

(Has the New Deal and Ethical Basis?) or)

The Ethical Basis of The New Deal:

All human undertakings, if they are to endure, must be brought finally into conformity with the ethical principles which underly human humanity. You may escape them for a long time, build gigantic edifices upon them, but they have the last word. It is when a question of conduct, of government, business and what not, is in question readjustments are sought, that ~~it must~~, if it is to be stabilized, this ethical basis must be found. It was bringing the slavery question down to the right and wrong of it that gave Lincoln his power over popular conviction. (Analyze argument)

All efforts to keep the matter away from this separation of the monstrous injustice, the lack of harmony between it and the fundamentals on which things stand, fail in the long run because ^{of} Lincoln's unwillingness to be given away. He might even be [?]. Was he at any point?

In his argument on abolition, [?]
~~but~~ these things he regarded as the outgrowth of that fundamental failure to recognize the moral question involved and whatever difficulty he had in getting back to them because of the adroitness and persistence of his really great disputant, he never failed to do it finally

You are seeing something, possibly, of a parallel
 situation. ^{it} in the New Deal, ~~is~~ in a way the same kind of a
 question, no less unjust. Either the question of the right
 of the man to earn the bread that he eats, to have his share
 of the increment that he has created, as we have been
 operating the thing we call profit, that is, the extra
 result of enterprise, have backed up in the hands of a few.
 Now every analysis shows that, I will not say all, but in many
 cases this congestion is the result of unethical practices,
 even ~~the~~ legal practices and that these have become so
 woven in to the productive pattern that it is almost impossible
 to pull them out without weakening the weaving. Nevertheless,
 they must be pulled out or they will rot out ~~rot~~ the whole
 fabric. Now the New Deal, speaking of Recovery, seeks
 reconstruction; ^{as well as} it speaks of correction of the unfair and
 unethical practices. There is the question whether in
 attempting to draw out these ^{threads} ~~fillets~~ from the weaving it
 replaces them by other threads which is not as plainly un-
 ethical ~~yet~~ have a certain ethical weakness. Wherever you
 find attempts, which are something of the vindictive
 which gloat over the downfall of the wicked practitioner of the
 practice, not the destruction of the practice itself, the
 chances are that you will be blinded to the quality of your
 own substitute. I think that this can be perhaps illustrated

by the Federal tax. It should be looked up, but I have always regarded our dealing with gains and losses in securities - the securities really being capital - as an attempt not to make an ^{equitable} income tax but to get hold of money of the rich. Now this could not be done, of course, without getting hold of the money of the small investor. The argument for this should be looked into. It seems to ^{me to} be a place where vindictiveness in a reform carried along with it an unethical quality, but ~~terror~~ ^{which} has come back to tease.

What this is all about is, that in attempting the New Deal the ethical basis must be regarded. This is ^{particularly} probably true/in regard to labor. I will not say particularly but it is true in regard to the labor conditions and both the management and the labor side are talking in opportunistic terms, political terms. Both are seeking not a fair co-operative basis on which to conduct dealing but each ^{are} seeking to get more power than the other, not only more power but to stand in with the government, one at the expense of the other. Anything of this kind carries its own weakness with it.

It has been apparent for many years in the dealing with the question of corporations, that the Government's institutions like the Trade Commissions, the Department of Justice, took not a cooperative, sound, ethical basis but

on a basis, prejudiced, prejudiced largely because that seemed to be the popular political side, the partisan operation, non-ethical to that degree.

In speaking of the promoter of good causes and his in seeking money I think it is fair to say that the reformer usually has a strong stomach when it comes to questions of pure ethics. You are guided here probably by a necessity partly.

In Lincoln's argument the question of necessity comes in. That is he says he tolerates slavery where it is by necessity, but that he will fight to death for extension, by principle. It was necessity that guided him when it came to emancipation, what he looked at as the larger interest involved, that it was the question of Unionism without which man could not evolve the freedom he was seeking.

He was fighting in the War to save the Union. When it became clear that emancipation could be used as a plausible, ^{was} even a necessary war measure, he used it with thankfulness of heart, that the day had come when by necessity he could emancipate.

How far must we recognize necessity? A necessary condition has been wished on you, you are not responsible for it, you recognize it as evil. The question comes then how to get rid of it. It is a question of method, not of ethics. You may continue the evil by a vindictive,

excited, immediate attempt at eradication.

In the New Deal the question of method in dealing with what ~~we believe~~ to be wrong must be considered, ^{are who} There/those /with a stroke could remove the capitalistic system because it is shot through with abuses. They do not remove the necessity for capital. Capitalism, state or private, or a combination of both must go on. It is not the capitalism which you fight, but the striking and immoral capitalist. Now to destroy him, ^{must you destroy} b/c the system? There are those that believe so. But does this violence which in the nature of things is inhuman, wrong, unjust, ^{ing} and while destroy/certain evils you plant others.

What we need particularly in the New Deal is a base, a recognized ethical base, a recognized moral tape measure.

Both politicians and industrialists, financiers, hesitate before an open declaration, that the thing must be right before they can go ahead. There has been so much hypocrisy mixed up with the doing of things in the name of right, or rather in the name of religion, that your business man who says we must ^{not} do this thing because it is wrong is put down as a hypocrit. Wrong has nothing to do in business, ~~text text~~ attack on what men call a practical matter. Do the thing which will get you where you want to go no matter how

many cracks you leave in the way or how you violate the law. That has nothing to do with the case, so says men whose whole effort inside the business they control was to secure a higher grade of ethical procedure, disclaim any intention to do it because it was right. They have gone far enough in their thinking and acting to know that the thing that was wrong was in the long run not practical. As Judge Gary used to tell his directors, if you cannot do this thing because it is good, etc.