Secretary Ickes. The latter at once notified State PWA directors to instruct the municipalities receiving these allotments "to proceed without delay."

How many persons can get jobs quickly on this type of work remains to be seen. To date 2,588 have been employed on both housing and non-Federal PWA projects. The deadlines for starting these projects is Dec. 1.
TUGWELL PROTESTS PUBLISHED FIGURES

Resettlement Bureau Care for 354,000 Families, or 1,500,000 Persons, He Says

2,500,000 TOTAL EXPECTED

Cost of Administration Is Less Than 10 Per Cent, the Administrator Asserts.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 19 — In a letter to the publisher of The New York Times, made public in the press, Rexford G. Tugwell, Resettlement Administrator, took issue with a story that in The New York Times on Sunday regarding the work release load which is being carried by the several emergency agencies and setting forth some details regarding the Resettlement Administration.

Mr. Tugwell took exception to the fact that the article stressed the size of his administrative personnel as, compared with the number of unemployed put to work or to be hired in the future by the administration. He pointed out that a large part of the work of his agency had to do with rural rehabilitation, which provides no unemployment relief. He stressed the fact that his administrative outlay would be “less than 10 per cent of the total funds.”

Public Works Administration officials said today that the administrative costs of that agency had run to less than 1 per cent. Work Progress Administration expenditures, it was estimated, were running less than 5 per cent for administration.

A detailed statement of the activities of the Resettlement Administration was made part of Mr. Tugwell’s letter.

MR. TUGWELL’S LETTER

The letter read as follows:

Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, President and Publisher, The New York Times, Times Square, New York City.

Dear Sir:

I was surprised to read in last Sunday’s New York Times a wholly misleading article on the activities of the Resettlement Administration. The article was printed on page 17 under the heading “Tugwell Has Staff of 13,000 to Create 5,012 Relief Jobs.”

The article and the headline made the point that the administrative costs of the Resettlement Administration are many times larger than the 5,012 relief jobs.

Tugwell’s letter is an attempt to set the record straight.

Sincerely yours,

R. G. TUGWELL

Administrator

New York Times
11/20/35

average farm family consists of more than four persons, you will see that nearly 1,500,000 persons are benefiting directly at this time from the program.

In addition to this work, we have employed 5,972 persons on direct construction work, and this number will be increased to more than 135,000 as the program develops.

From these facts you will notice that instead of two administrative jobs for each relief job, there are twenty-eight cases receiving work relief or rehabilitation under the Resettlement Administration for every person on the administrative payroll.

Total of 2,500,000 Expected

The New York Times ignored the 354,000 rehabilitation cases in the headline, thus creating a misleading impression about our administrative organization. Deep in the story was buried some reference to the rehabilitation cases, but not in such a way as to give the proper relationship to our administrative set-up.

At the peak of our activity it is estimated that 663,750 cases, work relief and rehabilitation, will be included in the Resettlement Administration’s program. This will mean a total of approximately 2,500,000 individuals. The additional activity will require an estimated increase in administrative personnel to 5,000.

Thus, we shall have approximately forty-four cases for each person on the administrative payroll.

For the entire year’s program the Resettlement Administration has available $735,000,000. The administrative budget is $35,600,000. Administrative expenses, including salaries, transportation, office space and equipment, will be less than 10 per cent of the total funds.

Creating direct employment for unemployed is only an incidental part of the work of the Resettlement Administration. In the executive order establishing the Resettlement Administration the President outlined the duties and functions as follows: (1) To administer approved projects involving resettlement of destitute or low-income families from urban and rural communities. (2) To carry out a program of approved projects involving conservation development of land, and (3) To make loans to farm families for the purchase of necessary farm land and equipment to enable them to achieve economic independence.

Explains Rural Rehabilitation

We have a large-scale land adjustment program under way. Already we have options on more than 10,000,000 acres of land. We are seeking to withdraw substandard land from its present cultivation and devote this land to its best possible economic use, such as parks, forests, game refuges and improved ranges.

In this program we are adding immeasurably to the weight of the nation, as well as relieving distress. For the families living in these poverty-stricken areas we are offering new hopes and new opportunities by giving them the chance to resettle on land where they can earn a decent American livelihood.

Rural rehabilitation not only
The worst he could write thing he was had to do with me this auditorium town project other than arranging to have them stay going some time there took around promised he was scheduled to leave in which case I do that our land is slow in some house cleaning is nearly complete on one end we could be at work on the other end of the matter to hand
Dec. 12, 1935

My Dear Mr. President,

I am sorry that you have to be so far removed from the actual carrying out of the things you start. You would get enormous satisfaction out of seeing them grow.

The most dramatic thing I've ever had to do with is this suburban town project that N.H. is carrying out. I have been staying very close to it. It has moved precisely on schedule to date—which is to say that our land is now in our hands, clearing is nearly complete on one project and we shall be at work on all four of them within a week.

The assembly of 30,000 acres of suburban real estate in 26 days from scratch is what the organization did; and the price is below
appraised value. But the most interesting thing is to watch the town and site planners work.

The top salary we can pay an architect or planner is $5,600. Despite that we have the best in the country and sometimes almost their whole staffs at work. They begin with our optioned land and on a plastic miniature begin to build up relationships between land and houses, sewers, water systems, the nearest city, the agriculture dominating there, etc. They list the preferences and prejudices of local people (whether they prefer porches, basements, separate houses, etc). They study the transportation problem intensively. They have a look at the prospective tenants. And all this, with a
good deal of sweat, gets itself on paper.

All these men are working in the old mansion windows, are. I often drop in to get or give an idea. They work all hours, often all night, sometimes 36 hours at a stretch. But out of it there are gradually growing four complete communities of which I think you may be proud. Unless we are short of skilled labor I believe we shall move rigidly on schedule.

I am going to Cincinnati and Milwaukee to Civic Meetings inaugurating the projects there. We are making some slides which show how from land and ideas whole communities are made to
grow. Except for speculator's opposition, this phase of R.A. is having the best public reception of all. I believe you will want to continue it.

As ever, respectfully,

Ray Fugwell
Dear Mr. President,

I have your memo, which refers to Mr. Connally's piece. He has had over 100 jobs from us. But he is the kind who gets grades as he is fed. Certainly we have out-of-Texas people in the Dallas office. It is a regional office and covers more than one state. Also I make no pretense with anyone about certain kinds of jobs—finance, for instance. We give the most rigorous exams. For them, studiously avoid any local or political connection. Practically every good politician on the help
appreciates the reasons for this and cooperates. But there are a few like Connolly who won't. They would be the first to run for cover if there were a breath of scandal, though.

I am proud of our record in that respect so far. With a force account construction job spread clear across the country, with hundreds of thousands of easy loans being made, so far as I know no one has turned up a case of the sort which I expected. And I lay it all to the
finance and inspection service I built up so carefully.
I have labored to get commonly to understand.
And there are a few others.
But on the whole I think our relations are pretty good. We have used all the jobs we felt we could for this purpose.

Faithfully,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. President,

Here is the memo about the Roundbrook litigation. What does not appear in the recitation is the tie-up we know to exist but cannot afford to mention publicly. One of them appears through Merritt Lane; others are more political. Senator Moore has urged me to go on with the project in any case, so be favor it. This is really a formidable attack and if the Senate limits itself to it you can picture what the publicity would be like in a campaign year.

Faithfully,

[Signature]
MEMORANDUM

Re: Litigation - Bound Brook Suburban Resettlement Project

1. The Bound Brook Suburban Resettlement project which is located in the Township of Franklin, New Jersey, will involve the construction of a community for 750 families. The total amount of land which will be purchased for the project will approximate 3500 acres. The total amount of money to be spent for this project will be approximately $6,600,000.

2. About December 10, 1935, the Township of Franklin and four taxpayers brought a suit to enjoin the project in the United States District Court of New Jersey. The attorney for the plaintiffs was Merritt Lane, representative for New Jersey of the Committee of Lawyers of the American Liberty League. Briefly, the contentions were that the project is unconstitutional and unauthorized, and that the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 is unconstitutional; that the Township would be injured by the loss of taxation from the property withdrawn into Federal ownership; and that the individual taxpayers would have their tax burden increased. The District Judge denied an application for a temporary restraining order. Prior to the date for the hearing on the motion for temporary injunction, the United States Attorney appeared and moved to dismiss. District Judge Clark dismissed on the representation that a suit would be brought in the District of Columbia, joining the Administrator of Resettlement Administration as a party.

In connection with this suit, there should be noted the unlikelihood that these individual plaintiffs would have chosen or would have had the means to choose an attorney of the standing of Merritt Lane.

3. On the following day an action was commenced in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia by the same parties, alleging in substance the same complaint, joining as defendants the Administrator, Secretary of the Treasury, Comptroller General and other officials. The attorneys for the plaintiffs were again an outstanding firm, namely, Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson and Shoob. Dean Acheson of this firm represented the plaintiffs in court. An application for a temporary restraining order was denied by Judge Atkins but a stipulation was agreed to to refrain from further work on the project until a hearing was held on the motion for the temporary injunction.

This motion was heard on January 5. Chief Justice Wheats dismissed the bill of complaint on the ground that there was no equity in the bill.
4. An immediate appeal was taken and a motion made for a temporary injunction pending the determination of the appeal. This was granted by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The appeal was argued on February 12, 1936, and supplemental briefs filed by both sides on March 4, 1936.

The Government limited its contentions to the propositions that this was a suit against the United States and that the plaintiffs had no standing in equity and were in no position to question the constitutionality of the Act. The plaintiffs, however, argued that the act was unconstitutional and the project unauthorized.

5. On February 17, 1936, the Board of Education of the Township of Franklin (which had in the meantime become a party to the litigation) passed a resolution withdrawing from the litigation.

6. On March 3, 1936, the Township Committee by a vote of 2 to 1 passed a resolution withdrawing from the litigation. These resolutions were not brought to the attention of the Court although the Department of Justice telephoned Dean Acheson to advise him of the fact that such resolutions were adopted. On March 7, the individual plaintiffs brought a suit in the New Jersey Supreme Court to have the action of the Township in withdrawing from the suit reviewed on a writ of certiorari and Supreme Court Justice Bodine enjoined the Township Committee and its counsel from taking any steps to withdraw from the litigation. In support of this order the plaintiffs filed affidavits implying that certain irregularities on the part of officials of the Resettlement Administration induced the action of two of the Township Committeemen in voting to withdraw the suit.

Testimony is now being taken in this action.

On March 9, 1936, Dean Acheson made two motions in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals:

(a) Asking permission to withdraw as counsel for the Board of Education because of the conflict of interest between it and the other plaintiffs; and

(b) Asking the instruction of the Court as to whether it can withdraw as attorney for the Township of Franklin in view of the conflict between the resolution of the Township and the order of Judge Bodine enjoining the Township from withdrawing.

7. On March 11, Senator Barbour introduced a Senate resolution to investigate the Resettlement Administration.
My Dear Mr. President,

There is one thing about which I am terribly concerned as we get closer to working on the farm-tenant bill. I find it difficult to talk to you, to such good citizens as Mr. Lowry and others, a disposition not to understand why the Resettlement Administration was put together as it was, and a certain easy assumption that it can be broken apart again. I do not now speak of the suburban projects which are something apart. But I do speak of all the rest.

If the land program were to be separated from the rehabili-
itation and resettlement work we should lose all we gained in putting them together. It is poor land which makes poor people, usually, and handling the poor land has to be done at the same time as people are resettled. These poor people are usually, but not always, tenants. At any rate they are tenants or mortgagees. And it is security in possession of the land which we are aiming at.

If we pass the bill in its present form, we shall not have done anything fundamental to make the situation better; in some respects it would be worse. (1) Because it contemplates
simple ownership without the protection of real security and without the supervision which is essential.

(2) Because it would leave the Resettlement Administration operating in the same field.

If we give up tenant activities we should still have the land program and resettlement both of which should be joined together and to the tenant operations.

What should be done is to formulate a simple amendment which would give you discretion to add to "the Farmer's Home Corporation the assets, liabilities and powers of any agency set up under the relief act of
1935. I wish you would give me a chance to talk to you about this. We are headed now toward a kind of administrative confusion which will be much criticised.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
Dear Mr. President,

There is one thing I think you ought to keep in mind in framing your new relief bill — and in fact in everything else of a legislative sort during this session: that is to have things framed so that renewal administrative organizations have to be set up.

My experience — and Harry's — is that it takes almost a year to perfect a country-wide administrative organization and that while
it is being done there is political turmoil over the job criticisms of procedure from the field. Maloney or the part of old organizations which fancy their prerogatives are threatened and other sources of irritation which are bad in an election year.

If the new relief bill could go on with WPA, W.W.A. Resettlement, Rural Elec. etc. under about the same scheme, I am sure you will save a lot of unnecessary trouble. At least I believe so.

Sincerely,
R. E. Tingwood