

To Whom It May Concern,

The Trump administration's push to expand at-will employment through the so-called "Schedule Policy/Career" rule is not about efficiency or accountability. It is a blatant power grab cloaked in bureaucratic language. Let's be clear: this proposal would breed a system with racist, anti-worker roots and repurpose it for authoritarian ends—and it is being forced into existence by Trump himself, pressuring the Office of Personnel Management to carry out his political agenda under the pretense of civil service reform. Let's not pretend this effort comes from a place of good faith. This administration's record on truth, lawfulness, and basic governance is catastrophically poor. From criminal indictments to blatant acts of self-enrichment and foreign entanglements, the level of trustworthiness here is virtually nonexistent. There is no reason to believe this proposal serves anything other than political self-preservation.

As with everything he touches, Trump deflects blame, scapegoats entire communities, and denies responsibility—but even proposing this policy is an insult to working people, to democracy, and to our shared humanity.

At-will employment was never neutral. It was designed to strip rights from workers—especially newly freed Black Americans and immigrants—the very people targeted by this administration—while protecting employers from any obligation to fairness. Now, this administration seeks to expand that same exploitative logic to the federal workforce, targeting nonpartisan civil servants whose only offense is loyalty to the Constitution rather than to a man. That is not reform. It is political retribution.

Under this proposal, career employees in policy-adjacent roles would be fireable without cause, stripped of their rights to due process, and silenced under threat of removal. Meanwhile, there is no loyalty test for members of Congress who incite violence, no ethical standard for presidential candidates who openly accept bribes, and no accountability for those in the highest positions of power who compromise national security for personal gain.

If this is truly about "preserving democracy," then why are protections being dismantled for those who've upheld it—and not for those who've actively undermined it?

Who decides what counts as "disloyalty," and by what standard?

How does removing procedural safeguards from federal jobs enhance democratic governance?

Why are we expanding an employment model historically used to suppress dissent and punish marginalized workers?

And why, in a moment of rising authoritarian threats, is this administration choosing to weaken the very mechanisms that ensure nonpartisan integrity?

You cannot defend democracy while gutting its core institutions.