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ABSTRACT

Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered approximately four hundred speeches between August 9 and November 1, 1920, when he toured the country as the Democratic nominee for Vice-President of the United States. This study reports, describes, and evaluates the invention, the organization, the style, and the delivery of the following seven major campaign appearances: Hyde Park, New York; Chicago, Illinois; Seattle, Washington; Wheeling, West Virginia; Louisville, Kentucky; St. Louis, Missouri; and Cincinnati, Ohio.

Analyses of the speaker's general preparation for the campaign, the principal issues, and the techniques of speech preparation precede a consideration of each tour. Each major speech is evaluated from the standpoint of audience, occasion, and setting; choice of subject and speech goal; premises and methods of proof; speech structure; use of language; and delivery. Speech texts, speech source materials, private correspondence, itineraries, press releases, scrapbooks, newspaper clippings, and unpublished manuscripts dealing with this period were obtained from the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library, Hyde Park, New York.

The candidate assembled an able secretariat to assist him on his three tours. The party's "advance man," Stephen T. Early,
surveyed speaking sites and relayed coded telegrams to Roosevelt relative to future engagements. Marvin H. McIntyre received and interpreted Early's messages while managing the private car, "Westboro." The accompanying staff also included a secretary, a stenographer, and a transportation manager. These men, along with other intermittent assistants, aided the nominee in gathering source material and in writing the speeches. Charles H. McCarthy, who managed the New York City headquarters, offered additional data and advice.

In the seven speeches studied, Roosevelt's audience always consisted of several thousand demonstrative and enthusiastic listeners. The New Yorker was respected highly in all areas where he campaigned, regardless of the prevailing local political sentiment. Each occasion and setting reflected the importance placed on an appearance by a major party candidate.

FDR's speeches developed national and international topics, with primary attention directed on American entry into the League of Nations. His ethos and pathos were uniformly satisfactory, however, logical arguments were vague at Hyde Park, weak at Louisville, and strong at Wheeling.

Speech structure was commendable in the acceptance speech, adequate at Wheeling, and generally weak in other discourses. The pressing itinerary apparently left the speaker little time to
revise and to edit his manuscripts. Often his major points were not clear, inserts were awkwardly interjected into the text, and transitions were inadequate or nonexistent.

Language was clear, vivid, and impressive. Roosevelt skillfully utilized attractive synonyms, common idioms, repetitious phrasings, parallel sentence structure, metaphors, striking statements, cunning ridicule, and first person pronouns. Isolated minor shortcomings in style included lengthy sentences in the exordiums and perorations, and excessive sarcasm.

Reports indicate that the speaker's delivery was effective. FDR was young, attractive, popular, friendly, conversational, and blended comfortably into any ethnic group. Democratic, Republican, and independent publications repeatedly praised his vocal and physical presentation. Although the opposition tried to counteract the advantages afforded by his kinship to the famous "Bull-Moose," Roosevelt successfully capitalized on the Progressive's popularity. In addition, he skillfully managed the challenges of auditors who interrupted his speeches, or followed his formal utterances with pointed questions.

Among those major addresses analyzed in this study, the best performances for each tour probably took place in Chicago, Wheeling, and Cincinnati. The overall outstanding presentation was the rebuttal speech at Wheeling which answered Harding's address in the same city on the preceding night.
INTRODUCTION

Franklin D. Roosevelt is the subject of many studies. "His speeches and papers have been searched for evidence of his growth and development in economic philosophy, political philosophy, social philosophy."¹ His manuscripts, recordings, and movies offer speech authorities of diversified interests a storehouse of research potential.

However, the campaign of 1920 has failed to attract any concentrated efforts of investigation. Unlike later New Deal personalities, not one permanent member of the 1920 campaign party ever produced a published account of his experiences.

Roosevelt's 1920 campaign is significant for the following reasons:

1. The Vice-Presidential nomination gave him his first opportunity to campaign nationally. This campaign offered him the initial chance to meet citizens in many states and to understand their problems first-hand.² One writer contends, "He learned new things about their psychology, their ethics, their foibles, their


sectional prejudices, and their truly national character."3 Frank Freidel, a foremost Roosevelt authority, relates, "With remarkable aplomb he learned what for him henceforth would be the greatest of sports, national campaigning. By the end of three months' intensive practice, he was a skilled player."4

2. His 1920 effort represents the last campaign speaking in which he was physically sound. He was afflicted with poliomyelitis in 1921. Future movement and speech delivery would be greatly inhibited by painful braces. Most of the published works carefully describe these physical difficulties.

3. According to one biographer, he "traveled more miles and made more speeches than any candidate for national office had ever done before."5 The 1920 audiences were fully aware that FDR's itinerary was an exceptionally extensive one.6

4. His speaking forced changes in Republican strategy. "Inspiring memories of the Roosevelt name helped his drawing


power—some of the people thought he was Teddy's son. The Republicans became so alarmed over this situation that they sent Theodore, Jr. out on Franklin's trail to counteract it.7 Later in the campaign, "Harding finally left his porch and delivered some stump speeches."8 However, it must be admitted that Republican leaders were contemplating several key addresses by Harding in different cities. This planning took place before the tours began, making FDR's influence on Republican strategy in this area somewhat doubtful.9 In looking back, Rexford G. Tugwell admits, "Even at that time, when no one could have foreseen that it had any special significance, Franklin made more stir than secondary figures usually do."10

5. The trips offered him an opportunity to present his political ideology to the populace.11 In referring to this

8 Burns, Roosevelt, p. 76.
10 The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 123.
factor, Tugwell calls it "the Roosevelt identity" which "would still be potent in 1932."\textsuperscript{12}

6. Friendships and associations were formed in 1920 that helped him in the later state and national elections.\textsuperscript{13} Alden Hatch indicates, "Louis Howe kept a list of all those thousands of new friends that Roosevelt made. Through the long years ahead, he and Franklin kept up a correspondence with them, and when the great moment came, they were still friends."\textsuperscript{14} Lela Stiles refers to Louis Howe's "selected list of 2000" being used following FDR's gubernatorial election of 1928. "Most of them, through Louis, had been corresponding with Franklin Roosevelt since 1920, and his startling New York victory caused them to listen with new respect."\textsuperscript{15} One diligent party worker of the thirties accredited his own political loyalty to the positive impressions left by the candidate's 1920 Montana visit.\textsuperscript{16} The nomination gave the New Yorker "license to roam the nation, exhibit his charm, and become acquainted with hosts of professionals. If he was not yet Mr.

\textsuperscript{12}The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 126.

\textsuperscript{13}Freidel, Franklin D. Roosevelt, p. 91; Gosnell, Champion Campaigner, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{14}Franklin D. Roosevelt, p. 124.

\textsuperscript{15}The Man Behind Roosevelt, p. 121.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 232.
Democrat, he was the heir apparent of not only the Bryan-Wilson tradition but that of Uncle Ted."\textsuperscript{17}

7. In preparation for this strenuous endeavor, he formed a dependable and permanent secretariat that carried over into the more successful political periods of his life.\textsuperscript{18} Active at this time were Steve Early, Marvin McIntyre, Louis Howe, Charles McCarthy, and "Missy" LeHand. Some were affiliated with the candidate during earlier years, but in 1920 they were woven into an efficient unit. All of these people were destined to play significant roles in the New Deal.

8. The first two Presidential routes were similar to the 1920 pattern. The trips in the thirties covered practically the same territory.\textsuperscript{19} Even the habit of delivering a final major address in Madison Square Garden was retained.\textsuperscript{20} One writer notes the "concentration on the West which was unprecedented but which broke the ground for later forays of the same sort. It is quite apparent that Franklin already had glimpsed the grand strategy of

\textsuperscript{17}Tugwell, The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{18}Gunther, Roosevelt in Retrospect, p. 217.
uniting West and South which would be so effective in 1932 in spite of opposition from the city machines."\textsuperscript{21}

9. He often referred to the 1920 experience in later speeches of the New Deal period. Samuel Rosenman points to specific examples of western utterances during the 1936 campaign in which FDR reminded the audiences of his visit sixteen years previously.\textsuperscript{22} Thomas Greer makes a similar reference in discussing Presidential speaking in 1934.\textsuperscript{23} In summing up the campaign, the candidate found it to be a "damn fine sail."\textsuperscript{24}

10. He learned a lesson in political defeat. In the future, "he was forever alert and on guard to see that all political fences were mended and secure."\textsuperscript{25}

11. Finally, he obviously gained considerable public speaking experience.\textsuperscript{26} He remarked, prior to his 1932 western tour,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Tugwell, \textit{The Democratic Roosevelt}, p. 126.
\item Samuel I. Rosenman, \textit{Working with Roosevelt} (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 120.
\item Gunther, \textit{Roosevelt in Retrospect}, pp. 63-64.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
"I am glad I had that 1920 experience, otherwise I should be worried by the prospect."\textsuperscript{27}

"In American history not many unsuccessful candidates for Vice President have been saved from political oblivion."\textsuperscript{28} Roosevelt had to use the experience as a stepping stone to future victories. Freidel maintains that the effort was "not so much a lost crusade as a dress rehearsal. It was his first presidential campaign . . . . This flurry of attention heralded the emergence of Roosevelt as a major public figure."\textsuperscript{29}

In order to gain a greater insight into Roosevelt's speaking career, this particular era is worthy of rhetorical investigation and analysis.

\textbf{Problem and Method}

The objective of this study is to report, describe, and evaluate the speaking of Franklin D. Roosevelt in his 1920 campaign for Vice-President of the United States. To fulfill this goal, the speech, the speaker, and the audience are investigated from the standpoint of ancient and modern standards of rhetorical criticism. The study concentrates upon invention, organization,

\textsuperscript{27} As quoted in Kilpatrick, \textit{Roosevelt and Daniels}, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{28} Gosnell, \textit{Champion Campaigner}, p. 69.
\textsuperscript{29} Franklin D. Roosevelt, pp. 70-71.
style, and delivery. Two texts in speech criticism are used as the primary bases for evaluation.  

30 Roosevelt's 1920 campaign speaking began officially with his acceptance speech at Hyde Park, New York, on August 9, and closed with the final pre-election address at Poughkeepsie, New York, on November 1. Within this period, there are three clear divisions. Each division is set apart by a meeting between Presidential candidate James M. Cox and Vice-Presidential candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Following the San Francisco convention, Roosevelt met Cox at the Governor's Mansion in Columbus, Ohio, July 12. In this meeting the two nominees divided the country. It was agreed that the New York Democrat would first go West and the Ohio Governor would travel in the East.  

31 Six days later came the conference between the two candidates and President Wilson at the White House in Washington.  

32 On July 20, a final pre-campaign conference was held at Dayton, Ohio, with Franklin Roosevelt, James Cox, and the Democratic


32 Ibid., July 19, 1920.
from August 9, through the remainder of the month, FDR toured the western states. He again met with Governor Cox on August 31, at the State Fair Grounds in Columbus, Ohio. Thus, the first tour was completed.

The second excursion, September 1 through October 3, found Roosevelt in the eastern part of the country. This jaunt gave him the opportunity to indulge in an exhaustive speaking trip in Maine before the state held its customarily early congressional elections; then, he took a brief vacation at Campobello Island. He completed a swing into West Virginia and Kentucky, followed by a meeting with Governor Cox aboard a train en route from Terre Haute to Indianapolis, October 3.

The final tour enveloped the West as far as Colorado, and ended with an intensive schedule of New York State appearances. Thus, the three divisions are clear.

This study deals with a rhetorical analysis and criticism of the major speeches delivered on each tour. These addresses

33 Ibid., July 21, 1920.
34 Ibid., July 13, 1920.
36 Ibid., October 4, 1920.
were selected according to the amount of publicity, the emphasis
placed on preparation, the time and place of delivery, the size of
the audience, and the contemporary importance of the issue, or
issues, involved. Less significant utterances are not neglected,
as these aid in the analyses of the major discourses.

Plan

The organization is as follows:

Chapter I gives a brief, historical development of Franklin
Roosevelt's general preparation for the campaign, beginning with
his political background and ending with his activities immediately
prior to the notification ceremonies.

Chapter II develops the principle issues of the period.

Chapter III analyzes the techniques of speech preparation.
Because these procedures varied little on the three different tours,
this information is included in a single chapter.

Chapter IV deals with a rhetorical analysis and evaluation
of three important presentations of the first campaign tour,
August 9 through August 31. This section includes an examination
of audience, occasion, and setting; choice of subject and speech
goal; premises and methods of proof; speech structure; use of
language; delivery; and a final evaluation.

Chapter V, while similar to Chapter IV in organization and
development, considers two significant addresses of the second
campaign tour, September 1 through October 3.
Chapter VI concentrates on two key speeches of the third campaign tour, October 4 through November 1. The initial trip focused on the West and the Far West, the intervening operation centered in the East and the border states of the South, and the final phase took place in the West, Midwest, and East.

Chapter VII offers a summary and an appraisal of the data.

Sources

The chief source of materials for this study is found at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Library, Hyde Park, New York. This information is filed in the following divisions:

"Group 15 - FDR Correspondence - Campaign of 1920," Boxes 1-9 and 11-23, contains letters, telegrams, memoranda, and miscellaneous material.

"Group 15 - FDR Itineraries - Campaign of 1920," Box 10, includes all of the available proposed and final itineraries of the three tours.

"Group 15 - Newspaper Clippings - Campaign of 1920," Box 24 and an "Oversize Box," are collections of scattered clippings prepared by members of the staff and a newspaper clipping service.

"Group 15 - Speech Material and Suggestions - Campaign of 1920," Box 25, consists of miscellaneous material suggested and/or employed in the speeches.
"Group 15 - FDR Scrapbook #1," and "FDR Scrapbook #3," represents a collection of handbills, cards, newspaper clippings, and miscellaneous data.

"FDR Speech File - Campaign of 1920," holds twenty-two complete addresses, seventy-three extracts, and seventeen unidentified or incomplete texts.

"The Halstead Collection - Roosevelt Family Papers," comprises various letters, telegrams, notes, and newspaper clippings.

"The Louis McHenry Howe Papers, 1913-21," Box 38 and Box 39, includes material in Howe's file collected during his tenure as assistant to Franklin Roosevelt.

A current member of the Roosevelt Library staff, Mr. Robert L. Jacoby, has compiled, in draft form, a calendar of the 1920 speeches. This annotated card file represents a considerable expansion of the calendar he published in 1952. 37

A former member of the Library staff, Dr. John A. Curtiss, produced an unpublished manuscript, "Franklin D. Roosevelt in Political and Private Life, 1912-1928." This paper was read at "a kind of seminar," January 3, 1942. 38

The second of two volumes containing Roosevelt's personal letters, edited by Elliott Roosevelt, publicizes a few items of correspondence relevant to the 1920 campaign.\textsuperscript{39}

Contemporary newspapers proved to be greatly beneficial in giving information pertaining to the audience, the occasion, the speech texts, and the editorial reactions.

Many books and publications relating to the period were valuable secondary sources.

\textbf{Speech Texts}

The exact number of speeches delivered by the candidate during this period is difficult to determine. John Gunther reports that "FDR himself made no fewer than 800 speeches."\textsuperscript{40} Lela Stiles estimates there were "over eight hundred speeches during the campaign . . ."\textsuperscript{41} Alden Hatch increases this figure to "a thousand in eighty days . . ."\textsuperscript{42} Dr. John A. Curtiss agrees with this number.\textsuperscript{43} Ernest K. Lindley is not quite

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{39}Elliott Roosevelt, editor, \textit{F. D. R. His Personal Letters: 1905-1928} (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1948), Vol. II.
\item \textsuperscript{40}\textit{Roosevelt in Retrospect}, p. 216.
\item \textsuperscript{41}\textit{The Man Behind Roosevelt}, p. 73.
\item \textsuperscript{42}\textit{Franklin D. Roosevelt}, p. 123.
\item \textsuperscript{43}"Franklin D. Roosevelt in Political and Private Life, 1912-1928," p. 11.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
certain, "but there were almost one thousand speeches on Roosevelt's planned itinerary, and he probably exceeded that number."  

Emil Ludwig is uncertain also, but he places the count at "about a thousand." However, Harold F. Gosnell and James M. Burns believe the figure exceeded a thousand. Less than a month before the completion of the campaign, a newspaper report estimated that the Vice-Presidential nominee had visited approximately thirty states, delivering 335 speeches. In the final pre-election address, Mr. Roosevelt maintained that he had set a record by delivering 469 speeches. The entire campaign period totaled eighty-five days. However, included in this sum were twelve Sundays and there is no evidence which indicates that Roosevelt ever spoke on the Sabbath. In addition, he took a four-day vacation at Campobello Island, September 7-10. During this time, he delivered only one speech. The vacation was interrupted by the death of his uncle, Warren Delano, at

44 *Franklin D. Roosevelt*, p. 199.  
46 *Champion Campaigner*, p. 66.  
47 *Roosevelt*, p. 74.  
48 *Omaha World-Herald*, October 8, 1920.  
Barrytown, New York. FDR returned for the funeral and, consequently, did no speaking for two days, September 11-12. Later in the same month, September 21, he took the day off to enter his son, James, at Groton. These interruptions decreased his active days of campaigning to sixty-seven. The largest number of discourses given in a concentrated period included the twenty-six presentations he made in the state of Washington during a two-day duration, in August. Three days before the close of the campaign, FDR made twelve speeches in Winchester County, New York. These examples are not typical. For instance, he traveled by train through the states of Idaho and Nevada without ever delivering a single speech. Many days his total effort consisted of two or three appearances. Therefore, estimations running from eight hundred to one thousand addresses are highly questionable. Even if Roosevelt's figure of 469 is accepted as accurate, the busy young man delivered approximately seven speeches a day. Nevertheless, his estimate appears to be the closest one to reality.

The above information is presented in order to show that the speech file for 1920 records a greater portion of the subject's orations than most current biographies indicate. Either complete manuscripts or portions of 112 texts are available for study. This total constitutes almost one-fourth of the number that the Democratic nominee claimed to make. There was
extensive repetition of a single speech, therefore, those on file are probably more representative than a simple numerical tally reveals. In her account of the campaign, Mrs. Roosevelt recalls standing "at the back of the hall when Franklin was making the same speech for the umpty-umpth time . . ." 50

Some of the documents are written in longhand by Mr. Roosevelt, but most of the collection consists of typewritten original or carbon copies of the speeches. Only the Hyde Park manuscript bears a notation that the available copy is the one used at the time of delivery. In several cases, the candidate's longhand original and the typewritten copy of the same speech are extant. Infrequently, the brief, scribbled outline is filed with a stenographic copy of the same address. The 1920 speech file is not as complete, or as efficiently classified, as the gubernatorial and Presidential collections.

Contemporary newspapers published several complete speech texts and a large number of additional excerpts. There is no published volume of Roosevelt's addresses available for this period.

Previous Studies

Doctoral dissertations investigating some phase of Franklin Roosevelt's speaking can be divided into three general

categories. First, there have been studies relating to a specific campaign. Included in this division are works dealing with the gubernatorial campaigns and various Presidential campaigns.

Second, there are dissertations which compare Roosevelt with another speaker. Frequently, these investigations also center around a particular campaign.


Third, there are several general studies of FDR's speaking during the Presidential years.\footnote{Earnest Brandenburg, "An Analysis and Criticism of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Speeches on International Affairs Delivered between September 3, 1939 and December 7, 1941" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1948); Bernard F. Phelps, "A Rhetorical Analysis of the 1937 Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt in Support of Court Reform" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1957); Lorin C. Staats, "The Extent of Variation of the Denotative Meaning Attatched by Audiences to the Forty-six Common Nouns in Context, In an Excerpt from a Speech Delivered by Franklin Delano Roosevelt on November 4, 1940" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1946); John F. Wilson, "An Analysis of the Criticism of Selected Speeches by Franklin D. Roosevelt" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1955).}

A number of theses also have treated different aspects of Roosevelt's Presidential addresses. However, there has been no previous rhetorical investigation of the 1920 campaign. Since this interval encompasses a significant period of an important speaker's public address activity, this study is justified.
CHAPTER I

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT'S BACKGROUND IN NATIONAL POLITICS

Introduction

It is not the purpose of this study to investigate thoroughly the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt. However, sufficient background material is established in order to evaluate the speeches concerned. Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, two foremost authorities on speech criticism, maintain:

Recent studies rest on sound precedent . . . in stressing the importance of the orator's background for a full understanding of the speeches subjected to criticism . . . Likewise, the critic will be in a better position to understand an orator's arguments if he knows the practical experience upon which the thinking rests.¹

These writers further observe that "the attitude of the audience toward the speaker — based upon previous knowledge of the latter's activities and reputation — cannot accurately be separated from the reaction the speaker induces through the medium of speech."²

Therefore, in developing pertinent biographical data, this opening chapter is concerned partially with the attitudes of the

²Ibid., p. 385.
The candidate's national political activities are divided into four separate sections: first, a brief historical account of his tenure as Assistant Secretary of the Navy; second, a review of the events leading up to the San Francisco convention; third, the Democratic nominations; and finally, FDR's functions prior to the opening of the campaign.

**Political Background and Trips to Europe, 1912-1919**

After twice being elected to the New York State Senate, Franklin Roosevelt stepped into the arena of national politics at the 1912 Democratic convention in Baltimore. The initial step did not command any immediate public recognition, but the Hyde Park Democrat's active support of Woodrow Wilson for the Presidential nomination ultimately led to a number of personal advantages. Dr. John A. Curtiss, a former member of the Roosevelt Library staff, indicates that FDR "managed to meet most of the leaders of the party," and "clearly identified himself with the progressive wing." As a result, in 1913 Roosevelt became Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

---


Secretary of the Navy at the age of thirty-one. At the same time, he was mentioned as the gubernatorial choice of liberal New York Democrats.\(^5\)

Although the liberal support was encouraging, FDR faced the opposition of Tammany Hall, the New York City Democratic organization. He openly opposed this organization's support of Champ Clark in 1912.\(^6\) After dismissing the possibility of a gubernatorial nomination, the Assistant Secretary initiated an attempt to control New York State patronage. This successful attempt led the New York Times to speculate that all New York appointments were subjected to his approval.\(^7\) There was some talk of running him for Governor in 1914, but his chances were dimmed by anticipated Tammany opposition.\(^8\)

Thinking he had Presidential support in the 1914 Democratic senatorial primary, Roosevelt opposed James W. Gerard, the Ambassador to Germany. With White House and Tammany backing, Gerard won by a two-to-one vote. The Assistant Secretary remained a strong personality in New York politics,\(^9\) while the Republican victory seemed to eliminate the Ambassador from any serious

\(^5\)Ibid.
\(^6\)Ibid., p. 1.
\(^7\)July 19, 1914.
\(^8\)Ibid., July 5, 1914.
\(^9\)Curtiss, "Franklin D. Roosevelt," pp. 4-5.
political consideration. Gerard was nominated for the Presidency at the Democratic National Convention in 1920, but he never obtained any significant support and the gesture was mainly one of good will.\textsuperscript{10}

The senatorial race marked an end to any extended fight against Tammany. Roosevelt contended that the organization made progressive reforms and developed a "more public spirited attitude."\textsuperscript{11} The hatchet was buried sufficiently deep for him to take the speakers' stand at Tammany Hall, jest lightly about former ill-feelings, then deliver one of the major speeches at the Fourth of July celebration in 1917. He was "warmly greeted by the Tammany braves."\textsuperscript{12}

In the Presidential campaign of 1916, Roosevelt served as Acting Secretary of the Navy while Secretary Josephus Daniels campaigned in Wilson's behalf. A similar situation existed during the congressional elections of 1918.\textsuperscript{13} Once again there was talk of a possible gubernatorial nomination, only this time the inspiration originated within the ranks of the organization.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11}Curtiss, "Franklin D. Roosevelt," p. 1.
\textsuperscript{14}Curtiss, "Franklin D. Roosevelt," p. 5.
Roosevelt did not want the nomination. In July, 1918, he urged Wilson's support for Alfred E. Smith and later praised Smith as "the best equipped man" for the job. After Smith's election, FDR possibly considered his own rejection of the nomination to be a serious mistake.

Labor problems constituted Roosevelt's specialty in the Department. His secretary, advisor, political tutor, confidant, and friend, Louis Howe, "insisted that Franklin find out something about labor conditions in the navy yards," and the experience was "one of the milestones in his life." John Gunther summed up the period as follows:

His seven years as Assistant Secretary gave Roosevelt experience that was of profound value all his life in several fields: (a) labor relations, (b) the detailed day-to-day management of a giant Government department during warfare, (c) naval strategy in general, (d) problems of logistics and supply, (e) the art of handling men. Also he got to know personally a multitude of officers and civilians who were to serve him as Commander in Chief in World War II.

15 New York Times, October 21, 1918.


As early as 1914, the Assistant Secretary boldly called for greater preparedness measures and a more receptive audience for the pleas of naval officers. Navy Secretary Josephus Daniels ultimately gave Roosevelt much of the credit in urging "big Navy" policy and in planning the North Sea mine barrage as a defense against German submarines.

In addition to labor problems and basic military planning, the Assistant Secretary "was responsible for the Departmental budget, civil service procedures, the purchase of supplies, and the legal intricacies of governmental accounting." He vigorously procured scarce materials, making it necessary for President Wilson to request the Navy to share with the other services. His activities in the Navy placed him "on good terms simultaneously with admirals, labor leaders, 'big navy' men, local politicians, and leaders of the Wilson administration, as well as some groups hostile to Daniels and the President."


21Gosnell, Champion Campaigner, p. 51.

Early in 1918, Roosevelt repeatedly agitated Daniels to allow a European visit by the Assistant Secretary in order to coordinate "the business and legal part of the Naval operations." After several denials, he finally sailed in mid-summer, and visited England, France, Italy, and Belgium. In England, he called upon "the Admiralty several times . . . went to see the King . . . and had a most delightful talk with Mr. Lloyd George." He also met the Belgium king, visited the front, and "was the first American civilian of Cabinet rank to see the war firsthand."

Following the first European visit, FDR made a favorable impression in publicizing the efficient wartime operation of the Navy's "hugely expanded establishment." Naval publicity was an old side-line of the Assistant Secretary. For years, he advertised the activities of the Department and consistently advocated a large defensive force. He wrote major articles in significant publications for the purpose of keeping the populace well-informed on military affairs. Since 1914, his writings appeared in

---

23 As quoted in Kilpatrick, Roosevelt and Daniels, p. 43.
24 As quoted in Ibid., pp. 46-47.
25 Ibid., p. 49.
26 Gunther, Roosevelt in Retrospect, p. 215.
Early in the war, Roosevelt volunteered for active commissioned duty with the Navy. After being retained in civilian status, the Assistant Secretary renewed his request for active duty before returning from Europe. Denied a commission once more,

28 "The Problem of Our Navy."

29 "Future of the Submarine," CCII (October, 1915), 505-508.


31 "On Your Heads," LXI (April, 1917), 413-416.

32 "What the Navy Can Do for Your Boy," XXXIV (June, 1917), 25.

33 "War Activities of the United States Navy," VIII (April, 1918), 19-21.

34 July 11, 1920.

he returned to the United States and initiated new requests for another European trip following the armistice on November 11.  

Justification for the second European visit was based on his plan "to deal with the disposal of property and the settling of the Navy's financial relations with the Foreign Governments and their citizens." Secretary Daniels also balked at this request, then finally gave in to the persistent Roosevelt, allowing him to sail with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in January, 1919. While at sea, they were saddened by the unexpected death of former President Theodore Roosevelt. Upon arriving in Europe, the young Navy executive found problems of demobilizing fifty-four shore bases of varying kinds in the Azores and European areas, twenty-five port offices, a railway battery of five fourteen-inch guns, several radio stations, and three hundred and fifty-nine vessels not participating in the transatlantic service. The task was further complicated by questions of property rights, governmental agreements, and the multitude of other factors arising from operations in foreign lands. In his annual report for 1919, Daniels wrote, "The plans perfected and the negotiations completed have resulted in the disposition of Naval property in a way that has been wise and beneficial."  

---

36 Kilpatrick, *Roosevelt and Daniels*, pp. 50-52.  
40 As quoted in Kilpatrick, *Roosevelt and Daniels*, p. 60.
Demobilization procedures did not occupy all of the Assistant Secretary's time. Both he and Mrs. Roosevelt had opportunities for social and business calls outside the confines of official Navy duty. There were visits with Colonel Teddy Roosevelt, Jr., confined to a service hospital with a knee injury; several conferences with Herbert Hoover, the Food Administrator; and observations of devastated fields, scorched by heavy fighting. With the Versailles Peace Conference in full swing, the trip also presented obvious political advantages. "Franklin could spend a good deal of time in doing what he had really come for. This, of course, was to watch from close by the goings on in Paris." Reflecting on these experiences at a 1943 press conference, he recalled that "everybody who had a 'happy thought,' or who thought he was an expert got a free ride." Over twenty years later, his observations were beneficial in helping to form the United Nations.

As Woodrow Wilson returned home, carrying a draft of the famous League of Nations Covenant, the Roosevelts were on shipboard and discussed the League with the President. The

41Elliott Roosevelt, F. D. R. His Personal Letters, II, 454-462.
42Tugwell, The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 115.
43As quoted in Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, p. 402.
44Burns, Roosevelt, p. 68.
advantages derived from visiting Europe prior to the armistice and returning during the peace talks, were to prove highly beneficial to the Assistant Secretary in conducting the 1920 campaign for Vice-President. The major issue of the campaign revolved about the American entry into the League. Among the campaigners, he alone claimed the unique distinction of observing, first-hand, some of the international discussions. He referred to these experiences rather glowingly in numerous speeches.

Reflecting on these events later, possibly FDR was tempted to place his own role out of its proper perspective. Rapid changes were taking place. Abrupt conversion, from war to peace, to demobilization, to negotiation, likely caused confusion in many specific details. For example, evidence reveals that he exaggerated his own personal connections with actual hostilities. At Salt Lake City, returning from the coast following the Democratic National Convention, he reminded the audience of a harrowing experience with a German submarine while crossing the Atlantic. His European interpreter, a passenger on the ship and


46 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920." Unless otherwise noted, all letters, memoranda, speeches, itineraries, telegrams, and press releases referred to herein are located in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.
a member of the Salt Lake audience, said the event was "news" to him.  

Various congressional investigations, insured by the Republican victories of 1918, were in order following the war. Upon examination, the Naval affairs were found to be "in good shape. It had been a well-conducted war." After testifying before congressmen, the Assistant Secretary informed Daniels, "The hearings before the Naval Committee are over — really great fun and not so much of a strain." On another occasion, before the Select Committee of the House, FDR urged that changes be made in budget-making, appropriations, promotions, agency functions, and departmental authority. These proposals were developed more fully during the 1920 campaign.

During Roosevelt's Navy service, two significant transformations occurred. First, while his family increased in size, he found it necessary to be away from home much of the time. Second, he gained the reputation of being a highly efficient governmental

47 Salt Lake City Tribune, July 9, 1920.
48 Tugwell, The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 115.
49 As quoted in Kilpatrick, Roosevelt and Daniels, pp. 67-68.
50 Burns, Roosevelt, p. 68.
51 Ibid., p. 67.
administrator. The first transformation was to become more pronounced as he campaigned for the Vice-Presidency, and more permanent during the executive years at Albany and Washington. The second transformation was beneficial in conducting the 1920 campaign, and in adding to his rapidly expanding storehouse of experience.

In serving as State Senator, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and even as unsuccessful aspirant to the United States Senate, FDR gained invaluable experience. Political campaigning, supervisory duties, contact with international leaders, and worldwide travel in an official capacity helped to develop the New Yorker into "a figure of more than local importance."53

Events Preceding the Vice-Presidential Nomination, January-June, 1920

"The image Roosevelt presented to the world during the immediate postwar period was that of the brisk young executive."54 During the war, "when members of the Navy Department wanted something done that required immediate attention and energetic action, the by-word was 'see young Roosevelt.'"55 He performed his duties

52Gosnell, Champion Campaigner, p. 51.
54Burns, Roosevelt, p. 68.
admirably and the congressional investigations further revealed the efficiency of operations within the Navy Department. He still reserved time to maintain important political contacts.

There was no electoral year from 1913 to 1918 when he was not talked of, prominently suggested, or actually offered some nomination. Sometimes the talk seems to have been stimulated by Louis Howe, but much of it was spontaneous. He was, in fact, upper New York's representative in the Wilson entourage.57

Prior to the national convention, he was mentioned unofficially as a candidate for governor, for United States Senator, and even for the Presidency. Typical examples of his popularity included one message from a publisher, endorsing Mr. Roosevelt for the Senate.58 Another letter urged him "to get in the way of the Presidential lightning."59 Earlier in the year, a national periodical mentioned him as a possible Presidential nominee, emphasizing the strategic position of his home state, his excellent record, and his blood relationship to former President Roosevelt.60 Immediately prior to the convention, the

57Tugwell, The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 114.
59Letter, Pendall to FDR, June 18, 1920.
Democrats of Beacon, New York, endorsed him for President. After the convention began, there was some talk among Tammany chieftains of running him for United States Senator. These were not the first, nor the only, statements of this type, but they disclosed the contemporary sentiment of some individuals and groups, both prominent and obscure. The honoree was evasive on all of these proposals, choosing to wait and to observe the attitude of the Democratic delegates in July.

In looking ahead to the convention, FDR stepped up his schedule of public speaking appearances. An unpublished, annotated calendar of speeches, by Roosevelt Library staff member Robert L. Jacoby, supplementing his published calendar, disclosed the volume of speeches delivered by the Assistant Secretary during this period. In January, he spoke at a Democratic rally in Washington, D. C., before the Newburgh, New York, Chamber of Commerce, during a meeting of New York State

62 Ibid., July 2, 1920.
63 Burns, Roosevelt, p. 71.
Democrats, Hampton Hotel, Albany, New York, and on a forum luncheon program of the Brooklyn, New York, Chamber of Commerce. 67

FDR opened the month of February in an afternoon debate with his neighbor and former Republican State Senator, Ogden Mills, before members of the Colony Club, New York City, arguing the relative merits of their respective political parties. 68 Perhaps some members of the audience recalled his Uncle Teddy's political appearance at this same Colony Club in 1914. 69 An hour later, after leaving the Club before the program concluded, he spoke to an audience of 1500 at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences at the Brooklyn Academy of Music. In this speech, he gleefully acknowledged negotiating a military preparedness measure by circumventing Wilson's authority, only to outdo this confession moments later by admitting the unauthorized expenditure of $40,000,000 without proper congressional approval. 70 He was like a naughty boy bragging of past pranks, secure in the knowledge that a certain lapse of time offered unofficial immunity through some mystical statute of limitations. Similar immodesty and frankness in public address invited a political furor during the campaign. In addition, he delivered February speeches at the

67 See also, Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce Bulletin, February 5, 1920.

68 See also, New York Times, February 2, 1920.

69 Ibid., July 16, 1914.

70 Ibid., February 2, 1920.
New York County Democratic Committee testimonial dinner for Homer S. Cummings; before the Garret and Saturn Clubs, Buffalo, New York; during an assembly of the Men's Forum, First Congregational Church, Binghamton, New York; and before the Harvard Union.\(^1\)

During the month of March, the New York Democrat spoke at the Saint Thomas Parish House, Washington, D. C.; before the Chester Club at Chester, Pennsylvania;\(^2\) in the Wierman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.; during a meeting of Women Democrats, New York City;\(^3\) and, at the Trinity Protestant Episcopal Church, Tohma Park, Washington, D. C.\(^4\)

Personal appearances were increased during the month of April. Mr. Roosevelt opened the month with the Marquette Club, Hotel Plaza, New York City.\(^5\) Then, he put in five appearances in three days before a Jefferson Day Dinner, National Democratic Club, Hotel Astor, New York City;\(^6\) during the morning service,


\(^2\) See also, Chester [Pennsylvania] Times, March 12, 1920.

\(^3\) See also, New York Times, March 27, 1920.

\(^4\) Jacoby, "FDR Speech Calendar 1920 Campaign."

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) See also, New York Times, April 11, 1920.
Old North Church, Boston; 77 in an afternoon meeting, The Radcliffe Club, Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston; 78 with the evening assembly, Saint Stephen's Episcopal Church, Lynn, Massachusetts; 79 and before the Chilton Club, Boston. 80 On April 24, he delivered three speeches during a single day at the Narragansett Club, Staten Island, New York; 81 before the Democratic Women's Campaign Committee of One Thousand, New York City; 82 and in the Brooklyn Club, Brooklyn, New York. 83 Toward the end of April, he spoke before the Daughters of 1812, Williard Hotel, Washington, D. C. 84

While FDR's speaking schedule decreased during the month of May, his appearances increased in importance. His audiences became larger and more diversified, with the exception of the local Associated Harvard Club, Washington, D. C. 85 He

77 See also, Boston Traveler, April 12, 1920.
78 Ibid.
79 See also, Lynn [Massachusetts] Telegram News, April 12, 1920.
80 Letter, Mayes to FDR, April 24, 1920.
81 See also, Staten Island [New York] Daily Advance, April 26, 1920.
82 See also, New York Times, April 25, 1920.
83 See also, Brooklyn Standard Union, April 25, 1920.
84 Jacoby, "FDR Speech Calendar 1920 Campaign."
85 Typescript of speech available in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
spoke at a mass meeting in Carnegie Hall, New York City, sponsored by the Manhattan Navy Club Campaign Committee. 86 In mid-May, he appeared before the annual conventions of the National Association of Woolen Workmen and the National Citizen's Conference on Education. 87 However, his most significant appearance, up to this time, was before the Democratic National Committee in Chicago. 88 "He made a fighting speech, declaring that the Republican party was dominated by reactionaries, from whom the country could expect nothing progressive." 89 He discussed the tariff, taxation, foreign policy, political party alignment, and partisan publications. He developed all of these subjects, in varying lengths, during the approaching campaign.

In June, prior to departing for the Democratic National Convention on the West Coast, the prospective candidate held a "get-together" at his Hyde Park home, inviting prominent Democrats from Putnam, Orange, and Dutchess Counties. The purpose of the meeting was stated ostensibly in the letter of invitation:

"There is no intention of transacting any business but simply to give us all a better opportunity to know each other and to talk

86 See also, New York World, May 4, 1920.
87 Jacoby, "FDR Speech Calendar 1920 Campaign."
89 Ibid.
over the general situation." The responses, often bitter in tone, were skeptical of Democratic success in the forthcoming elections. Several problems were mentioned, including the rapidly declining popularity of both President Wilson and Governor Smith; and New York State's unit rule voting policy, which bound all convention delegates to the support of a single candidate.

While a clear account of the meeting's agenda is not available, one newspaper praised the idea of holding a political "get-together" and endorsed Roosevelt for United States Senator. Another publication briefly referred to the meeting the following week.

After mailing 181 invitations to Democratic National Convention delegates-at-large, 120 accepted and the "meeting did real good." 

A few guests were asked to arrive early for lunch, including John E. Mack, Poughkeepsie, a close friend; William Church Osborn, New York City, a colleague in future political warfare; Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Hopewell Junction, the Treasury Secretary during the New Deal; Thomas M. Lynch, Poughkeepsie, the

---

94 Letter, FDR to Tuthill, June 9, 1920.
transportation agent on the 1920 campaign tours; and several others. Possibly, future convention strategy was considered in this early meeting. Another likely subject of discussion centered around the general financial support of the Democratic Party. Earlier in the year, FDR affixed his name to a guarantee of $8500 to the national Democratic campaign fund. He had trouble collecting these funds from the leaders of his district. This meeting offered the first opportunity to present such a problem to the assembled Democratic delegates of Putnam, Orange, and Dutchess Counties.

Later in the month of June, FDR was awarded an honorary Doctor of Laws degree from a Pennsylvania college, and he spoke at the graduation exercises of Lawrenceville School, Trenton, New Jersey. Also, early in the month, he wrote a public letter to Frederick Hale, Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Naval Affairs, emphasizing needed improvements in Navy administrative

95 "FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920."
96 Letter, Cummings to FDR, January 15, 1920.
97 Letter, Cummings to FDR, May 19, 1920.
98 Letter, La Tour to FDR, June 24, 1920.
Two weeks later, he made public his recommendations for improving government administration in general.

During the first six months of 1920, Roosevelt delivered a number of speeches on diversified subjects to many different groups. The audiences included educators, businessmen, politicians, clergymen, lay religious workers, college students, school children, military men, and labor leaders. Not all of these speeches were solely political in nature. In addition to politics, he discussed naval, religious, and historical topics. One biographer wrote:

Some of his ideas were simply fatuous. He expressed the hope on one occasion that state and national governmental affairs would be as 'free from politics' after the war as during the war. Some of his talks were of the spread-eagle type, filled with references to 'good Americanism,' 'clean living,' 'straight thinking.' But certain threads ran through many of his speeches: nationalism ('Americanism') rather than localism or sectionalism, the use of government to solve problems, the improvement in governmental machinery to handle heavier burdens.

The sarcastic portions of this observation were unjustified, in many cases, when the speeches, the historical settings, and the audiences were considered collectively. For example, terminology such as "Americanism" possibly was meaningful to a 1920 listener.

---

102 Burns, Roosevelt, p. 71.
Or, appeals for "clean living" and "straight thinking," seemed to be appropriate when analyzed as motivational devices in inspirational speeches to children and to young adults. Two contemporary authorities in public address maintain, "As a rule the goal of the inspirational speech is to strengthen or intensify attitudes, opinions, or beliefs already held by the auditors." The pre-convention speeches of Roosevelt were undeserving of sweeping censure for carrying out this accepted dictum. Before hasty charges of "fatuous" ideas are accepted, the observations of Thonssen and Baird must be recalled:

It is a truism that speeches are meaningful only when examined in the social settings of which they are a part . . . .

Since the orator himself operates under limitations imposed by his subject and his data, the critic must prepare his analysis with full recognition of the limitations.

Closer observations of economic, social, and political issues operative at this time are developed in the second chapter of this study.

The pre-convention appearances in Roosevelt's public speaking career provided excellent preparation for the intensive

---


104 Speech Criticism, pp. 11, 355.
national campaign which followed during the latter months of 1920. The speaker's popularity was indicated by the multiple number of invitations repeatedly requesting his public utterances, and the large, diversified audiences he attracted. The groups recommending him for various public offices seemed to be quite impressed with his "fatuous" ideas. Willing to abandon his duties at the Navy Department, he frequently sounded like a political candidate. However, at this time no one, probably not even the busy speaker, conceived the specific purpose and future importance of these speeches.

The Democratic National Convention, July, 1920

Franklin Roosevelt prepared for a two-week stay in San Francisco during the Democratic National Convention. In May, he made plans to establish his "headquarters" on board the New Mexico, the flagship of the Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Hugh Rodman. However, Secretary Daniels had similar plans. Therefore, with at least two other battleships available, FDR made arrangements to use the New York. Apparently, ships of the Pacific Fleet were ordered strategically to San Francisco for

105Letter, Rodman to FDR, May 27, 1920; Telegram, FDR to Rodman, June 17, 1920.
106Telegram, Rodman to FDR, June 17, 1920.
107Letter, FDR to Rodman, June 18, 1920.
this occasion. On June 26, the Assistant Secretary spoke to the early convention arrivals, urging them to visit the New York.  

During the evening, he addressed a banquet in the Bellevue Hotel, paying tribute to the local Navy yard for its work during the war. Secretary Daniels, Admiral Rodman, George Creel, the former director of publicity for the Committee of Public Information, and other notable figures were in attendance. Mrs. Roosevelt chose to remain in the East, taking the children to the family's summer home at Campobello Island, off the coast of Maine.

The Democratic National Convention officially opened its main order of business on Monday, June 28. A planned demonstration of tribute to Woodrow Wilson immediately placed Roosevelt's name in the news. The New York delegation, under the iron-clad rule of Tammany Hall's Charles Francis Murphy, refused to join in the procession honoring the President. The Empire State delegates apparently feared a third term stampede. FDR and the mayor of Schenectady, George R. Lunn, tore the state standard from protesting Tammany hands after a fist fight, and carried it

---

into the aisle with a successful football rush." The entire convention was disrupted.

The whole place was ringing with excitement, fists were swinging, contesting hands were snatching at the State standard, men were pulling and hauling, when suddenly a realization came over the delegates and they subsided just as Lunn and Roosevelt and their few supporters gave a mighty tug at the standard and bore it into the aisle to the acclaim of a roaring cheer of triumph.

Though New York's unexpected contribution to the proceedings occupied no more than three minutes of the opening session . . . it caused more hubbub of discussion and denunciation than any other convention incident. During the campaign, one newspaper eulogized this demonstration of "fighting spirit" and "courage" as an example of "red-blooded Americanism that wins by steady, uphill fighting against wrong." The New York Times editorially praised the insurgents for physically defying Tammany's "dullness, stupidity, and party disloyalty."

The delegates were unhappy with Governor Alfred E. Smith, Boss Charles F. Murphy, and other New Yorkers who remained in

---

112 Ibid.
114 June 30, 1920.
Considering Wilson's physical condition, it seemed amazing that he was regarded to be a serious candidate, but the bosses feared the possibility of an enthusiastic demonstration developing into a quick third-term nomination. Rumors of Presidential re-nomination were revived repeatedly before the convention opened. Two recent photographs of Wilson, taken "for the purpose of indicating the extent to which his appearance denotes regained physical strength," were released presumably to increase the chances of a third nomination. Unknown to most party leaders at the time, some definite steps toward a Wilson draft had been initiated. Whether Roosevelt intended his strong Administration support, vividly demonstrated on the convention floor, to be used as evidence of his advocacy for a Wilson third-term never was clarified. Although less serious than his earlier scrapes with Tammany Hall, the young Assistant Secretary and the New York organization represented opposing sides once more.

115 Ibid., June 29, 1920.
118 Printed in Ibid., June 27, 1920.
119 Ibid., June 22, 1920.
few days later, Murphy's prestige was impaired further by an indictment charging "conspiracy to defraud the Government of taxes." 121

The Democratic side of the Roosevelt family did not claim a monopoly on convention violence. Coincidentally, at the State Republican Convention, Saratoga Springs, New York, on July 28, Lieutenant Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., also became involved in a "bout at fisticuffs." 122 He defended a female delegate who was pushed during a struggle for possession of the Kings County standard. 123 Therefore, during the same month, on opposite coasts, two cousins gained public recognition for fighting over political banners. In order "to offset the Democratic Roosevelt asset," 124 Teddy, Jr., followed his cousin's campaign trail during the initial western trip, 125 and attempted to discredit the candidate's appeal by declaring, "He is a maverick — he does not have the brand of our family." 126 Yet, Democratic and

---


123 Ibid.

124 Ibid., August 5, 1920.

125 St. Paul Dispatch; Milwaukee Journal, August 13, 1920.

126 As quoted in New York World, September 18, 1920.
Republican delegates probably remembered marked similarities in the conduct of the two Roosevelts during political party conventions.

Two days after the convention's boisterous opening, nominations of Presidential candidates began. In a brief seconding speech for the New York Governor, Roosevelt said, "In the Navy we shoot fast and straight. Governor Smith, in that respect, is a Navy man." Thereby, the brash Assistant Secretary pushed his animosity for Tammany into the background. Smith did not become a serious choice for the nomination. William Gibbs McAdoo, the President's son-in-law, and A. Mitchell Palmer, the Attorney General, led the early balloting. McAdoo had an impressive record as an efficient administrator, while Palmer gained fame as a blustering, fumbling fighter of the "Reds." Governor James M. Cox of Ohio and Alfred E. Smith trailed the two early leaders. Herbert Hoover was a Democratic possibility early in the year, but he sounded like a Republican prospect later in

---


violently attacking the President. Following the Chicago convention, Hoover announced his support for Senator Harding. McAdoo continued to vacillate, confusing and scattering his supporters, while he awaited Wilson's decision concerning a third term. The President never formally withdrew from consideration, and thereby gravely damaged McAdoo's chances. The main issue before the convention centered around the Administration and the League of Nations. Also, during this era of prohibition, the delegates from major cities wanted a "wet" candidate. Sensing national repudiation of Wilson, Democratic leaders decided to seek a candidate who was free from Administration connections.  

Needing a two-thirds vote at this time, Governor James Middleton Cox was finally nominated on July 5, after forty-four ballots. He was a compromise candidate. While not a member

130 Ibid., June 19, 1920.
131 Ibid.
133 For example, the New York City delegation gained the support of other big city groups in publicly asserting its opposition to prohibition, New York Times, June 27-July 6, 1920.
134 Gosnell, Champion Campaigner, p. 62.
of the Wilson team, he was acceptable to its leaders.\footnote{Burns, \textit{Roosevelt}, p. 73.} He had gained prominence as the first governor in Ohio's history to serve three terms.\footnote{James Middleton Cox, \textit{Journey Through My Years} (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1946), p. 211.} Yet, the Democrats knew their ticket needed strengthening with a strong Vice-Presidential candidate from a pivotal state.\footnote{Hatch, \textit{Franklin D. Roosevelt}, p. 119.}

On the opening day of the convention, one newspaper published a list of thirty-nine possible candidates for the ticket. FDR was not listed.\footnote{Cited in Gunther, \textit{Roosevelt in Retrospect}, p. 216.} Several weeks earlier, a national publication listed likely candidates for both major parties, but failed to recognize Roosevelt as a Democratic possibility.\footnote{Hamilton Holt, "Undiscovered Candidates," \textit{The Independent}, CII (April 17, 1920), 87.} After the Presidential nomination, four men became Vice-Presidential prospects. Governor Cox's supporters wanted Edward T. Meredith, the Secretary of Agriculture. Others prominently mentioned included Joseph E. Davies of Wisconsin, Senator Davis I. Walsh of Massachusetts, and Senator Thomas Walsh of Montana. However, the New York delegation felt that it had "'something coming'
for the seventy votes it handed to Cox and kept on handing to him when his prospects seemed poor.141

Cox was uncertain of Tammany's attitude toward Roosevelt. The young New Yorker persuaded the rules committee, over organizational objections, to cease binding the state's delegates by the unit rule.142 The upstaters were freed from the organization's practice of voting the entire delegation.143 No one could overlook FDR's clash with Tammany men during the demonstration for Wilson. After admitting, "I don't like Roosevelt," Charles F. Murphy, the organization's chief, did not object to his nomination.144

The following day, July 6, the Assistant Secretary's name was placed in nomination by one of the Cox floor-managers, Judge Timothy T. Ansberry of Washington, D. C.145 Governor Smith, a product of the New York City machine, delivered one of the seconding speeches.146 Thus, speeches by Ansberry and Smith

141 New York Evening Sun, July 6, 1920.
143 Tugwell, The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 122.
144 As quoted in Cox, Journey Through My Years, p. 232.
145 Ansberry's earlier actions in behalf of Cox were reported in the New York Times, June 28, 1920.
146 Ibid., July 7, 1920.
symbolized another Roosevelt truce with Tammany. After being approved by a vote of acclamation, the candidate was called upon to deliver a speech, but he left the building rather than break the precedent of speaking before his formal notification.\textsuperscript{147} Secretary Josephus Daniels delivered a speech in his Assistant's behalf.\textsuperscript{148}

Typical of the responses to the nominations of both Calvin Coolidge, the Republican candidate, and Roosevelt, one contemporary periodical concluded, "The choice of Vice-President seems to have been the only act by either convention which pleased all parts of the nation and all factions of the party."\textsuperscript{149} The congratulatory messages which poured into FDR's office in Washington and his home at Hyde Park did not offer an accurate barometer of his acceptance nationally. However, later in the month, he estimated receiving about 2500 letters and telegrams of congratulation or support. "Fully one-third of these have come to me from men who call themselves Progressive Republicans."\textsuperscript{150}

\textsuperscript{147}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{148}A copy of this speech appears in Daniels, \textit{The Wilson Era: Years of War and After}, pp. 554-555.

\textsuperscript{149}"Roosevelt the Second," \textit{The Independent}, CXXX (July 17, 1920), 85.

The Democratic press showered lavish praise on the candidate. One newspaper noted on the day following the convention: "Western Democrats are particularly pleased over Mr. Roosevelt's nomination. They feel that his name on the ticket will do much to stir up a friendly feeling for it in their part of the country." An article in a national weekly publication, entitled "All the World Likes a Roosevelt," went on to conclude, "There is a feeling that all the Roosevelts are made of the right stuff." A Democratic, midwestern newspaper described him as "a representative of the best type of American manhood, strong, clean, open." In a feature article, glorifying FDR's educational background, the New York Times noted his "strong affiliations" with his famous uncle "in basic ideas of government and politics." A week later, the same publication optimistically compared his nomination in 1920 with that of Chester A. Arthur in 1880, hinting at the possibility of his candidacy helping the Democrats to capture Teddy's 4,000,000 Progressive

152 Richard Boeckel, "All the World Likes a Roosevelt," The Independent, CIII (July 17, 1920), 71-72, 91-93.
154 July 18, 1920.
votes of 1912. Even before the Vice-Presidential nomination at San Francisco, FDR received favorable responses from Republicans concerning a published letter which called for reforms in governmental business procedures. His secretary, Louis Howe, even requested that better business administration in government be made the key point in all campaign speeches.

The only noteworthy criticism of the candidate had come from Admiral Benton C. Decker who verbally assailed both Josephus Daniels and Franklin Roosevelt. But his attack was lightly regarded as being one stemming from either personal animosity or from military discontent. As expected, the Republican press later came forth with editorial assaults on Roosevelt's candidacy. A typical, and frequently stated, reaction appeared in a western daily: "He is the democratic [sic] nominee because he bears the distinguished name of Roosevelt and for no other reason." The GOP unleashed its fury over the opposition's attempt to capitalize on the Roosevelt name. One newspaper, located just nine miles from

156 Ibid., June 21, 1920.
157 Telegram, Howe to FDR, July 7, 1920.
158 Ibid.
160 Portland (Oregon) Oregonian, August 24, 1920.
Hyde Park, attacked the Democratic bid to garner the 1912 Progressive vote. "In our estimation the Progressive will be the very last man who could be persuaded to vote the Democratic ticket in this coming election." Democratic appeal for the Progressive vote irritated an especially sensitive Republican political nerve. Still smarting under the 1916 defeat, the GOP openly courted former Progressives in 1920. Senator Harding invited some of the more liberal party men to Marion for private conferences. Plans were developed for Colonel Teddy Roosevelt, Jr., accompanied by Republican Governor E. P. Morrow of Kentucky, to ride on horseback into the mountains and address "audiences of mountaineers . . . at dozens of places." Although dead for several months, the image and spirit of the elder Roosevelt seemed destined to haunt both major parties.

The Republicans variegated their attack. Another publication questioned FDR's vote appeal and party loyalty in reminding its readers: "No longer than six years ago, he was chasing Murphy [Boss Charles Murphy of Tammany Hall] up and down the state in an attempt to win the senatorial nomination over Mr. Murphy's

163 Ibid., August 5, 1920.
While one journal accused the candidate of delivering "tirades" in complete ignorance of "the Wilson covenant," two days later, another editor found that he aroused "indignation" by uttering remarks "emanating from Wilson." Thus, the Republican press seemed to swing wildly in its attempt to discredit the Democratic Roosevelt. Also, the sudden and apparent disorganized stirs of partisan discontent offered the usual derogatory remarks, such as, "He is a spoiled child, to be spanked."

Louis Howe made elaborate preparations for a large and hearty welcome upon the candidate's arrival in Washington.

Invitations for public speaking appearances began to present an immediate problem. Recalling the strain of government office and the need for family adjustments, Eleanor Roosevelt received

---

168 Telegram, Howe to FDR, July 9, 1920.
169 For example, several invitations were vague and indefinite, such as one requesting a visit "to Chautauqua during July or August," Letter, Mott to FDR, July 12, 1920.
the news of her husband's nomination with mixed emotions. She recalled that "it never occurred to me to be much excited."¹⁷⁰

Leaving San Francisco by train, Roosevelt started the long trip first to Ohio for a meeting with Governor Cox, then to Hyde Park for a reunion with his family. The events of the week changed the course of his political and private life. From the role of delegate, graciously inviting early arrivals to visit him on board the battleship New York, and then physically battling the forces of Tammany on the convention floor, he ascended to the role of nominee for the second highest office in the land. To facilitate such a rapid ascent, it was necessary for him to receive the blessings of the same machine that he had opposed earlier. Some of the topics idly mentioned at this time, such as progressivism, the western vote, "the Wilson covenant," the "wets," the Administration, "efficient government," Progressive Republicans, "Uncle Ted," and others, were developed more fully during the campaign.

Activities Immediately Prior to the Vice-Presidential Campaign, July-August, 1920

Roosevelt looked and sounded like an unofficial candidate several months before the nominating convention. After his

¹⁷⁰_This Is My Story_, pp. 310-311. After a press interview with the candidate's wife in West Virginia, a reporter noted, "Mrs. Roosevelt was not anxious for her husband to accept the nomination," Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.
The period immediately before the opening of his first national campaign he spent making political speeches, meeting with party leaders, resigning as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, traveling extensively, and resting for brief periods.

En route to a meeting with Governor Cox at Columbus, Ohio, the nominee stopped off for a bear hunt in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. President Theodore Roosevelt had hunted big game near the same locality in former years. The Republican mayor converted a non-partisan public appearance into "the first political meeting in the Presidential campaign," by announcing his intention to vote Democratic in order to support the League.

Arriving at Columbus on July 12, FDR met Cox at the Governor's Mansion for a conference that lasted several hours. In his book, the Ohioan recalled, "I liked him from the outset. His mind was alert and he was keenly alive to the conditions that would bear on the campaign." Roosevelt requested an announcement that, in the event of election, Cox would allow the Vice-President's attendance at Cabinet meetings. The Governor declined. As President of the Senate, FDR "might be regarded as

173 Journey Through My Years, p. 238.
a White House snoop. Harding took the opposite attitude toward Coolidge, but one newspaper defended Cox, predicting that the Vice-President would be merely "loafin' round the throne." After the meeting, the New Yorker announced the decision for opening his initial tour in the western states.

FDR departed from Columbus after the conference. An enthusiastic gathering of townspeople, local politicians, and motion picture cameramen greeted him upon his arrival in Poughkeepsie, New York. A lengthy motorcade ushered him to "Springwood," the family estate, nine miles to the north. The local hook and ladder fire-fighting unit joined the procession, with over five hundred people converging on the front lawn. The chairman of the reception committee introduced the candidate as "Our Hyde Park Boy." In a brief response, Roosevelt recounted his "unexpected" nomination and appealed for a campaign free from "mud-slinging." Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt arrived after a strenuous trip from the family's summer home near Eastport, Maine. The nominee and his wife returned to Poughkeepsie together,

---

174 Ibid.
178 As quoted in Ibid.
being greeted by an audience of 5000 in Eastman Park. Once more, the candidate delivered a brief speech, crediting his nomination to the efforts of "the Dutchess County Gold Dust Twins," John Mack and Tom Lynch, and repeating his desire "that there be no mud[-]slinging." A local newspaper later recalled this plea and admonished both parties in declaring, "Here it is the month of August, and the mud is flying in all directions ... Let us have the old-fashioned methods of debate in place of the mud-slinging."  

Mack and Lynch were among FDR's intimate circle of friends at the June "get-together," described earlier in this chapter. While lacking specific evidence, a critic can assume that prospective nominees for office did not escape the notice of those friends who met with Mr. Roosevelt "to talk over the general situation" a month prior to the official selection of candidates. The meeting provided an excellent time to discuss political strategy along these lines. The specific nomination for Vice-President probably was somewhat "unexpected," as the

179 As quoted in Ibid. A condensed account is available in New York Times, July 14, 1920.
181 "FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920."
candidate insisted, yet, the planting of political seeds for a nomination of some sort remained a strong possibility.

A day after his arrival, FDR issued a press release, replying to Senator Harding's charges of Presidential domination of the Democratic platform issue. In accusing the Republican of attempting to square "an ancient grudge against an individual," and of summoning forth "bogies and imaginary ghosts," Roosevelt concluded, "A Democratic victory means ratification of the Treaty and the League of Nations ... a Republican victory means that the U. S.[,] with Russia, Mexico, and Turkey[,] shall remain on the outside." This statement placed in capsule form an appeal used repetitiously by the Democrats in the months ahead.

In the company of his wife and mother, he motored to New York City and, from a destroyer, viewed the July 15 yacht races. These races, a gala social and sports event, involved international competition extending over several weeks. Following the afternoon yacht races, he spoke at the Bowery

---


184 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
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Mission, then boarded the midnight train to Washington, D. C. for an approaching White House conference with Cox and Wilson.\textsuperscript{188}

After careful planning by Louis Howe,\textsuperscript{189} 2000 workers and clerks organized an "impromptu" parade in honor of the "assistant chief" upon his arrival at the Navy Department,\textsuperscript{190} and presented him with a gavel made from the handrail of the President's yacht, the Mayflower.\textsuperscript{191} The "assistant chief" responded with a brief address.\textsuperscript{192} Later, in discussing the political picture with newspaper correspondents, he repeated the Democratic emphasis to be placed on the League of Nations issue.\textsuperscript{193} After Cox arrived for the visit with Wilson, both candidates stressed the importance of the League at a press conference.\textsuperscript{194} These interviews proved to be significant. Misconceptions arose concerning Wilson emotionally influencing the selection of campaign issues, but both candidates accented the paramount importance of the League several times prior to the White House discussions.

\textsuperscript{189} Telegram, Howe to FDR, July 9, 1920.
\textsuperscript{191} New York Times, July 17, 1920.
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{193} Ibid., July 18, 1920.
\textsuperscript{194} Ibid.
There was some opposition to the approaching Sunday morning conference between the President and the Democratic nominees. One Georgia Congressman urged, "For God's sake stop it[.] Go to church Sunday[.] Talk politics Monday[.]" \(^{195}\) Regardless of mild opposition, the three Democratic leaders met for an hour. The candidates reiterated their pledge to campaign on the League of Nations issue. \(^{196}\) In speaking to newsmen following the conference, Roosevelt attempted to capitalize on a word made famous by Uncle Ted, stating that Cox and Wilson were in "splendid" accord. \(^{197}\)

During the San Francisco convention, the bitter Wilson apparently had harbored some hope of being nominated for a third term, and "privately opposed all other aspirants." \(^{198}\) This conference was an overt attempt by the Democrats to show party solidarity, but Cox's unqualified support for the President's position on the League, both before and during the campaign, probably injured his chances. \(^{199}\) There were rumors of the President "raking Governor Cox over the coals" concerning the

\(^{195}\) Telegram, Upshaw to FDR, July 17, 1920.


\(^{197}\) As quoted in Ibid.

\(^{198}\) Bagby, The American Historical Review, LX, 575.

\(^{199}\) Faulkner, From Versailles to the New Deal, pp. 52-53.
Regardless of the outcome, the Republicans were prepared either to emphasize a split in the Democratic leadership, or to accuse Cox of being a follower of Wilsonian idealism. After the Cox-Wilson-Roosevelt conference, Harding declared, "When the nominee establishes accord with the President, it means that the latter is in charge of the campaign and will be the real force of the next Administration, if it is Democratic." To indicate the persistency of this stratagem, an editorial eight days later concluded, "Of course, it is part of Republican tactics to make it appear that COX and WILSON are at loggerheads." The New York Times noted four results of the White House meeting:

1. "The League of Nations is to be the chief issue of the campaign."

2. "The complete agreement between Wilson and Cox is no indication that Cox is to be the tail to Wilson's kite."

3. Both Democratic "candidates intend to tour the country from Maine to California."

---

201 Ibid.
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4. "Democrats will go into the campaign as a unified party."

Two days later, the candidates attended a meeting of the Democratic National Committee in Columbus, Ohio, where they had an additional opportunity to discuss campaign strategy. George White succeeded the retiring Homer S. Cummings as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Some observers suggested that this move was an attempt by the Presidential nominee to free himself from Administration advisors. If the change was motivated by this factor, it was a weak attempt, coming on the heels of the Washington meeting and the complete adoption of the President's League program. A look at White's political background indicated a more realistic reason for his elevation. In previous years, he was known as an avid "dry" and enjoyed the endorsement of the Anti-Saloon League. In violent verbal attacks, the Anti-Saloon group characterized Cox as the "last hope of the wets." The Governor was preoccupied with this very problem

204 Ibid., July 21, 1920.
205 Faulkner, From Versailles to the New Deal, p. 52.
207 Ibid., June 17; 21, 1920.
just three days before the change in Committee leadership.\footnote{Ibid., July 18, 1920.} Therefore, one likely reason for White's appointment rested in an attempt to offset Cox's identification with the "wets." On the other hand, as Congressman from Ohio, White opposed a Presidential program of governmental railroad ownership in Alaska. Although warmly endorsed by Wilson, his differences with Administration forces were recalled at this time.\footnote{Ibid., July 27, 1920.} Undoubtedly, Cox felt that White would help to change popular sentiment regarding the Democratic attitude toward prohibition and Presidential influence.

Friction developed between the Governor and his campaign manager, Edmond H. Moore.\footnote{Cox, Journey Through My Years, pp. 238-239.} This eruption was symbolic of the party's tenseness and irritation, as evidenced in much of FDR's mail.\footnote{"FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920."} Nevertheless, "Mr. Roosevelt made a happy talk,"\footnote{As quoted in Cox, Journey Through My Years, p. 239.} and returned to Washington.\footnote{New York Times, July 22, 1920.} In a press interview before departing, FDR tried to detract from the internal difficulties of his own party by emphasizing the proper speaking style of ethical
politicians. It was an obvious jab at the Republican's proposed "front porch" campaign.

All of my friends know that I am not given to pussyfooting and evading, and that I am totally incapable of the old-fashioned oratorical speech, which clothes definite issues with glittering generalities. The candidate should clothe the true expression of his belief in language which will be understood by the average person and not merely by the philologist. 214

Tending to administrative duties for several days, Mr. Roosevelt issued his itinerary through August 9, and left to spend the final week of July with his family on Campobello Island. He chose to take a destroyer into Passamaquoddy Bay and "was landed in a launch at the foot of the lawn in front of his cottage." 215 For this unwise extravagance at government expense, he was criticized severely by several publications. 216 At Campobello, he engaged in cliff-climbing, yachting, tennis, romping with the children, and working on his acceptance speech. 217 During the vacation, he visited the city of Eastport, Maine, accompanied by his wife and his mother. After a warm reception, he delivered an address similar to the previous

214 As quoted in Ibid., July 21, 1920.
215 Ibid., July 26; 27, 1920.
216 Freidel, Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 74-75.
speeches at Hyde Park and Poughkeepsie. He anticipated an approaching difficulty in campaign oratory by lamenting, "I will not get an opportunity of having such a talk from the bottom of my heart for some time . . . ." Mr. Roosevelt called this speech his "non-partisan swan song."

Plans for his notification ceremony were progressing, and the candidate was taking an active part in this preparation. Before proceeding to New York and Washington, the initial draft of the acceptance speech was completed. With plans for the first western trip already released, additional forthcoming addresses possibly occupied some of his attention at Campobello.

Naval duties were ignored completely. In New York City, Roosevelt conferred with George White, posed for movies on the balcony of the Grand Central Palace, recorded a number of "canned"

---
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campaign speeches, and released a detailed itinerary for August.\textsuperscript{224} Returning to Washington with his wife and daughter in the "terrible heat" of summer, arrangements were made "for giving up the house" and FDR prepared to resign his position.\textsuperscript{225}

Never seriously involved in Departmental duties again, Roosevelt made an informal speech at a hearing of the Navy Yards Wage Board. Since a number of crafts were appealing for wage increases due to rising prices, he attempted to clarify several facts. First, Congress appropriated a definite amount of money which placed rigid limitations on expenditures. Second, the appropriation was inadequate, but the burden of responsibility rested with Congress and not with the Navy Department. FDR concluded, "Therefore, increased wages may mean a decreased force of employees."\textsuperscript{226} This speech revealed the speaker's awareness of a national economic problem. It also demonstrated his total lack of positive solutions to meet the shortcoming. In sympathizing with employee demands, but holding firm to current fiscal policies, he did not damage his popularity among the workers. On the other hand, he offered them no remedy for their legitimate complaints.

\textsuperscript{224}Ibid., August 3-4, 1920.

\textsuperscript{225}Eleanor Roosevelt, \textit{This Is My Story}, p. 312.

Turning out 2000 strong the next day, civilian and military personnel attended the ceremony marking the severance of the Assistant's tenure in the Department. An "exact replica of the original Paul Revere Loving Cup now reposing in the Boston Museum of Art" was presented to the nominee, along with expressions of high praise, by Secretary Josephus Daniels in the name of "the Master Mechanics Association of the Navy Yards and Stations, the employees of the Navy Yards and Stations, and on behalf of the Navy Department." In recognizing "a day that I have been looking forward to with real dread for a long time" because it meant the termination of "something deeper than mere employment," the young Democrat spoke briefly to the large gathering and read telegrams of appreciation addressed to all military and civilian workers of the Navy. In his handwritten resignation, effective August 9, he paid tribute to Secretary Daniels for keeping "my feet on the ground when I was about to skyrocket . . . ."

---
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Following the official resignation, Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt, accompanied by their daughter, Anna, attended Governor Cox's notification ceremonies in Dayton, Ohio. Returning to Hyde Park after the termination of festivities, the Vice-Presidential nominee made last minute preparations for his notification, scheduled for August 9.

FDR was not considered to be "a great orator," but capable of speaking effectively with a "natural and stirring ... ease and directness that saves the driest subject from seeming heavy." He sounded "like a man who knows his whole subject and could say a lot more if he had time." However, he did not always say "the things that professional politicians would like to have him say" because it was "not within his nature to stoop to epithet or to rise to the heights of passionate bitterness."

While the Philadelphia Public Ledger described him as a "quiet, studious young man," the New York Times declared him to

---
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be "a happy liver, fond of social life, and a member of a large number of clubs." Likely in reference to "his attractive personality, his relationship to the other Roosevelt, his opposition to Tammany, and his progressivism," most contemporary accounts visualized him, in varying degrees of emphasis, as "a clean-cut, vigorous young American of the best type who has the courage of his convictions."239

Physical stamina was an important consideration in the approaching campaign. With an athletic physique, six feet two inches in height, he was a well-dressed, handsome, energetic individual. Walter Camp, the noted Yale coach in charge of the Navy's sports program, praised the candidate's outstanding fitness. FDR could easily "play fifty-four holes of golf on a hot summer day." Physical stamina in a speaking campaign also involved vocal strength. On occasion, serious campaigners, both before and after 1920, were plagued with weak voices. As late as October, FDR admitted, "I am still alive and going fairly strong,

---
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 tho' my voice is that of a crow!" On the contrary, one observer noted, "His voice is pitched well, goes forward without tripping." The candidate apparently developed no serious vocal or physical problems during the campaign.

In being "as friendly as an Airdale pup and young enough to want to look older," FDR appeared to be "much younger" than his thirty-eight years. He believed that his youthful appearance was a detriment to his political career. In college, he was accused of applying ammonia to his hair in order to induce premature greying, but it remained black and wavy in 1920. Pictures of the period reveal occasional use of pince-nez which became a familiar part of caricatures during the New Deal years. These same pictures show the consistent use of glasses while speaking from a manuscript. The cumbersome leg-braces were not yet a cramping and distractive problem in campaigning.

---
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From the moment of his nomination up to the time of his official notification, Franklin Roosevelt traveled across the country, visited with James Cox on several occasions, enjoyed a festive homecoming in New York, had an audience with President Wilson, planned forthcoming strategy, concluded his duties in the Navy Department, paused for brief periods of relaxation, produced a completed draft of his acceptance speech, graciously accepted the accolades bestowed upon him by several groups, issued press releases, and delivered a number of speeches in many states. The candidate's itinerary and frequency of public speaking appearances appeared to be a challenge to his endurance. Yet, possessing extraordinary physical fitness, he apparently was able to endure the rigorous schedule comfortably. This period of preparation seemed to be a far less ambitious undertaking when compared to the taxing months of national campaigning which followed his speech of acceptance.

Summary

After two successful state senatorial efforts, Franklin D. Roosevelt's general background and experience in national politics fell into four divisions.

As Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he gained administrative experience, especially in military and labor management; enjoyed political acclaim, being frequently mentioned for state
and national office; received campaign experience, losing the United States Senate primary of 1914; and made two European trips in an official capacity, closely observing the Paris Peace Conference on the second visit. Impressing "the public" with "the fine record which he has made at Albany and at Washington," the candidate united "unusual intelligence with sterling character." 249

From January through June, 1920, Roosevelt traveled widely in the East, visited several states, and delivered a number of public addresses on a variety of topics. He looked and sounded like a candidate, was asked to run for several offices, but seemed to be pursuing an uncertain destination. He was "vibrating with energy, strong in ideals and opinions, and ever willing to start an argument on any and all subjects — being a fluent talker and rapid thinker and an extremely sprightly opponent." 250

At the Democratic National Convention in San Francisco, his nomination for Vice-President came as a mild surprise. Yet, the choice drew words of praise from various sectors of the national political community. He was described as a man of "independent proclivities who thinks for himself," being put on


the ticket as an Administration man, but not being hurt by anti-
Administration sentiment. His nomination "has given a larger
degree of popularity to the Democratic National ticket . . . He
is known as a progressive throughout the great progressive belt
of the west, and his relationship to Theodore Roosevelt is
considered a very big asset to the party." 252

The nominee continued to travel widely and to deliver many
speeches during the month following his nomination. In praising
the Vice-Presidential candidates of both major parties, one
writer paid high tribute to Roosevelt, stating, "He has been
listened to respectfully even by his opponents." 253

Often appearing to lack organization at this time, the
events in these four divisions in FDR's political development
proved to be an intensive preparatory period for his first
national campaign.

---
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CHAPTER II

THE CAMPAIGN ISSUES

Introduction

The opening chapter surveyed Franklin D. Roosevelt's background in national politics, concentrating on the 1920 period immediately preceding the Vice-Presidential campaign. The second chapter will be concerned with two phases of the campaign: first, the issues and, second, the positions taken by the nominees relative to these issues.

Finding the issues in any political campaign is no easy matter. Various writers, according to their party allegiance, emphasize different points. Often the speakers avoid taking a definite position on, seemingly, the simplest disputes. A Democratic newspaper featured a statement authored by the American Federation of Labor:

'The paramount issues of this campaign easily are discovered,' says the statement. 'Reaction is doing its best to conceal and evade these issues, but no thinking American can fail to see them. They are:

1. The League of Nations.
2. The protection of the people against the profiteers.
3. The relation of Government to the aspirations of the workers.
4. The use of the injunction as a means of compelling workers to obey the will of employers.
5. The high cost of living.
6. The establishment of arbitrary tribunals and boards to coerce the workers, repress their normal and legitimate activities and clog the processes of industry by artificial methods.

7. The right of workers to organize for mutual advancement and development, and to withdraw their services when terms and conditions of service are oppressive.¹

This statement reflected strong labor orientation. On the other hand, a Republican journal enumerated three key issues:


As minor points of controversy, it listed:

- The restoration of the railroads to their full pre-war efficiency.
- The development of waterways to relieve railway congestion.
- The solution of the housing problem.
- The promotion of all branches of education.
- The solution of the tenant farmer problem.
- The development of our foreign trade.
- The unshackling of business.²

This list of "issues" was influenced by management and capital. Both newspapers revealed the prejudices of their respective political affiliations, generously including topics remote from anything resembling an issue. The League of Nations was the only item mentioned by both dailies. A weekly magazine compared

¹Cincinnati Enquirer, October 28, 1920.
²Editorial, Wheeling Intelligencer, October 19, 1920.
the major party platforms. It found marked differences only on the League and the tariff questions. ³ One writer comments:

Over the years the impression has grown that Cox and Roosevelt campaigned almost exclusively on the League issue. While they did stress the League and pressed vigorously for its adoption in the event of their election, they did not neglect other matters. ⁴

Too often, the nominees evaded an open clash. In commenting on the political complications involved in an election year, a contemporary publication noted that many people in government service "put their ideas largely in cold storage, and 'mark time' pending the decision of the momentous contest. Changing the metaphor—it is admitted to be no time to 'rock the boat!' and those who do are anti-social individuals." ⁵ Unfortunately, this condition often applied to the campaign orators. "Our foreign affairs are suspended. Our domestic policies on important matters hang fire . . . There is a twilight in government which is deeper this year than on most occasions." ⁶

Under these circumstances, coupled with the necessity of using extremely partisan sources, the futility of developing a

---


⁴Karl Schriftgiesser, This was Normalcy, An Account of Party Politics during Twelve Republican Years: 1920-1932 (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1948), p. 71.


⁶Ibid.
neat list of "issues" becomes apparent. Thonssen and Baird recognize that the critic "deals with documents and sources the trustworthiness of which is anything but uniform and the completeness of which is often open to question." Operating under recognized handicaps, the writer attempts to uncover the major points of political controversy.

**Economic Issues**

Political issues would evolve, seemingly, from financial problems during 1920. It was a year complicated by many economic difficulties. The country's largest newspaper called national fiscal affairs a principal point of conflict. Yet, both major parties either failed to recognize the full significance of these conditions or tended to evade them. A division of material into capital, labor, and agriculture is followed.

**Capital**

In a vigorous campaign, the Democrats declared war on "big business." Governor Cox freely used this topic as a major point in many speeches. At Ogden, Utah, he jointly condemned "big

---


9For example, see Wheeling Register, September 8, 1920.
business" and the "Senatorial oligarchy," indicating that these two groups were forming a conspiracy to control the nation's wealth by controlling the Republican Party. In his Denver speech, he attacked "wealthy men" in general. Closing his western campaign in Kansas City, Missouri, he stated, "Big business is fighting us because I favor the golden rule and not the bayonet to settle industrial controversies."

In Cleveland, he specifically condemned the munitions maker, T. Coleman du Pont, because "his family has grown fat financially and insolent on the profits of war."

Governor Cox, however, did stand for some concessions to major financial interests. For example, at San Francisco, he favored the abolition of the excess profits tax. But, from Louisville, Kentucky, he warned the business men: "You need not worry about the excess profits tax, because, unless we go into the League of Nations, unless the civilization of the world is restored, there will not be any excess profits in America next

---

10 As quoted in Ibid., September 16, 1920.
11 As quoted in Ibid., September 25, 1920.
12 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 3, 1920.
13 As quoted in Ibid., October 17, 1920.
14 Wheeling Register, September 19, 1920.
Therefore, the economic issue was subordinated to the political aspects involving the League.

The Democratic press was militant and outspoken in its condemnation of capitalistic leaders. GOP charges of Administration fiscal irresponsibility were answered in typical partisan terseness:

Have the Democrats mismanaged for the people? No! But they have 'mismanaged' for Wall Street, and against the great incomes of the country by levying taxes thereon.

There is the rub! And big business is squirming all over itself because, after making billions out of the war, it has to pay a goodly portion of the bill incurred in preventing Germany from coming to this side and levying indemnities upon the American people.

In a New England speech in mid-September, FDR charged that the object of Senator Harding and his "syndicate" was "to gain control of the National finances in order that they may again establish the special privileges of the old 'money trust'."

Two days later, still in the East, he directed stinging words at oil "trusts" and other "big combinations."

---

15 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 9, 1920.

16 Editorial, Wheeling Register, September 12, 1920.

17 Carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Holyoke, Massachusetts, September 14, 1920, p. 2. Unless otherwise noted, all letters, memoranda, speeches, itineraries, and telegrams referred to herein are located in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.

18 Ibid., New Bedford, Massachusetts, September 16, 1920, p. 2.
The Republican program of tax revision was stronger than the Democratic pledge to abolish the excess profits tax. Harding promised: 1. to revise and possibly to repeal the excess profits tax; 2. to abolish government tax on freight and passenger traffic; 3. to increase tariff schedules; and, 4. to reduce the income tax. He began speaking on the protective tariff issue early in the campaign. The tariff continued to be an important issue in several sections of the country throughout the campaign.

From Minneapolis, Roosevelt scoffed at Harding's tariff pronouncements.

I can only remark in passing that he must be much put to it to unearth topics for his 'front porch campaign' . . . The tariff was . . . taken out of politics by a law, supported not only by Democratic but Republican votes, placed under a non-partisan tariff commission, along sound, economic lines. Senator Harding has evidently forgotten that this event took place.

These comments were repeated substantially a week later in Seattle, and again in San Francisco. The California fruit growers, who reportedly were "facing ruin," considered the tariff

---

20 Ibid., August 13, 1920.
21 Ibid., Seattle, Washington, August 20, 1920, p. 3-D.
22 San Francisco Chronicle, August 24, 1920.
a pertinent issue. A Republican publication objected to FDR's assertions concerning the tariff commission because "Mr. Wilson appointed but one Republican to that commission, and he was a pallid type who readily absorbed ink from the White House rubber stamp outfit." Roosevelt was cautioned about eastern interest on the tariff subject. Yet he failed to alter his western statements. In Rochester, he answered all GOP tax arguments by contending, "We believe in a continuation of the present theory of taxation." Harding devoted practically his entire Wheeling address to the tariff question, and FDR followed him into the city the next night, delivering an address which attempted to refute the Republican position. The Vice-Presidential nominee referred to the tariff as "that poor old corpse." Nevertheless,

24 Ibid.
26 Telegram, Early to FDR, September 13, 1920.
27 For example, see carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Worcester, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 1.
28 Ibid., Rochester, New York, September 23, 1920, p. 3.
29 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 29, 1920.
30 Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.
31 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Wheeling, West Virginia, September 29, 1920, p. 3.
the GOP press worked diligently to keep the subject in the limelight after his departure. 32

In October, Harding pressed his economic points. At Wichita, he developed "the doctrine of good, old-fashioned protection that protects the farmer, the manufacturer and the worker." 33 At Oklahoma City, he declared: "I am a protectionist from the soles of my feet to the top of my head." 34 He voiced these sentiments in Chattanooga, hoping to make "a dent in the Solid South." 35 FDR believed that the Senator wanted to take "the tariff away from the nonpartisan Tariff Commission in order that it might be retinkered to protect further the gray-haired new infant industries that have grown up in the Republican ranks." 36

In their acceptance speeches, both Harding and Coolidge appealed for "more production" as a solution to contemporary economic problems. 37 During the campaign, they placed strong

32 For examples, see editorials, Wheeling Intelligencer, October 7; 9; 11; 23; 28, 1920.

33 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 10, 1920.

34 As quoted in Ibid.


36 As quoted in Ibid., October 6, 1920.

emphasis on the Republican platform plank which favored "protective principles." 38 Cox and Roosevelt supported the Democratic declaration of a tariff for revenue only. 39 While serving as a United States Congressman, 1909-1913, Cox had made his first congressional speech in opposition to the Payne-Aldrich high protective tariff act. 40

Despite Democratic efforts, the question of high protection became an important economic issue in the 1920 campaign. A Republican editorial accurately summarized the situation as follows: "The truth of the matter is that the tariff cannot be removed from politics so long as there are two schools of thought representing free trade and protection." 41 Furthermore, the Democrats were outspoken in their attacks on "big business," while the Republicans refrained from following or answering this line of argument.

Labor

Labor conditions grew steadily worse as the campaign progressed. Strikes, union movements, high living costs, 

38 Ibid., pp. 91-92.
40 Ibid., pp. 124-126.
unemployment, returning veterans, and poor housing offered monumental challenges. Rather than meet these problems, all major party nominees either failed to recognize the difficulties of the laboring class, or purposefully avoided suggesting any solutions.

Harding's references to labor in his acceptance speech presented no points of controversy. He promised to relieve the high cost of living through tax reductions, and to work toward "unshackling child labor and elevating conditions of woman's employment." He pushed aside the complicated problems by stating, "But the insistent call is for labor, management, and capital to reach understanding." Coolidge echoed the Senator's sentiments regarding tax reductions.

In his acceptance speech, Governor Cox blamed the Republican Congress for a lack of action on tax reduction, advocated collective bargaining, called for stronger laws which defined the rights of capital and labor in a dispute, and recognized that the "child life of the nation should be conserved . . . ."

42As quoted in Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 47, 50.
43As quoted in Ibid., p. 42.
44Ibid., p. 59.
45As quoted in The Democratic Text Book, pp. 54, 58-59.
Roosevelt offered "a pledge that the safeguards of workingmen and women already accomplished under Democratic leadership shall remain; not the fear that 'a' Republican change will restore to power the influential few." This statement was expanded in the West, with the candidate referring to his successful labor experience in the Navy Department, and concluding, "There has been a broad bond of sympathy between Washington and those in every State of the Union who toil with their hands." An American Federation of Labor audience in Brooklyn was reminded of the Navy years in an appeal for fairness and honesty in employer-employee negotiations. The Democrats were given credit for establishing a Department of Labor and pressing for "the 8-hour law; the child labor law; the workmen's compensation law, and many others."

The major party nominees adhered to the economic planks in their respective platforms. The Republican platform defended the GOP Congress and favored a tax reduction. In favoring a similar

---

48 Ibid., Brooklyn, New York, September 6, 1920, pp. 2-3.
49 Ibid., Boston, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 2.
50 Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 74-76, 83-84.
tax reduction, the Democratic platform blamed a Republican Congress for not taking positive steps on this subject.\textsuperscript{51} The Republican platform blamed the high cost of living on the Democrats;\textsuperscript{52} the Democrats blamed it on the war.\textsuperscript{53} The GOP advocated a child labor law;\textsuperscript{54} the Democratic statement was somewhat weaker in urging the protection of "child life."\textsuperscript{55} Both parties opposed compulsory arbitration,\textsuperscript{56} with the Republicans recognizing "collective bargaining" but frowning on strikes.\textsuperscript{57}

The Democrats invited organized labor support by publishing Gompers' condemnation of the GOP.\textsuperscript{58} The A. F. of L. president became a highly controversial figure during this campaign. He delivered many speeches throughout the country, speaking in opposition to "Harding and that police-baiter, Coolidge."\textsuperscript{59} The Republican press accused Gompers of paying

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{52}Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 87-88.
\textsuperscript{53}The Democratic Text Book, pp. 14-15.
\textsuperscript{54}Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{55}The Democratic Text Book, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{56}Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 79; The Democratic Text Book, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{57}Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 79.
\textsuperscript{58}The Democratic Text Book, pp. 411-414.
\textsuperscript{59}As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 14, 1920.
\end{flushleft}
off a debt because his son "holds one of the good jobs in Washington . . . and no plank in the Republican platform no matter what its merits might be, would bring from him a good word."\textsuperscript{60}

The A. F. of L. strongly endorsed FDR, crediting him with "a fine record" in dealing with organized labor.\textsuperscript{61} On the other hand, it damned Harding as an "opponent of legislation to benefit labor."\textsuperscript{62} This opposition was pointed out as follows:

And as a matter of fact not only is it fairly established that labor cannot expect much from the Republican party, but it is a matter of record that out of a total of twenty-seven opportunities during the last three Congresses, Mr. Harding voted favorably to labor only seven times, unfavorably ten times, was paired unfavorably once, did not vote at all in nine other instances.\textsuperscript{63}

Roosevelt reminded the electorate of these circumstances:

"Practically all of this beneficial legislation had the direct opposition of Senator Harding himself and the little group in the Senate with whom Senator Harding has aligned himself in the present campaign."\textsuperscript{64} Organizational endorsement of the former

\textsuperscript{60} Editorial, Wheeling \textit{Intelligencer}, October 16, 1920.

\textsuperscript{61} Louisville \textit{Evening Post}, September 1, 1920.

\textsuperscript{62} Cincinnati \textit{Enquirer}, October 26, 1920.

\textsuperscript{63} Donald Wilhelm, "Harding Keeps His Eye on the Ball," \textit{The Independent}, CIII (July 3, 1920), 5.

\textsuperscript{64} Carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Boston, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 2.
Assistant Secretary came as no surprise. His union sympathy often was more pronounced than that shown by the Administration. The nominee felt his past record was an advantage. "You know that Labor itself, through its leaders, has been consulted on every question of interest to the workingman." 65 However, the close affiliation with union leaders did not become an advantage at this time. A Republican daily accurately noted that Gompers, Morrison, Woll, and other A. F. of L. leaders were not great assets for the Democratic Party to claim. 66

The "prosperity under Democracy" idea 67 became a repetitive campaign argument. After Harding's appearance in Wheeling, a Democratic newspaper reported: "The old, reliable Republican dinner pail was conspicuously absent in the parade last night. No doubt the bucket was on the table at home full of good, Democratic grub." 68 Economic conditions in the West Virginia coal fields made such assertions completely ludicrous.

Both parties avoided labor issues. They tried to rely on past performances. Democrats blamed existing conditions on the

65 Ibid., Danville, Illinois, October 12, 1920, p. 3.
67 The Democratic Text Book, pp. 327-337.
68 Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.
war and the Republican Congress. Republicans blamed the Administration. Neither group offered a constructive program to alleviate specific complaints. Therefore, planks and speeches regarding labor produced no real campaign issues.

Agriculture

Individuals in agricultural pursuits experienced more economic problems in 1920 than did any other occupational group. Complications involving middlemen, mortgages, "tight" money, indebtedness, over-production, labor shortages, loss of European markets, decreased national demands, transportation problems, and falling land prices begged for workable solutions.

Harding, in his acceptance speech, called attention to existing agrarian situations involving the increased urban population, asked for "cooperation," and appealed for further action in land conservation and reclamation. Coolidge's speech recognized a need for greater profit by the "original producer." Both Republican candidates appealed for "more production."

Political attacks on this farm program could be anticipated. Harding conferred with Henry C. Wallace, a "real dirt" farmer-publisher from Iowa, and proceeded to lambast the Wilson

---

69 As quoted in Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 48-49.
70 As quoted in Ibid., p. 60.
71 As quoted in Ibid., pp. 41, 59.
Administration's agricultural policy. Obviously, the Democrats had to offer something new in this field in view of existing situations. Simply "standing on the record" of past accomplishments would invite disaster. Apparently, the party in power chose to divert attention from contemporary evils by vilifying Harding's legislative record. Speaking to the first group of "pilgrims" at Marion, the Senator tried to explain his 1917 congressional remark which favored wheat production at a dollar a bushel. The Democrats continued to press this point. Speaking at Salina, Kansas, during his second western swing, Roosevelt warned his audience "that Senator Harding is asking you to vote for a man who expressed on the floor of the United States Senate his profound conviction that a dollar was a perfectly sufficient price for any Kansas farmer to receive for his wheat." Touring in Kansas and Oklahoma a few days later, the Senator asked, "Do you think I would be chump enough, as a public servant, to talk about dollar wheat in these times?" He brushed aside opposition argument in this regard by referring to it as "the miserable, silly, old lie."

---

73 Ibid., August 1, 1920.
74 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 6, 1920.
75 As quoted in Ibid., October 10, 1920.
Basically, Harding combined his agricultural and tariff arguments, hoping to make the farmer believe that high protection was advantageous. He sent a statement to the Southern Tariff Congress which read in part, "No section of our country at this time needs so much the application of the principle of the protective tariff." Speaking in Chattanooga, he tried to unite southern and northern voters on the Republican policy of protection. Therefore, the Senator did not present an agrarian program as such, but made parallel appeals to both capital and agriculture.

Cox developed similar rural topics. In his acceptance speech, he noted the population shift to cities, advocated crop shortage during heavy production years, condemned middlemen, and called for competitive marketing. The Governor failed to offer specific solutions and, like Harding, merely recognized contemporary shortcomings. He attempted to surpass Republican proposals of "spoils" distribution. In a speech before the National Board of Farm Organizations convention in early September, he promised to appoint "dirt farmers" to responsible government positions. These offices included the Secretary of Agriculture, and members

76 As quoted in Ibid., October 12, 1920.
77 Ibid., October 14, 1920.
78 The Democratic Text Book, pp. 59-60.
of the Tariff Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Reserve and Regional Reserve Board. Appealing for governmental regulation of cold storage facilities, a fair test of private railroad operation, and co-operative marketing, he declared himself to be "a farmer and not an agriculturalist."\textsuperscript{79}

The National Board of Farm Organizations possibly influenced the Governor's campaign philosophy. It favored "a candidate of progressive tendencies" and "expressed disappointment" over the Republican "platform and the candidate."\textsuperscript{80} Cox toured the West, placing emphasis on "progressivism" and comparing it with the undesirable GOP "reaction."\textsuperscript{81} He frequently combined League of Nations and agricultural arguments, as if the two were inseparable. After completing the Pacific trip, he concluded: "The West understands, [sic] the practical opportunities which the league affords overseas, and why agriculture products prices are falling."\textsuperscript{82}

FDR's rural pronouncements were not radically different from those of the Presidential nominees. In the area of "food production and marketing," he called for "careful study" in order

\textsuperscript{79}As quoted in Louisville \textit{Evening Post}, September 2, 1920.

\textsuperscript{80}Quoting Charles S. Lyman, secretary of the National Board of Farm Organizations, in Wilhelm, \textit{The Independent}, CIII, 26.

\textsuperscript{81}As quoted in Wheeling \textit{Register}, September 12-28, 1920.

\textsuperscript{82}As quoted in Cincinnati \textit{Enquirer}, October 4, 1920.
"to bring about some national remedy for what undoubtedly is a national evil."\textsuperscript{83} As in the case of labor, he mentioned past Administration achievements, which included "Farm Loan Banks" and "Federal aid for good roads."\textsuperscript{84} He followed the appeals of all major party candidates in asking for increased production.\textsuperscript{85} In order to carry out this endeavor, the following "concrete proposals" were enumerated:

1 - Increase food production by opening up at once and on a large scale millions of acres of land now unproductive . . . .
2 - Improve transportation facilities . . . .
3 - Make farm life more attractive, and direct an intensive campaign to provide better living conditions in the country districts.
4 - Eliminate many of the unnecessary hands through which articles at the present time pass . . . .
5 - Change the present ineffective laws regarding profiteering . . . .\textsuperscript{86}

The Vice-Presidential candidate's western addresses highlighted land reclamation and Federal responsibility. His expression at Billings, Montana, was a typical example: "Every year that goes by makes this great development problem more and more a national, and less and less a local one."\textsuperscript{87} Therefore,

\textsuperscript{84}Ibid., Boston, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{85}Ibid., Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 13, 1920, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{86}Ibid., Albany, New York, September 20, 1920, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{87}Ibid., Billings, Montana, August 17, 1920, p. 1.
Roosevelt emphasized governmental obligations in meeting rural problems. However, this approach failed to produce an economic issue.

The Republican agricultural plank was written by Senator Arthur Capper. It promised to promote farm co-ops, trade, conservation and reclamation; to support the Federal Farm Loan Act; to initiate government study; and to publish the findings. The GOP platform accurately generalized the "crux of the present agricultural condition lies in prices, labor and credit." But it failed to suggest any real solutions.

The Democratic agricultural plank boasted about past accomplishments, including the Federal Farm Loan Act and the rural mail service. To satisfy any contemporary difficulties, it favored "comprehensive studies." However, it conveniently failed to discover any pressing problems. The farmer's circumstances were described as follows: "New opportunities have been offered him, and out of them he is achieving prosperity." During the closing days of the campaign, Cox did not repeat this fallacious statement. He conceded "the loss of agriculture,"

88 Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 76-77, 95-96, 128.
89 Ibid., p. 126.
90 The Democratic Text Book, pp. 20-22.
91 Ibid., p. 415.
"the depression in industry," and, "the present potential decrease in the need for labor"; however, he blamed these conditions on America's failure to join the League of Nations. "But for the 'partisan plot' at Washington, America now would be riding upon a full tide of prosperity . . . ."92 Furthermore, the Democratic aspirant derided Harding's senatorial record on agriculture, labor, and "Big Business."93

Both major parties based their reclamation programs on the conservation policies of President Theodore Roosevelt.94 This policy emphasized the political eagerness to claim association with any economic program which held vote-getting potential. As in the case of labor topics, both parties avoided agricultural issues. A high protective tariff, the one economic issue, was presented by the Republicans as a panacea for capital, labor, and agriculture. Although defending a tariff for revenue only, the Democrats chose to subordinate all economic issues to the political arguments involving the League of Nations.

92 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 24, 1920.
93 As quoted in Ibid., October 29, 1920.
94 Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 95-96; The Democratic Text Book, pp. 22-23, 33-34.
Social Issues

The social topics of the period were divided into prohibition, crime, intolerance, and religion. Only prohibition and intolerance were sufficiently developed by the campaigners to deserve consideration in this section.

Prohibition

Governor Cox's nomination, which was supported by powerful big city "machines," placed the Democrats on the defensive regarding prohibition. The nominee planned to avoid the Eighteenth Amendment enforcement question. This stratagem was emphasized by the following newspaper report:

The League of Nations issue — not the question of 'rigid' or 'liberal' enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead act — will occupy the foreground in the appeals of Governor James M. Cox to the people during the national campaign.

... Governor Cox regards the Congressional elections this Fall as the proper forum through which to carry to the people the fight for a liberalization of the Volstead act, in line with the traditional Democratic doctrine of sovereign State rights.95

Once the campaign opened, his support for law and order did not dismiss all controversy regarding the Eighteenth Amendment. In response to his position, an opposition organ observed: "Of course, Cox is for law enforcement. No candidate dare say, or

intimate, otherwise. But, in the minds of the nation the law through him may be changed, or liberally interpreted, or even poorly enforced." 96 The West, in particular, was interested in the prohibition subject. As Cox shifted his campaign to the Pacific Coast, Washington newspapers branded him a "wet." 97 He responded by declaring that prohibition was "not an issue," 98 and by repeating his pledge to enforce "every U. S. law." 99 At this time, Chairman Will Hays of the Republican National Committee testified that Cox received financial support from organized liquor interests. Denying this charge, the nominee asserted, "The wets have not contributed a dollar to our campaign fund and they will not." 100

Cox continued to speak on the topic of prohibition enforcement in blasting western newspapers. Undoubtedly irritated over the vast numbers of GOP journals, he charged, "Nine-tenths of the newspapers in California do not print the news." He further accused these publications of falling under "senatorial


97 For example, see Seattle Post-Intelligencer, September 11, 1920.

98 As quoted in Wheeling Register, September 12, 1920.

99 As quoted in Ibid., September 14, 1920.

100 As quoted in "Echoes of the Campaign: Liquor Men Support Cox," The Independent, CIII (September 18, 1920), 344.
oligarchy" control. In so doing, he continued the attempt to shift the blame for existing evils to the same group who was responsible for defeating the League of Nations. The liquor question was declared to be "as dead as slavery," yet he allotted the topic prominent treatment in his addresses. This "dead" topic was developed at Albuquerque, New Mexico, and a press statement on the subject was released in Cheyenne, Wyoming. The latter news release assailed Wayne E. Wheeler for trying to "protect" Senator Harding and accused the Anti-Saloon official of being "a chattel of Republican headquarters." Furthermore, Cox called Harding "a brewer who is apologizing for his holdings."

William J. Bryan's zealous lobbying in behalf of prohibition damaged Democratic political solidarity. Senator Pat Harrison, Chairman of the Speakers' Bureau, tried to show a "united" front by revealing Bryan's intentions to speak for the party nominees. Returning from his western trip, Cox attempted to extend the olive branch again. In Omaha, he reminded the audience of his support during the Nebraskan's Presidential

101 As quoted in Wheeling Register, September 21, 1920.
102 Ibid., September 22, 1920.
103 Ibid., September 24, 1920.
104 As quoted in Ibid., September 27, 1920.
Therefore, the Democrats were battling not only GOP opposition on the liquor topic, but were attempting to appease a recalcitrant faction within the party. Cox went on to develop the "dead" question before his Kansas audiences. Roosevelt was considered to be "anti-Tammany" even though Boss Murphy did not object to his nomination. In being less outwardly obligated to big city "machines," the Vice-Presidential candidate apparently felt less defensive on the liquor topic. He did not become preoccupied with an explanation of his position and left this subject for Cox's disposal.

The Republicans, seemingly sensing their advantageous position, let the Democrats defend themselves from editorial onslaughts. In his acceptance speech, Harding simply declared, "I believe in law enforcement." Cox used this same approach, but tried to expand and to explain his precise attitude. Harding left such duties to other Republican speakers. For example, William Howard Taft referred to Cox as a "shifty politician," and one supported by the "wets" and Gompers. Therefore, the

---

106 Wheeling Register, September 28, 1920.
107 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 1, 1920.
109 As quoted in Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 51.
110 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 19, 1920.
GOP chose to keep the pressure on Cox by exercising constant offensive tactics.

Minor Democratic speakers were of questionable advantage to the cause. A New York delegate at San Francisco, W. Bourke Cockran, submitted the platform amendment for light wines and beers, and bitterly denounced William Jennings Bryan.\[111\] Cockran actively campaigned in behalf of Cox and Roosevelt. In Cincinnati, his audience "taxed the capacity of Music Hall" on October 14, and the listeners were "Thrilled by the power of his oratory."\[112\] However, the contradictory presence of both Cockran and Bryan in the same political camp defied any earnest attempt to interpret the Democratic Party's attitude toward prohibition.

The militant Anti-Saloon League continued to work for rigid enforcement of prohibition statutes. In fact, the League threatened to punish Federal judges who were deemed to be negligent in this respect. A Democratic editorial retorted:

The Anti-Saloon certainly is not lacking in audacity. Having bully-ragged the weak-kneed senators and congressmen into passing the most undemocratic, un-American measure (the Volstead act) ever spread upon the national statute books in the history of the entire country, the league is aspiring higher now, from beneath the vary [sic]

\[111\] Ibid., October 9, 1920.

\[112\] Ibid., October 15, 1920. This was a Democratic account of Cockran's address.
dome of the national capital, attempts to coerce
the judiciary into rendering favorable prohibition
decisions by threatening federal judges with
'punishment' are being made.\(^\text{113}\)

The Democrats possibly chose to criticize the Anti-Salooners
because of the League's opposition to Cox. But even Reverend Dr.
Russell Conwell, vice president of the organization, was
questioning the League's effectiveness. He blamed some setbacks
on "those extremists who defeated the purpose of prohibition by
seeking to carry it too far; because of the temperance people
themselves."\(^\text{114}\)

During the final month of the campaign, Cox and Harding
repeated their intention "to enforce the Eighteenth Amendment to
the Constitution."\(^\text{115}\) Therefore, an "issue" regarding prohibition
did not develop. Most of the controversy involved factional
strife within the Democratic Party, some differences of opinion
within the Anti-Saloon League, and an attempt by the Republicans
to embarrass the opposition candidate by forcing the temperance
topic. The Governor's identification with the "wet" forces was a
recognized handicap. But the nominees' stated positions were
identical. Therefore, rather than being an issue, prohibition
involved the circumstances of identification.

\(^\text{113}\)Wheeling \textit{Register}, September 16, 1920.

\(^\text{114}\)As quoted in editorial, \textit{Ibid.}, September 17, 1920.

\(^\text{115}\)Louisville \textit{Courier-Journal}, October 2, 1920.
Intolerance

The wave of nativism and the persecution of "hyphenated" Americans produced additional dilemmas for the campaigners. At a time when "100 per cent Americanism" was expressed frequently, the politicians' attitudes toward minority groups became a significant consideration. Sensible strategy demanded the pacification of these groups without incurring the wrath of native-born voters. Like many other contemporary subjects, this technique involved "straddling" the proverbial political fence.

Harding stood for "freedom of speech, press, assembly." The Republican platform made similar pronouncements, adding its opposition to alien agitators and urging an end to lynchings. Cox vaguely spoke about safeguarding "person and property." The Democratic platform was repetitious of the GOP statement on this subject, except for eliminating all references to lynchings.

Leaving on a southern and midwestern swing, Cox was "expected to deal strongly with the German-Americans who propose to drive the United States into a separate peace with Germany." 

---

116 As quoted in Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 43.
117 Ibid., pp. 93-94.
118 As quoted in The Democratic Text Book, p. 58.
119 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
120 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 7, 1920.
A week later at Columbus, Ohio, he arraigned the Republican Party for "catering to racial groups" and disloyal elements. He named Irish, German, Italian, Greek, Bulgarian, and Negro aliens and their descendants as being among those to whom false GOP pledges were made. He mentioned the "disloyal groups fed out of the propaganda fund supplied by the makers of war munitions who are against the League of Nations for reasons that are obvious."  

Two days later, speaking to a Cleveland audience on the League topic, he appealed to lingering wartime prejudices by declaring:

"This morning Senator Harding himself leaves his dug-out and comes to the hosts of peace, with his hands to high heaven, crying, 'Kamerad, kamerad!' America has heard this cry before, and by experience it has found that it came from those who could not be trusted, even after they surrendered."

Rather than call the Senator a coward, he was identified with an alien group. The same procedure was followed in referring to T. Coleman du Pont as the "Krupp of America." Also, Cox handled the alien question along with other topics, such as the League of Nations. Following the leadership of Governor Cox, Roosevelt unleashed several scathing remarks against opposition efforts to win the alien vote. He pointed to brazen attempts to

---

121 As quoted in Ibid., October 15, 1920.
122 As quoted in Ibid., October 17, 1920.
123 As quoted in Ibid.
gain blocs of votes by offering sweeping concessions to German, French, Italian, Jugo-Slav, and Irish leaders in the United States. On this subject, he contended, "Beginning the campaign with [a] solemn pronouncement upon Americanism, Senator Harding is gradually descending to daily appeal to all the un-American and alien prejudice and passions in our land."  

After George Sylvester Viereck came out for Harding, FDR offered the following response:

It is becoming more and more obvious that the Republican Campaign Managers are bending every effort to secure the hyphenated vote. They are making special appeals to the very small but dangerous element in our Country which was not loyal, or was of doubtful loyalty during the War.

... I call upon Senator Harding and other Republican Leaders to repudiate hyphenated allegiance and hyphenated politics, and especially the organizations formed in his behalf with hyphenated names.  

Like Cox, the Vice-Presidential nominee developed his references to minority groups along with arguments for the League of Nations. "The issue on the League and on the hyphenated vote is becoming more and more definite as the days go by."  

---


126 Ibid., p. 3.
Essentially, there were no social issues developed during the campaign. The nominees agreed to enforce the prohibition laws. They did not mention the intricacies involving crime and religion. They did not differ outwardly in a remedy for the removal of intolerance. The Democrats were on the defensive in explaining their position on the Eighteenth Amendment and somewhat perturbed over Republican success at winning the leaders of "hyphenated" voting groups. No constructive social proposals emanated from either major party.

Political Issues

One economic issue, the tariff, evolved during the campaign. No social issues became apparent. However, politically several differences between the major parties were evident. The League of Nations commanded foremost importance, but it gave rise to a controversy centering around Woodrow Wilson and his Administration. Woman suffrage and third parties failed to produce any sparks, but the campaign financing question did. Several other political subjects took form, including campaigning methods, governmental efficiency, and "progressivism." These various topics are analyzed separately.

League of Nations

President Wilson challenged the Republican Party on the League of Nations issue even before the Democrats selected their
candidates. He contended, "No one will welcome a referendum on that issue more than I."\textsuperscript{127} At the same time, he recognized the forthcoming Republican strategy "to becloud the issue by attacks on the Administration."\textsuperscript{128} Therefore, the consideration of the League issue overlapped the controversy resulting from eight years of Democratic executive power.

At the Republican National Convention, Senator Lodge urged the negotiation of an immediate peace with Germany and took issue with Article X of the League Covenant. He felt that this Article obligated the United States to act at the command of foreign powers.\textsuperscript{129} This contention represented the heart of the extended controversy over the League issue. Quoted in full, Article X read as follows:

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{127} As quoted in "The Story of the Week: Wilson Talks Politics," \textit{The Independent}, CI\textsuperscript{II} (July 3, 1920), 16.

\textsuperscript{128} As quoted in \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{129} Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 27, 30.

\textsuperscript{130} The Democratic Text Book, p. 169. This publication contained a complete copy of the League Covenant, pp. 165-176.
Harding's acceptance speech repeated the earlier contentions of Senator Lodge. The nominee opposed Article X by stating, "Our party means to hold the heritage of American nationality unimpaired and unsurrendered." Furthermore, he promised a "formal and effective peace," followed by the organization of "an association of nations . . . ." The New York Times declared, "Harding Scuttles The League," and his "long and verbose" speech offered "friendship to all the world." It noted "that Senator Harding, whether wholly knowing what he was about or not, has put the case for the League of Nations, single and entire, before the country."

Cox interpreted Harding's speech as a call for a separate peace with Germany and took issue with the Senator. The Governor classified the League of Nations as "the supreme issue of the campaign," and declared, "I am in favor of going in." Thus, he took an unqualified position in support of the League, as further emphasized by the party platform.

131 As quoted in Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 37-38.
133 Editorial, July 24, 1920.
134 As quoted in The Democratic Text Book, pp. 48, 50-51.
135 Ibid., pp. 3-7.
Before the campaign, the Republicans attempted to satisfy the contrasting shades of opinion within the GOP. The platform opposed both Wilson and the League, then advocated an "agreement among nations to preserve the peace of the world."\(^{136}\) This political maneuver saved face for former League exponents, such as William Howard Taft, and prevented a wholesale party bolt. The New York Times condemned the procedure as follows:

Thus Mr. Taft's blessing of Senator Harding comes down to this: You are inconsistent, incoherent and timid. You are all wrong about both facts and law. The scheme you advocate is certain to prove a miserable fiasco. Otherwise you are all right. So I'm with you, Warren my boy. God bless you!\(^{137}\)

Therefore, the Republican position on the League was vague and indefinite on the eve of the campaign.

Close scrutiny of Harding's political utterances revealed a gradual shift in tactics relative to the ever-present League controversy. Late in September, while speaking to a Wheeling, West Virginia, audience, he stated, "I will favor friendly association and conferences with the people of the world . . . ."\(^{138}\) The League already offered these advantages. Apparently, responding to unexplained pressures, the Senator urged the United States to

\(^{136}\) *Republican Campaign Text-Book*, pp. 65, 70-72, 117.

\(^{137}\) Editorial, July 31, 1920.

\(^{138}\) As quoted in *Wheeling Intelligencer*, September 29, 1920.
stay out of the world organization altogether in speaking a week later at Des Moines and at Omaha. He expanded further on the subject after returning home:

Let me restate my position as explicitly as my power of words permits:

1. I am opposed unalterably to going into the League of Nations as that particular proposition now stands. That proposal is contemptuous of, and potentially destructive of, the American constitution. It is not favored by the American public.

2. I am in favor of a world association — call it what you will, the name is of slight consequence — that will discourage, or tend to prevent, war and that will encourage, or tend to encourage, a better understanding among the nations of the earth.

Harding continued to give the subject his attention in touring through Indiana and delivering an important night address at Indianapolis. Proceeding to St. Louis, he was moved to claim, "France has sent her spokesman to me, informally asking America in its new realization of the situation to lead the way for an association of nations."

Cox, asserting that Harding's French contact was only a newspaperman, demanded an immediate explanation of the Senator's

---

139 Ibid., October 8, 1920.
140 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 12, 1920.
141 Ibid., October 16, 1920.
142 As quoted in Ibid., October 17, 1920.
authority to deal with a foreign power. President Wilson made similar demands and cabled French officials to check Harding's claim. Referring to the incident while speaking in Lima, Ohio, Roosevelt stated, "Wandering Frenchmen cannot speak on behalf of their country any more than some haphazard American who happens to be traveling abroad can speak for the United States." The furor subsided and the Republican nominee ended the campaign by expressing additional opposition to Article X, and by declaring that his record was "clear."

In his own campaign, Governor Cox pressed the League issue most vigorously. From the middle of August through October 30, he emphasized the importance of joining the organization and constantly asked his opponents to bring forth a better proposal. Touring through Minnesota, Montana, Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, he concentrated on the League question in his addresses. At Salt Lake City, he attempted to divide the

143 Ibid., October 19, 1920.
145 For examples, see Cincinnati Enquirer, October 27-29, 1920.
146 As quoted in Ibid., October 31, 1920.
149 Wheeling Register, September 7-15, 1920.
Republican Party by noting Elihu Root's work on the Court of International Justice. He called this Court "an essential part of the league."\textsuperscript{150} Cox was accused of being unwilling to alter any portions of the League Covenant, especially Article X. He answered this charge at Reno, Nevada, by announcing that he would "endeavor to meet all reasonable desires for proper reservations which are offered in sincerity."\textsuperscript{151} The Republicans ignored this statement and persisted in making the Democrat appear to be uncompromising in his League stand. In a telegram, Root reminded Cox of the earlier meeting with Wilson and their "complete accord," binding the Governor to Article X. That same day, in Buffalo, Harding pledged, "I will never submit a treaty with Article X in it."\textsuperscript{152} Cox quickly emphasized his willingness to accept changes.\textsuperscript{153} Three nights later, he further contended that he was ready for reservations.\textsuperscript{154} However, the opposition ignored his pleas and hammered home the impression that Cox was as stubborn as Wilson in demanding the acceptance of the existing language in the Charter.

\textsuperscript{150} As quoted in \textit{Ibid.}, September 16, 1920.
\textsuperscript{151} As quoted in \textit{Hartford Courant}, September 17, 1920.
\textsuperscript{152} As quoted in \textit{Cincinnati Enquirer}, October 22, 1920.
\textsuperscript{153} \textit{Ibid.}, October 23, 1920.
\textsuperscript{154} \textit{Ibid.}, October 26, 1920.
This confusion, manufactured or sincere in nature, became the nucleus of contention. Thirty-one prominent Republican politicians, educators, and clergymen signed a statement supporting Harding which specifically upheld the Senator's position on Article X. It stated, in part:

The question between the candidates is not whether our country shall join in such an association. It is whether we shall join under an agreement containing the provisions which are very objectionable to great numbers of the American people . . .

That is substantially the difference between the parties now. The Democratic platform and candidate stand unqualifiedly for the agreement negotiated at Paris without substantive modification.\(^{155}\)

This clever maneuver came late in the campaign. Not to be outdone, the Democrats came out with a list of "more than 100 representative men and women who usually have supported the Republican or Progressive tickets," but now announced their intention to vote for Cox and Roosevelt.\(^{156}\) The list contained the same professions represented by the thirty-one GOP signers. Cox, obviously troubled by the Republican statement, denounced the signatories in a speech at Detroit.\(^{157}\) However, the opposition tactic probably produced a telling result.

---


Earlier in the campaign, the Governor issued reckless charges. For example, in Los Angeles he surmised, "If Newberry had not been in the Senate we would now be a member of the League of Nations." Newberry, convicted of corrupt practices, was a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This Committee, headed by Senator Lodge, gave President Wilson considerable trouble in reporting out the League document. Nevertheless, fixing total blame on one member was recognized as a foolish charge, even in the Democratic press.158

Cox continued to develop his League points in traveling through New Mexico, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, and the eastern states.159 His use of satire and ridicule, especially bitter in Lafayette, Indiana; Baltimore; Akron, Ohio; and Chicago,160 possibly adversely reflected on his advocacy of the humanitarian principles embodied in the Covenant.

Roosevelt supported the League early in 1919,161 and was willing to regard it as the "dominant issue" in the 1920

158 Wheeling Register, September 22, 1920.
159 Cincinnati Enquirer, September 24-October 30, 1920.
160 Ibid., October 13; 22; 30-31, 1920.
campaign. However, he did not consider it to be a "fixed issue," and predicted the possibility of its alteration in status as the campaign progressed. The Vice-Presidential candidate was treated with respect in the Republican Campaign Text-Book. GOP speakers were warned: "Avoid Mr. Franklin Roosevelt's superficial assumption that the United States without the use of force could have kept the peace of Europe by joining a league founded upon force." This warning was directed at his hypothetical inference that Germany "would not have dared" to wage war if the League had been functioning in 1914.

FDR followed Cox's leadership in proposing "to have the United States ratify the treaty of peace and the League of Nations." Furthermore, he vigorously criticized Senator Harding for offering to substitute "a sort of glorified Hague Tribunal." At Buffalo, he observed that the League was already preventing wars and, with America's aid, would guarantee world peace.

162 As quoted in Ibid., July 13, 1920.
163 As quoted in Ibid., July 22, 1920.
164 P. 398.
165 "Speech Material & Suggestions, Campaign of 1920."
167 Buffalo Times, September 25, 1920.
Recognizing Article X as the major point of contention, he often carefully explained this one aspect of the Covenant. He contrasted the functioning organization with Harding's "ouija board league."

However, in his eagerness to answer opposition charges, Roosevelt made widely published claims which haunted him for the remainder of the campaign. The GOP circulated the story that England had six votes to America's one, due to far-flung British Empire possessions. FDR attempted to show that the United States could expect the full support of its neighbors to the South.

Therefore, the bloc of English votes would be overcome. In mid-August at Butte, Montana, he reportedly stated:

The Republicans are playing a shell game on the American people, because they are still busy circulating the story that England has six votes to America's one. It is just the other way. As a matter of fact the United States has about 12 votes in the Assembly. Until last week I had two of them myself, and now Secretary Daniels has them. You know I have had something to do with the running of a couple of little republics. Facts are that I wrote Haiti's constitution myself, and if I do say it, I think it is a pretty good constitution. Haiti and San Domingo, Panama, Cuba, and Central American countries, who have at least 12 votes in the League Assembly, all regard Uncle Sam as a guardian and big brother, and this country will have their votes in the League.

---

168 For example, see Batavia [New York] Times, September 25, 1920.

169 As quoted in Cincinnati Post, October 14, 1920.

170 As quoted in Boston Transcript, August 19, 1920.
The report caused international repercussions. Pan-American diplomats found the speech to be "offensive." A representative of the Haitian government denied the former Assistant Secretary's asserted authorship of his country's constitution. The candidate quickly denied ever making the remarks attributed to him, and this denial supposedly angered the people of Montana.

The Republicans did not allow Roosevelt's speech to fade suddenly from the news. On his front porch the following month, Harding developed the incident in detail and concluded:

To the best of my information this is the first official admission of the rape of Haiti and San Domingo by the present administration. To my mind moreover, it is the most shocking assertion that ever emanated from a responsible member of the government of the United States.

Of course, Roosevelt objected to Harding's address. He telegraphed the Senator, and charged that "you have put into my mouth an alleged statement . . . which I had already publicly denied making and which denial was printed in all the leading

---

171 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 26, 1920.
173 Ibid., August 29, 1920.
174 As quoted in Hartford Courant, September 18, 1920.
newspapers. 175 The Democrat persistently attempted, for the remainder of the campaign, to explain England's six votes. 176

Both Democratic nominees featured the League question in their speeches. FDR recognized the necessity to overcome the opposition's "poison propaganda," which he pictured to be "as insidious as that of the Germans during the war." 177 He tried to "make it clear that this grave issue transcends every other." 178 Encouraged by the endorsement of "many prominent" Republicans, 179 he cited the League of Nations as "the greatest issue that has come before the American voters since the Civil War." 180

Kentucky's Governor, Edwin P. Morrow, presented a typical GOP oversimplification of the League issue. He addressed a Newport, Kentucky, audience as follows:

Where is all the trouble? Over there. Where are all the wars? Over there. Where are all the boundaries that are to be preserved? Over there. Where are they all broke? Over there.

175 As quoted in Hartford Times, September 18, 1920.

176 For example, see Cincinnati Enquirer, October 18, 1920.


178 Ibid., Des Moines, Iowa, October 8, 1920, p. 3.

179 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 13, 1920.

180 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 22, 1920.
Where are they all at peace? Over here. Where is the bank roll? Over here. This beautiful idealistic League of Nations exists where? Over there. Forty countries have signed up. Where are they? Over there. Suppose we let all who signed keep all the trouble over there, and we'll stay over here.¹⁸¹

The Democrats were faced with countering this spirit of isolation, the objections to Article X, and the evasive statements of the opposition. Toward the end of the campaign, a Republican editorial summed up the developments in the following statements:

"In the plainest English, Senator Harding has stated that he favors staying out of the league of nations as it now stands. Governor Cox has stated plainly that he favors going in. On the Wilson league of nations we have a clean cut issue."¹⁸² The following day, this same newspaper noted that Harding stood for "an association of nations."¹⁸³ Later, in Indianapolis, he favored "the good" in the Versailles Covenant¹⁸⁴ without distinguishing between "the good" and "the bad." Therefore, the Republicans continued their elusive position throughout the campaign, while the Democrats maintained a stable, consistent program of League endorsement.

¹⁸¹As quoted in Ibid., October 8, 1920.
¹⁸²Wheeling Intelligencer, October 11, 1920.
¹⁸³As quoted in Ibid., October 12, 1920.
¹⁸⁴As quoted in Ibid., October 16, 1920.
Wilsonism

The President did not escape the wrath of those opposed to the League of Nations. Often it became difficult to determine whether the opponents were sincere, or merely using League denunciation as a retaliatory force against Wilson. Senator Lodge's convention speech was directed against that "autocrat" in the White House who "has kept us out of peace." Harding followed suit by firing an opening salvo at Wilson, remarking, "I believe in party government as distinguished from personal government, individual, dictatorial, autocratic or what not." Early in July, the New York Times saw the Democrats' defense of Wilson as the chief difference in major party platforms. The Democratic platform supported both Wilson and the League, while the Republican platform censored them both. Cox emphasized Wilson's great war record. In fact, the party's campaign text book contended that the Democrats won the war.

---
185 As quoted in Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 19, 31.
186 As quoted in Ibid., p. 35.
188 The Democratic Text Book, pp. 3-7.
189 Republican Campaign Text-Book, pp. 65, 70-72.
190 The Democratic Text Book, p. 65.
191 Ibid., pp. 295-299.
Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., matched this ridiculous conclusion with his own explanation that the "Republicans won the war." He was editorially asked, "Does he not know that the Republican war cry in this year of 1920 is that the war was a failure?" Indeed, the GOP campaigners were classifying practically all Administration endeavors as failures. Harding, and others, preferred to use the term "Wilsonism."

The Republicans overstepped the bounds of propriety in condemning the President. A cartoon, dubbing the League of Nations "the Immaculate Conception" and depicting Wilson as "The Greatest He Angel," originally appeared in "Colonel" George Harvey's North American Review and was re-printed in leading newspapers. The cartoon drew considerable criticism. One man called it "Sacrilege" and subscribed $25,000 to the Democratic fund "to rebuke blasphemy countenanced by [the] man who claims he nominated Harding."

Still smarting under opposition comments relative to his Montana utterances, Roosevelt denounced the caricature as follows:

---

192 As quoted in editorial, Louisville Evening Post, September 6, 1920.
193 Ibid.
194 For example, see Cincinnati Enquirer, October 13, 1920.
195 For example, see Wheeling Register, October 28, 1920.
196 Ibid.
The campaign of win-at-any-cost conducted by Republican managers is well borne out by the disgusting episode of the cartoon published in the current issue of Harvey's Weekly. The public of the United States understands the sacrilegious character of this disgusting picture. It is an insult to the whole Christian world. He repeated the condemnation in his last pre-election speech.

In a pre-campaign interview, Wilson said, "I suppose I should be flattered over being made the issue of the Presidential campaign by the Republican party." But, on the contrary, "Every charge directed against me and my Administration is obviously designed to becloud and negative the paramount issues...." Expressing sympathy for the Chief Executive, the New York Times pleaded, "Is it too much to hope that President Wilson may now get fairer treatment from his political opponents? He will have but eight months more in office. During that period would it not be decent to let up on the ferocity of attacks upon him?"

GOP campaigners failed to heed this plea. They poked fun at the 1916 campaign slogan, "He kept us out of war." Partisan

---

198 Ibid., Hudson, New York, November 1, 1920, pp. 1-2.
201 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 20, 1920.
newspapers often printed sarcastic editorials, such as the following example:

Mr. Wilson considers himself the alpha and omega of the peace treaty and covenant. Nobody else knows anything about the subject . . . The only Americanism is the Americanism of Woodrow Wilson . . .

Mr. Wilson has made the issue cameo clear. Mr. Wilson has invited it. No one can be blamed for taking up the gauntlet he now formally flings down.202

Leading Republican speakers freely admitted leveling their campaign artillery in the President's direction. Former President William Howard Taft, in an address at New Haven, Connecticut, declared that "the present election is not a referendum, the result of which will determine whether the American people are in favor of Mr. Wilson's league or against it. The issue of this campaign is whether we shall approve the Wilson Administration." 203

The President assumed his own defense during the campaign. He issued a statement which appealed for general League support.204 He allowed Cox to draw evidence "from official files of the White House, in which the secrets of the writing of the treaty of Paris are revealed in part . . . . and advertise the alleged equivocal

203As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 31, 1920.
204For complete text, see Louisville Courier-Journal, October 4, 1920.
position occupied by Mr. Taft and other friends of the league, now consorting, according to the Democratic candidate, with the destructionists. The President continued to release bits of information relative to the Peace Conference and even sent to Paris for some of the data. He spoke to a delegation of pro-League Republicans and independents during the final campaign week. It was his first speech since the physical collapse and was directed to the entire nation, containing emotional references to "the mothers of those who had fallen in battle."

Seemingly, the charges of "Wilsonism" troubled and confused the Democratic campaigners. Republicans came out with the slogan "Cox is for Wilson — Harding is for us!" Cox could not rebuff the President's support. Indeed, he readily accepted White House aid in assembling campaign ammunition. However, his speeches did not reflect a willingness to continue all phases of the Wilson program. For example, at Omaha, he disapproved of "matters in the administrations" of Attorney General Palmer and Postmaster General Burleson. But he never openly renounced the Administration.

205 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 11, 1920.
206 Ibid., October 12, 1920.
207 As quoted in Ibid., October 28, 1920.
208 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 24, 1920.
209 As quoted in Wheeling Register, September 28, 1920.
Subsequent speeches reflected vague and general endorsements of Presidential policies by inserting these observations in with other pertinent issues. 210 At Louisville, he defended the "stricken man in the White House."211 Prominent Republican speakers, such as Justice Charles Evans Hughes, persisted in uniting the views of Cox and Wilson throughout the campaign.212

At the same time, Roosevelt found himself equally challenged on the "Wilsonism" issue. In the West, a Republican newspaper criticized him "for ignoring Wilson and [the] party platform."213 It is reasonable to assume that his expressed support for the President would have drawn further criticism. Returning to the East, he tried to counter the GOP anti-Administration charges by defending Wilson as an executive who made "an earnest endeavor to bring the Nation back to a peace footing." Furthermore, he contended that any "maladministration has been directly due to prominent Republican dollar-a-year men!"214 He also shifted

210 For examples, see accounts of the Kansas tour, Cincinnati Enquirer, October 1, 1920.

211 As quoted in Ibid., October 9, 1920.

212 Ibid., October 24, 1920.

213 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 22, 1920.

considerable blame to the Legislature. "The record of this Republican Congress is one which the Republican campaigners cannot explain away or avoid." The situation was not a unique one. He pointed out that many former Presidents suffered slander and abuse, including Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, and Roosevelt. "We are witnessing today a similar phenomenon in the nation. A concerted partisan plan is being carried out to discredit the President of the United States."

Roosevelt's seven and half years as Assistant Secretary connected him more firmly than the Presidential nominee to the unpopular Administration. He apparently realized the futility of attempting to disclaim any phase of the Wilson program. On the contrary, he proudly reported returning from Europe "on the same ship with President Wilson." Hoping to use this experience against the bitter opposition, he further reminded his audience of Governor Calvin Coolidge's warm reception at Boston, where the current Republican nominee designated the Chief Executive "a great statesman." For this reason, he called the present GOP


\[216\] Ibid., Springfield, Massachusetts, September 14, 1920, pp. 1-2.

opposition a sinister plot to head off Wilson's popularity. He later classified Administration opponents as those "who want 'to get even' with President Wilson, who is not running for the Presidency this year." At New Brunswick, New Jersey, the campaigner tried to dismiss the "Wilsonism" issue by declaring, "Voters who are considering the casting of a protest vote should remember that the real choice lies between Governor Cox and Senator Harding, and they ought to be influenced most of all by the major issues of the campaign."

The Republicans obviously intended to make the most out of popular resentment against the President. Senator Harry S. New, chairman of the Speakers' Bureau, directed party spellbinders as follows:

The reports that reach this Committee from meetings thus far held would seem to indicate that audiences are particularly interested and greatly impressed by the instances of waste, extravagance and mismanagement on the part of the Democratic Administration. There are so many instances of this perfectly inexcusable and almost imbecile waste that a speaker can spend hours in enumerating them ....


219 Ibid., Kansas City, Missouri, October 9, 1920, p. 1.

220 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 29, 1920.
In referring to the League of Nations, it should always be spoken of as 'Mr. Wilson's League'...\textsuperscript{221}

FDR obtained a copy of New's letter for his own files to use against former League supporters, such as Mr. Taft, and to indicate the unethical recommendations of Republican "campaign managers."\textsuperscript{222}

He repeatedly tried to refute the "'Mr. Wilson's League'" idea.\textsuperscript{223}

Regardless of Democratic efforts, the Administration remained an especially vulnerable point. Representative Royal C. Johnson of South Dakota, chairman of the House committee which investigated war expenditures in France, issued the following observations after a trip through the Middle West:

If there is anything certain in politics, it is that Senator Harding will be the next president... The people of the West are for him. Not because they know him particularly or have clear impressions of exactly what he will do if elected, but because they are through with Wilson, Wilsonism, internationalism, inflation, and socialistic experiments under the direction of temperamental idealists.\textsuperscript{224}

Years later, Mark Sullivan concurred in this observation by relating:

\textsuperscript{221}Letter, New to Republican Speakers, undated.


\textsuperscript{223}For example, see \textit{Ibid.}, Binghamton, New York, October 22, 1920, pp. 4-5.

\textsuperscript{224}As quoted in \textit{Seattle Post-Intelligencer}, August 29, 1920.
In 1920 the American people voted against Woodrow Wilson, a man out of the official political race.

... Wilson was the unhappy victim, symbol of the exhaltation that had turned sour, personification of the rapture that had now become gall, sacrificial whipping-boy for the present bitterness.225

Therefore, "Wilsonism" and two terms of Democratic executive control became an issue in the campaign. It was developed often along with complaints against the League of Nations. Wilson's Administration possibly produced more campaign headaches for the Democrats than the controversial League issue.

Woman Suffrage

Both major party platforms endorsed woman suffrage,226 with the Democrats placing special emphasis on Tennessee's important role.227 Both Presidential candidates expressed endorsement of equal suffrage in their acceptance speeches.228 Thus, woman suffrage was not a campaign issue.

Newspaper coverage of the speeches indicated that Roosevelt had more to say about woman suffrage than any other major


226 The Democratic Text Book, p. 25; Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 100.
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campaigner. Possibly he was attempting to capitalize on his reported popularity among female voters. He felt that the women were receptive to a strong emotional appeal regarding the League of Nations. He was advised, "The women of America, their hearts still bleeding, will do everything possible to avoid war." For this reason, he was cautioned to put the League "in a nutshell," not in a long, technical argument.

FDR failed to analyze correctly this portion of his audience. He wanted to feel "that the advent of women at the ballot box will bring us a very high moral and right-thinking outlook in our public life . . . . they are progressive." He was "strengthened by the firm belief that women of this nation . . . will be unbound by partisan prejudices and a too narrow outlook on national problems." Furthermore, "they have given little evidence of following their husbands or brothers with blind obedience . . . they will not only vote but will furnish a tremendous surprise in the League of Nations, the super-question  

---
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before the Country."

The early Maine elections produced the only available "evidence." Analyzing the result, a Democratic daily revealed that many women remained away from the polls and "the drift of the suffragettes was to the Republican party there is no doubt." Earlier, the San Francisco Bulletin poetically predicted the situation as follows:

Mary had a little vote,
A ballot white as snow
But what she means to do with it
The bosses do not know.

But if those bosses stick around
The polls election day,
They'll note that Mary's views are sound,
She'll vote her hubby's way.

Maybe "the moral side, the great Christian purpose of the League" did appeal "to the women of all parties," but their voting habits failed to reflect it.

In a press interview while touring with her husband, Mrs. Roosevelt reiterated some of his campaign expressions relative to women voters. She spoke about "the moral side of politics," "progress in foreign and domestic affairs," and "the men who will

---
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enforce the right laws." Of course, the Republicans recognized the importance of garnering the feminine vote. But their appeal played down the moral aspects involved. For example, Mrs. Edith Roosevelt, widow of the former President, simply asked the "manhood and womanhood of America" to elect Harding and Coolidge.238

Although the techniques for attracting the voters varied somewhat, the woman suffrage question never became an issue in the campaign. Therefore, although the two new Constitutional Amendments, the Eighteenth and the Nineteenth, suggested points of difference among the nominees, neither Amendment became an issue during the latter half of 1920.

Third Parties

The Farmer-Labor Party advocated "100 percent Americanism" and public ownership of the railroads; while it opposed all international agreements.239 The Socialist Party wanted public ownership of all industries which were "essential for the existence and welfare of the people," and protested against the "mischievous organization called the 'League of Nations.'"240 The Prohibition

237 As quoted in Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.

238 As quoted in Wheeling Intelligencer, October 1, 1920.
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Party was the only group which adopted a strong prohibition plank. In addition, it favored the League of Nations and struck out against "profiteering" and "the general lax enforcement of law."\(^{241}\)

Although the major parties vigorously debated some of the issues included in third party platforms, the minor parties never became a campaign issue. Democrats and Republicans avoided mentioning these groups in either their platforms or their major addresses. Apparently, the minor parties were out of favor and the major parties decided to leave well enough alone. From his prison cell, Eugene Debs branded the League of Nations a "dishonest issue" and announced the importance of giving foremost consideration to the "coal shortage."\(^{242}\) This outburst failed to stir either major party. Aaron S. Watkins, the Prohibition Party candidate, promised to withdraw from the race if either Harding or Cox would pledge support to the dry program.\(^{243}\) But Republicans and Democrats continued to ignore the desperate small party candidates.

The Farmer-Labor Party was not allowed a separate listing on the California ballot because no petition "was filed with the Secretary of State prior to June 17, as required by California

\(^{241}\text{Ibid., pp. 443-446.}\)

\(^{242}\text{As quoted in San Francisco Chronicle, August 24, 1920.}\)

\(^{243}\text{Wheeling Register, September 23, 1920.}\)
The Prohibition Party in Ohio failed to get enough signatures to its petitions to authorize its appearance on the state ballot. Seemingly, the Republicans faced a greater threat from third party groups than did the Democrats. In West Virginia, two Non-Partisan Leaguers entered the Republican primary elections. After losing out, one was entered as an independent in the fall elections. The two Non-Partisans received more collective votes than their Republican rival. This factor possibly gave some encouragement to the Democrats. Concerning the Washington State primary, the Seattle Daily Times predicted that all Republican influence "will be used during the remainder of the primary campaign to defeat any candidates indorsed by the Nonpartisan League and seeking a nomination in the Republican primaries."

However, the Democrats could derive little comfort from these circumstances. Roosevelt was warned, "Nonpartisans are nonpartisans first, Republicans second, and never Democrats."

From Fargo, North Dakota, he was told that Democrats and

---
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Republicans were both willing to do "anything" to "kill" Non-Partisans. In Billings, Montana, some Non-Partisan newspapers openly endorsed the Democrats and were "vicious" in dealing with the GOP national ticket. Washington State interest "centers on reclamation of lands and destruction of Non-Partisan League. The Boss will be asked to express himself on Non PL and their kind of radicals . . . . Advise strongly that you do not hit the NPL directly." Reportedly, only Utah "radicals" would support their native son, Parley Parker Christensen, the Farmer-Labor candidate.

The Roosevelt papers revealed considerable frustration on the part of advisors when they were faced with campaigning in third party strongholds. Generally, FDR was urged to evade the subject. Apparently, the other major party candidates received similar advice, because minor parties never became a campaign issue.

Campaign Financing

The Democrats definitely assumed the offensive in the early development of the campaign financing question. They attacked the

249 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 14, 1920.
250 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 15, 1920.
251 Letter, Early to McIntyre, August 17, 1920.
252 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 25, 1920.
pre-convention expenditures of prospective Republican nominees and indignantly recalled Senator Newberry's "purchased seat in [the] U. S. Senate." In his acceptance speech, Cox spoke of the "fabulous contributions to the present Republican campaign fund." The Governor continued to refer to an opposition "slush fund" while touring through the Middle West, the Far West, the South, and New England.

The Democratic nominee became overzealous in his anxiety to prove illicit practices in Republican financing. During the first month of the campaign, he charged that the opposition fund would total slightly less than $15,000,000. Sympathetic newspapers had a hard time supporting this assertion. One editorial calculated on the hypothetical premise that "if $8,000 were raised amongst every 50,000 people in the country . . . 100,000,000 people would contribute $16,000,000 to the Republican campaign fund, just as Governor Cox charged." The same day these carefully arranged statistics were printed, the Governor spoke for one hour from the second story veranda of a Nampa, Idaho, hotel. In this widely

253 _The Democratic Text Book_, pp. 367-373.
255 _Wheeling Register_, September 4-15; _Cincinnati Enquirer_, October 9-20, 1920.
256 _Wheeling Register_, September 14, 1920.
publicized address, he declared, "If eighty per cent of the people will forget their politics and help me lick the two per cent that is raising a fund of from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 to beat me, we will make government an agency for the one hundred per cent and not the two per cent." 257  In Louisville, he dropped the references to percentages and millions and remarked, concerning irregular and incorrect tax returns:

Let me give you a hint — and I haven't mentioned it in this campaign before — I am prepared to believe that a great many large campaign contributions have been made this year in the hope that a Secretary of the Treasury might be installed who would be mindful of the financial obligations that attach to large campaign contributions. 258

At Columbus, Ohio, he mentioned huge funds which were raised to woo the racial vote. 259  His Boston speech used the Newberry incident to show the result of greedy, corrupt, political money-raising. 260

The total effect of the Governor's charges was open to question. David Lawrence, a political writer who followed in the wake of the Cox western tour, observed many favorable impressions.

257 As quoted in Ibid., September 15, 1920.
258 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 9, 1920.
259 Ibid., October 15, 1920.
260 Ibid., October 20, 1920.
left by the nominee. However, concerning the financial charges, he wrote as follows:

Now as to the charges of a big slush fund. Democrats will tell you privately that they don't think it dignified for a presidential candidate to engage in that sort of tactics. They think Cox has proved his charges — what's more, republicans [sic] will tell you that Cox was right in respect to the quotas he gave about the northwest. But that kind of charges would have fallen with a better grace from a campaign manager and would have developed more spontaneously through the senatorial investigating committee than to have been made the principal topic of the addresses by Governor Cox in this region. Much of it the people already had read in the newspapers. They wanted new stuff from Governor Cox. 261

The Democratic managers did issue propaganda on this subject. During the final week of campaigning, Chairman White exposed a letter which was sent, supposedly, by GOP headquarters in order to show that the Republicans were selling out to the corporate interests in return for financial backing. 262

Later analyses of this issue were not always developed in the proper perspective. One writer declared:

When Cox made his sensational charges in 1920 and declared that the Republicans were raising a 'slush fund' of at least $15,000,000, Harding paid no attention; instead of falling into a panic, the

261 Hartford Times, September 17, 1920.

chairman and treasurer of the national committee treated the charges as a fantastic invention. It was erroneous to contend that Harding "paid no attention" to these charges. From the first month of the campaign, he attempted to answer the Democrats. Perhaps his ambiguous and vague terminology contributed to later confusion. Also, the Republican national treasurer was busy submitting press statements which related to financial collections.

However, the GOP entrusted the major burden of rebuttal on this subject to minor party officials. Illinois Congressman Fred A. Britten charged that the English Parliament appropriated $87,500 in favor of the British ambassador at Washington for "entertainment purposes, and this money found its way into the Democratic national campaign fund." Another Illinois Congressman, William A. Rodenberg, accused the Democratic national committee of assessing "the army of government employees for political purposes," and further maintained that "the overloaded government payroll can be traced to this practice." He concluded, "It is a

265 For example, see San Francisco Bulletin, August 24, 1920.
matter of record in Washington that these employees are taxed a certain percentage of their salaries for campaign purposes, and if the total were made public it would startle the entire nation."267

Congressmen Britten and Rodenberg offered no evidence to support their serious allegations. But Cox failed to back up his charges either. One writer felt that the Democratic candidate had more to lose under these circumstances: "If the unsavory matter is brought forth or approved, even tacitly, by one who is a candidate he always appears to have soiled his fingers; and if he cannot [offer] complete proof he loses votes by the hour."268 Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson, and Harding apparently benefited from Presidential campaigns so conducted by their opponents.269

While Cox was in Dayton demanding for Will Hays to show the GOP books on their "slush fund,"270 FDR was in San Francisco deriding the Republican Chairman for side-stepping the charges.271 The Vice-Presidential nominee issued a statement which hypothetically deduced that "the fund would run up to $30,000,000, but even

267 As quoted in Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 28, 1920.

268 Sait, American Parties and Elections, p. 608. Sait is quoting Behind the Scenes in Politics by an anonymous author, p. 56.

269 Ibid.

270 San Francisco Examiner, August 23, 1920.

271 Ibid., August 24, 1920.
half that figure would constitute grave danger to a clean election."\(^{272}\) This statement preceded Cox's Nampa, Idaho, speech by three weeks. Therefore, the possibility existed that the Governor's later reference to the $30,000,000 was merely an attempt to back up the claim of his running mate. If such was the case, Roosevelt's remark further weakened an already poorly supported contention. He devoted considerable attention to campaign financing in his Omaha speech a few days later, when he blasted Republican Treasurer Upham, Chairman Hays, and the "Old Guard clique."\(^{273}\) In the same speech, he answered "a little Congressman from Illinois," recalled Senator Newberry's "purchased election," and said "the Republican managers seek to raise somewhere between fifteen and thirty millions to continue this dirty business."\(^{274}\) In Boston, he praised the Administration measure regarding the publicizing of campaign expenses in order to detect political fraud.\(^ {275}\)

Possibly, the root of the Democratic charges could be traced partially to their resentment and jealousy over


\(^{273}\)Holograph (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Omaha, Nebraska, August 28, 1920, pp. 1-3.

\(^{274}\)Ibid., pp. 2-4.

\(^{275}\)Carbon typescript (extracts), in Ibid., Boston, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 1.
campaigning against a heavily financed opposition. At Denver, Roosevelt lamented:

The Republicans are fortunate in having a campaign fund large enough to enable the sending out of pamphlets. The Democratic campaign fund is, as is usual with the Democratic Party, so low that Democratic literature has to be kept down to a minimum, but I am glad that we have not even the temptation of sending out such pamphlets as I have seen emanating from Mr. Will Hays' office. I can only characterize them as 'clumsy lies.'

A Republican newspaper volunteered a simple explanation for the financial stability of one party as opposed to the near bankruptcy of the other:

If the [Democratic] party is hard up at the present time, it is because it has relied upon the large contributions of a comparative few, instead of going to the rank and file. The Republicans were wiser than that. Democrats have seen fit to attack their methods, but they simply took their cue from the managers of Red Cross, Y. M. C. A. and Liberty Loan drives all over the country.

Early in the campaign, the electioneering financing question was "rapidly forging to the front as a battle issue of considerable intensity." Most people treated this subject as a serious one. However, the "Bugs Baer" syndicated column sarcastically observed that the "campaign committees will accept

---
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anything from frost-bitten buttons to tobacco coupons. This gives
the man who never took part in national politics a chance to get
interested in it. My, ain't Santa Claus got long whiskers this
year.\textsuperscript{279}

Cox and Roosevelt expressed concern over the alleged
Republican "slush fund." The absence of effective documentation
weakened their charges. Harding did express himself on the
subject and vaguely referred to these allegations, but the major
rebuttal responsibility was wisely delegated to lower-ranking
party members. Campaign financing was definitely an issue, but
its total effect on the political race was difficult to judge.

### Campaigning Methods

The Republican intention to wage a "front porch" campaign,
as opposed to the "swing around the circle" Democratic plan,
invited a heated controversy. The candidates devoted considerable
attention to this difference, especially in their earlier speeches.
Therefore, in order to investigate the methods utilized by the
nominees, a chronological analysis of their monthly activities is
developed.

Chairman Will H. Hays said that Senator Harding "possesses
Presidential qualifications peculiarly fitting present national

needs." Yet, the Republicans showed no enthusiasm for exhibiting their candidate before numerous audiences of potential voters. However, a concession was forthcoming. The GOP announced that their candidate would make a few major addresses in several key cities. The New York Times said it looked as if "Senator Harding will go out and hustle for his election just as if he were a wretched Democrat." In July, the announced "front porch" campaign embittered some commentators to write responses, such as the following:

The elephant is a slow and heavy animal, principally of use in circuses. One of his most familiar circus tricks is standing on wooden objects to which he is not by nature suited. He is careful and can often be seen using his trunk in meticulous investigation to make sure that he is not going to step onto some spot that will let him thru and break either his leg or his neck. In Chicago a platform was constructed on which the most intellectually timid Senator that ever originated in Ohio can walk about safely with absolutely no danger of treading upon an idea. The only good chance of breaking Harding's neck is to scare him off the platform and tumble him down to earth.

Harding planned no speaking engagements away from the security of his front porch during the month of August. The

281 Editorial, August 2, 1920.
immobility on his part became the subject of several terse Democratic remarks. Cox delivered five speeches in Wheeling, West Virginia, August 14, and disdainfully referred to the "front porch" campaign. In contrast with the Republicans, the Democratic nominees agreed in their first meeting following the convention that they would "take themselves and the cause they represented before the people of the United States and would be willing then to abide by the decision as registered in November." Roosevelt restated this pledge in initiating his first western tour, and added: "We are opposed to the attitude of placing ourselves in some self-appointed shrine and then asking America to come and worship at our feet." A few days later, he sardonically responded to Senator Harding's willingness to make a few major addresses:

I am particularly glad to read that the 'porch' campaign [sic] of the Republicans is breaking down and that Senator Harding has now condescended to make five whole speeches away from home.

The theory of the Democratic Campaign is, of course, just the contrary. Our candidates are

284 As quoted in Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.
trying not merely to carry the campaign to the Country, but to find out what the Country is thinking.286

He continued this method of attack on the Pacific Coast by declaring, "We believe that national candidates should be 'Nationally-minded' not 'Marion-minded.'"287 Marion, Ohio, was Harding's home town. At the end of August, FDR offered an explanation for the GOP refusal "to let their candidates go West of the Mississippi." He recalled "Mr. Hughes' disastrous campaign to the Pacific Coast," and contended that the 1920 GOP managers "fear a repetition of 1916."288 David Lawrence gave some credence to this final contention, but added the following:

The northwest would like to see Senator Harding but it will not fail to vote for him just because he didn't come out to see the western folks. It is the people who are already convinced and want to vote for Harding who want to see him. If he came west and had to submit to hecklers and discuss vital questions of interest to the western country, Senator Harding, being human, like Charles Evans Hughes or Governor Cox, might be caught in the maelstrom of western policies, too, and hurt his cause.289

Initial political jousting regarding campaign methods began in August. This activity was intensified in September. Harding, by no means, confined himself to the "front porch." He made eight

287 Ibid., Seattle, Washington, August 20, 1920, p. E.
288 Ibid., Indianapolis, Indiana, August 30, 1920, p. 5.
289 Hartford Times, September 17, 1920.
speeches over a three day period while visiting Minnesota.  

When he reportedly made plans for an extensive tour of the country, the Democrats claimed that Cox "forced Harding to get off his porch."  

The Democratic press intensified its condemnation of the "front porch" method. One editorial concluded:

By keeping Senator Harding on his piazza a great many political embarrassments would be avoided. Those few hundreds who would journey to the front porch would be the 'old faithful' for whom any kind of chatter containing something about Americanism, Abraham Lincoln and protection would suffice.

Oliver Herfer, writing in the New York World, was moved to place Democratic resentment into verse:

The Marion-ette

In Marion town there's a wonderful show,  
Backed by Penrose and Smoot and Co.,  
Presenting the marvelous puppet clown—  
The Marion-ette of Marion town.

The greatest manikin of the age  
That ever was seen on porch or stage;  
Worked by wires and wheels, et cet. —  
A most remarkable Marion-ette

It dances to any old tune you please  
And straddles the League with the greatest ease.  
It's Pro and it's Anti-Suffragette  
This highly adaptable Marion-ette.

---
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Though a puppet, it really seems to speak,
But behind the screens stands a powerful 'clique'
To furnish big words and phrases set
For this awfully ingenious Marion-ette

Its sonorous gabble brings equal cheer
To the son of toil and the profiteer.
For the Drys it's [dry] and the Wets it's wet
This very ambiguous Marion-ette.

Its favorite word is 'normalcy,'
Which means 'get back to what used to be.'
Good old Reaction's one best bet
Is this truly reliable Marion-ette?
This hoary back-number-ful, phony stage-
— thunder-ful, perfectly wonderful Marion-ette.

Of course, this poetical blast was leveled not only at
Harding's confinement to Marion, but also at his method of
listening to questionable advisors and of shifting positions on
various topics "while the people — the customers — wait."294

Employing the Republican slogan, which appeared on countless
billboards, Cox preferred to call it "wiggling and wobbling."295
He submitted a "schedule of wobbles" by chronologically listing
the Senator's ever changing points of view.296 William Gibbs
McAdoo, the President's son-in-law, said Harding's empty and inept
speeches "leave the impression of an army of pompous phrases

293 Reprinted in Wheeling Register, September 14, 1920.
295 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 13, 1920.
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moving over the landscape in search of an idea; sometimes these meandering words would actually capture a straggling thought and bear it triumphantly, a prisoner in their midst, until it died of servitude and overwork."297

Harding concluded the month of September in a flurry of activity. He spoke in Baltimore and toured through West Virginia.298 His West Virginia itinerary revealed the extent to which he temporarily abandoned the porch. After speaking at Grafton, Fairmont, Mannington, Cameron, and Wheeling on September 28, he visited Sistersville, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, Huntington, and Ashland [Kentucky] on September 29.299 David Lawrence did not feel that such exhaustive trips were necessary. In mid-September, he observed:

Before Senator Harding went to Minnesota, people did think there was something in Cox's statement that he was quite ready to go out to the people, while Harding majestically asked the people to come to him. The plan of the republican [sic] managers to have Mr. Harding make a few speeches away from Marion is fully expected to answer that criticism.300

298 Wheeling Register, September 28-29, 1920.
299 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 29, 1920.
300 Hartford Times, September 17, 1920.
Governor Cox made his western tour in September. His punishing schedule led to a throat irritation. A masseur accompanied the candidate, administering treatments and urging him to cancel some speeches. But the Governor doggedly pursued his itinerary. Disregarding medical advice to ban outdoor speeches, he believed his attack of "speakers' laryngitis" was on the wane. He proceeded to deliver a string of rear platform and other open-air addresses which contributed to a severe case of hoarseness in Idaho. During this trip, Cox accused Chairman Hays of sending "scouts" into the area to heckle him and to employ other cynical devices. In Oklahoma, he uttered the following startling accusation:

"These scouts," the Governor said, "have been traveling everywhere. I don't know how many men Will Hays has employed. You will find them in sleeping cars, smoking 25 cent cigars for the first time in their lives. Their policy is to get into conversation with passengers. They will say: "How's the election going?"

"Well," the scout says, "I have been a Democrat for 20 years, but no more for me. I'm done."

"There are thousands and thousands of that kind of scouts traveling all over the United States and big business is paying the bill."

---
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This account, similar to the previously cited instances involving campaign financing, lacked proper documentation. Such irresponsible outbursts possibly further jeopardized Cox's chances at the polls. He became sufficiently annoyed by opposition failure to answer each and every charge that he sensed the existence of a "Conspiracy of silence on the part of Republican managers."\textsuperscript{305}

The Governor's September record revealed the sincerity of his intention to project himself "before the people." He delivered ten speeches on the final day of his swing through the West. At Kansas City on October 2, an accompanying reporter wrote the following summation:

His speech tonight was a total of 190 for the Governor during his Western trip, exclusive of many minor greetings in the twenty-two states visited, and a total of 220 speeches since his notification last August. Upon arriving home at Dayton, Ohio, tomorrow evening, to rest and prepare for another trip into Kentucky and Tennessee late next week, the candidate will have traveled about 11,300 miles on his Western tour, or an average of 364 miles daily.\textsuperscript{306}

In his eagerness to contact as many people as possible, Cox met some crowds at the rear platform in Missouri and Indiana "clad in his pajamas, swathed in an overcoat."\textsuperscript{307}

\textsuperscript{305} As quoted in \textit{Ibid.}, October 1, 1920.

\textsuperscript{306} \textit{Louisville Herald}, October 3, 1920.

\textsuperscript{307} \textit{Cincinnati Enquirer}, October 4, 1920.
FDR continued to help Cox take the Democratic message to the people during September. While Cox was speaking in the West, the junior candidate was working the eastern and border states. He censored Harding in late September for devising "carefully worded speeches to be delivered on special occasions before a hand-picked audience . . . ." At that time, the Senator was giving many speeches in small West Virginia towns, which reflected on the accuracy of Roosevelt's statement. Apparently, FDR was determined to oppose the "front porch" method of campaigning even after Harding went out on tour. He was well aware of the change in Republican strategy because he attempted to refute some of the Senator's Baltimore statements.

By September 29, one newspaper estimated that FDR traveled 17,000 miles, spoke before 250,000 auditors, and traversed twenty-nine states since his official notification at Hyde Park. However, this method of campaigning was not without its critics. In Amsterdam, New York, he was denounced for speaking only about three minutes from the rear platform of his special car. A local editorial stated:

---
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It was very kind of Mr. Roosevelt to give us all this time ... 

He was in Schenectady the other day and delivered two addresses there to thousands of working people.

He was in Utica Wednesday, and spoke there at two luncheons and two public meetings, according to press despatches.

... He might be expected, perhaps, to regard Amsterdam, with its 35,000 people, as a place of some importance, and worth more than a three minute speech. But he can't know everything — and his campaign speeches show that there are quite a few things he doesn't know. 311

Whereas the Republicans were criticized for an insufficient number of speaking appearances, Roosevelt was condemned for only pausing momentarily to deliver brief addresses.

In October, all of the major nominees swung into action. Harding delivered key speeches and rear platform addresses in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and Oklahoma, before returning to Marion for a brief rest. 312 Prior to launching this trip, the Senator received adverse publicity for allegedly ordering the arrest of a heckler who interrupted his Baltimore speech the previous month. 313 The heckling disturbances persisted. "Hecklers, it

312 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 6-11, 1920.
313 For example, see Ibid., October 5, 1920.
is said, had been planted in the Des Moines Auditorium [by Democrats] and they shot question after question at the nominees.\[^{314}\]

From the Middle West, Harding struck out on the "home stretch" of his campaign, which carried him through Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, and back to Missouri.\[^{315}\] The church folks in Louisville registered a protest when it was announced that he was scheduled to speak in the Gypsy Smith Tabernacle. An evangelistic committee "scored the use of the tabernacle by Senator Harding as 'desecration,' possibly, it is said, because of his position, or lack of it, on the League of Nations."\[^{316}\] But the opposition melted when it was learned that Roosevelt was to speak in the same tabernacle.\[^{317}\]

As in September, Harding toured in sudden bursts of energy and then returned to the "porch." On October 15, he campaigned through the Indiana towns of Jeffersonville, New Albany, Speeds, Scottsburg, Crothersville, Seymour, Columbus, Edinburg, and Franklin during the daylight hours. In the evening, he delivered addresses to large crowds at Monument Place and Tomlinson Hall.

\[^{314}\textit{Ibid.}, October 8, 1920.\]
\[^{315}\textit{Ibid.}, October 13-18, 1920.\]
\[^{316}\textit{Ibid.}, October 4, 1920.\]
\[^{317}\textit{Ibid.}\]
in Indianapolis.  

318 He journeyed to St. Louis and then returned to the old homestead.  

319 He ended the month with speeches at Jackson, Ohio; Rochester and Buffalo, New York; Cleveland, Akron, Cincinnati, and Columbus, Ohio; with intermittent retreats to Marion.  

320 Therefore the Senator by no means idled away the campaign at his Ohio retreat. Slow to gain momentum, he nevertheless periodically left the "porch" to speak in various parts of the country.

Even Governor Coolidge came out of silent seclusion long enough to engage in a short trek through Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Maryland, and West Virginia. Starting at Philadelphia, this trip consumed a mere eight days, and he made no significant contribution to the issues under debate. But at least he felt compelled to briefly expose himself. Perhaps the party planned this maneuver as an additional overture to dispel the opposition claims of campaign timidity on the part of the Republican nominees.
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322 Like Teddy Roosevelt, Jr., Coolidge campaigned in the Kentucky mountains with Governor Morrow. See Ibid., October 20, 1920.
October found Governor Cox relentlessly plodding through a myriad of public speaking engagements. Like Roosevelt, his itinerary became ridiculously peppered with exceedingly brief rear platform appearances. From Paducah, Kentucky, to Louisville, his schedule called for the following speeches:

- Kuttawa, two minutes.
- Princeton, seven minutes.
- Dawson Springs, five minutes.
- Nortonville, three minutes.
- Greenville, one minute.
- Central City, eight minutes.
- Beaver Dam, one minute.
- Horse Branch, three minutes.
- Leitchfield, Cecelia and West Point, momentary stops.

The train also stops at Eddyville, but as this place is but two-miles from Kuttawa the Eddyville folks may be invited to Kuttawa and the Eddyville speaking may be abandoned.\textsuperscript{323}

The Governor's staggering schedule simply sapped his energy. Toward the end of the campaign, after an address at Akron, "he was reeling from exhaustion, being compelled to lean upon a chair for support."\textsuperscript{324}

The atmosphere generated at the Democratic nominee's meetings gave further insight into a specific campaigning method. He insisted that his political gatherings were "public forums" and not political rallies. A reporter observed that they adopted "the

\textsuperscript{323} As quoted in Louisville \textit{Evening Post}, October 4, 1920.

\textsuperscript{324} Cincinnati \textit{Enquirer}, October 30, 1920.
spirit and the outward appearance of a religious crusade." Cox talked about extending "the Eighth Commandment," opposing the substitution of "the creed of Cain for the creed of Christ," and applying "the parable of the good Samaritan." Reportedly, he was "preaching the gospel of ratification," employing "the spirit of the evangelistic revival," inviting clergymen to participate in his "forums," and picturing Harding "as the Levite who 'passed on the other side.'" A Republican editorial branded these evangelical, emotional appeals as "sob stuff." Apparently, Cox not only wanted to prove that he was a more vigorous and a more active campaigner than Harding; but, that he was the more ethical and the more righteous of the Presidential candidates.

Although Harding left his "front porch" in September, Roosevelt's October addresses persisted in scorning the abbreviated activity of the GOP nominee. Previously, he noted the Republican's refusal to cross the Mississippi River. At Greeley, Colorado, October 7, he declared, "It is obvious now that the Republican nominee for the Presidency is not going West of the Missouri River,
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328 Wheeling Intelligencer, October 12, 1920.
and in fact is only going as far West as Kansas City, Missouri." He was forced to retreat from his Mississippi reference because Harding started a four-day western trip the same day FDR visited Colorado. Both the "Missouri River" and the "Kansas City" references proved to be erroneous. The Senator spoke in Oklahoma City on October 9, an area lying west of Kansas City. In going directly from Kansas City to Oklahoma City, he had to cross the Missouri. Possibly, FDR meant to indicate that the Senator would not visit the Pacific Coast, but this fact did not correct his geographical error.

In mid-October, he condemned Harding's Baltimore conduct when "a man in the audience asked a question and got thrown into jail for doing it." Two nights later, he surmised that Harding injured his chances considerably by taking to the stump and spouting contradictory statements. After noting "the disgusting episode of the cartoon published in the current issue of Harvey's Weekly," the Democrat "recognized in many of Senator Harding's carefully prepared addresses a close resemblance to the writings

331 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 10, 1920.
332 Ibid., October 9-10, 1920.
334 Ibid., Grand Rapids, Michigan, October 18, 1920, p. 4.
Thus, as the campaign passed into its final phases, Roosevelt said less about the inactivity of Republican nominees and more about the futility of their public addresses.

Therefore, in considering issues, it was important to analyze not only what the nominees said, but how they presented these ideas to the populace. The Republican "front porch" method was an issue in itself during the months of August and September. It became a less controversial point when Harding, and even Coolidge, consented to make short trips into certain areas. But the GOP candidates never attempted an extended tour which matched their rivals. Harding was challenged to debate Cox, but Senator New replied, "I would not consider a proposition so utterly absurd." Undoubtedly, the opposition's contempt for the open expression of ideas annoyed the Democrats. Cox and Roosevelt attempted to capitalize on their policy of presenting themselves "before the people," and to advertise the evasive conduct of their opponents. Certainly, this factor influenced the presentation and content of 1920 political oratory.

A later writer reviewed the advantages reaped by the GOP method:

---

336 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 15, 1920.
The moment Harding made up his mind to stick as closely as possible to the front porch he had tucked under his arm a whole collection of advantages over his opponent. Not the least of these, and I speak of it first, was that he did not have to make unprepared utterances or wear his good sense, his restraint and his own estimate of values into pathetic frazzles by being kept everlastingly trying to silver-tongue corporal's guards of listeners. When he was going to speak to a group the next morning he could hand the press correspondents a written speech to put on the wire the night before. Under these conditions there is no chance for the slips and breaks made by any man who is tired through talking.337

Governmental Efficiency

The term "efficient" government means utilizing "the specialist, the commission, or the expert consultant" in order to effect financial economy and greater proficiency.338 Woodrow Wilson, unlike most progressives, did not believe in this type of "efficient" government.339 The term "governmental efficiency," as used in this section, relates to the reorganization of Federal departments, methods, or procedures.

337 Sait, American Parties and Elections, p. 622. Sait is quoting Behind the Scenes in Politics by an anonymous author, p. 75.


339 Ibid.
The Republican platform recalled the Senate Naval investigations and advocated the establishment of a budget along with departmental reorganization. \(^{340}\) The Democratic platform scoffed at "Fifty 'Smelling Committees'" that failed to find a single scandal, and it only concurred in the GOP recommendation for a budget system. \(^{341}\) Both Presidential candidates repeated their respective platform provisions on this subject without going into detail. \(^{342}\)

New York State Republicans showed an interest in emphasizing "economy in government" prior to the campaign. \(^{343}\) Harding came out for "more businesslike" methods in government, but a New York Times editorial centered the blame on the GOP for inaction in this area. \(^{344}\) However, a weekly magazine placed the blame on the Democrats by declaring:

On the other hand certainly no progress has been made in the direction of reorganizing the departments during the Democratic regime — the war vastly extended and complicated the situation, which was bad enough, and the President, it may be ventured, has not taken advantage of the Overman Act to effect reorganization and the


\(^{342}\) Ibid., p. 63; Republican Campaign Text-Book, p. 49.


\(^{344}\) Ibid., July 29, 1920.
Democrats have not manifested either so much interest or ability in grappling with the problem as have the Republicans. 345

The demand for greater efficiency in governmental operations seemed to be in order. There was considerable talk about the "billions of dollars" spent by the Democrats on war preparations. 346 Also, the cost of collecting the growing tax receipts was estimated at fifty per cent of each dollar. 347 Such defects were treated, ordinarily, under the "Wilsonism" arguments. Neither Presidential aspirant suggested solutions to these problems.

In one of his final pre-election speeches, Harding opposed government waste, Article X, and Woodrow Wilson. 348 Sympathetic Democratic accounts praised Cox's gubernatorial record, which revealed his support for a budget system, prison reform, a compulsory workmen's compensation act, and an anti-lobby law. 349 But, in the 1920 campaign, neither major Presidential prospect offered either specific or general solutions to eliminate waste and inefficiency. Harding took a stand for departmental reorganization, but he apparently never strongly pressed this point.


346 For example, see Wheeling Intelligencer, September 16, 1920.

347 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 11, 1920.

348 Ibid., October 29, 1920.

Immediately after the nominations, Howe urged FDR to "make business administration keynote of your speaking," and to emphasize "the work of putting government departments upon a business basis as well as eliminating the more archaic Senatorial rules . . . ." The candidate's recommendations, which won bipartisan praise, were enumerated in a published letter as follows:

1. Create a true budget system, not the small beginning already attempted.
2. Consolidate the appropriations in one general committee, with sub-committees to deal with the separate subjects.
3. Put into law the general principles recommended by the Reclassification Committee's report, together with the authorization of adequate salaries of Government employees.
4. Invite a conference with the executive branch of the Government looking to a reclassification and redistribution of the work of the departments.
5. Give by law greater authority to the heads of the executive departments in conducting their executive business . . . .

Harding's ideas on governmental reorganization never were expressed as clearly as FDR's, but the New York Times pointed to the similarity of their general viewpoint. Cox, in offering only a budget system, seemingly, differed with his running mate as well as his opponent. On this one point, Roosevelt's acceptance

---

350 Telegram, Howe to FDR, July 7, 1920.
352 August 1, 1920.
speech brazenly declared "that the government machinery requires reorganization. The system, especially since the war, has become antiquated. No mere budget system, much as we need that, will correct the faults."  

Although given a clean bill of health by the investigating committees, FDR's approval of the Navy Department's "spending orgy ... of gross extravagance and mis-management" was mentioned by GOP speakers, such as Congressman Britten. The Republicans either discounted, or overlooked, this apparent opportunity to show a lack of Democratic harmony on the subject.

While campaigning in the East, FDR was highly critical of current, Federal, employment conditions. At Augusta, Maine, he declared, "There are too many government employes for the work which has to be done .... people doing the same kind of work are called by dozens of different titles and receive dozens of varieties of pay." Yet, he blamed these circumstances, and many more, on a Republican Congress which "has left the same old system


354 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 27, 1920.

The GOP press response followed this pattern of rebuttal:

Frankie Roosevelt told his Maine audiences that he favored the weeding out of inefficient clerks in the Federal service and the cutting down of the force. The Democratic administration have had a chance to do that very thing ever since the war ended . . . . It was the denial by a Republican Congress of the extravagant demands of the administration for funds for the present fiscal year that is resulting now in the discharge of thousands of unnecessary clerks from the departments . . . . In view of the actual accomplishments of the Republicans, Mr. Roosevelt's wordy protestations fail to convince.357

Touring through his home state several days later, the Vice-Presidential nominee directly challenged congressional management:

But government reform should certainly not stop with the Departments. The legislative methods themselves are far more antiquated and wasteful considering the cost of the Congress of the United States to the tax-payers of the country. It is an unwieldly, unbusinesslike and badly organized body . . . . playing politics and filling thousands of pages of the Congressional Record with speeches which have never been delivered . . . .358

A month later, he developed similar points in declaring, "Congress should be the first body in our government to be


Giving instances of government inefficiency, he cited the divisions of responsibility for Alaskan bears, with the war department being in charge of the black bears, the department of agriculture being guardian of the brown bears, the department of commerce looking after the interests of the Cadiac bears, a new species, and finally the department of interior watching over the rest of the bears.

He went on to state that the War Department operated a larger navy than the Navy Department controlled, and, in reality, the United States maintained five separate navies.

However, the major parties did not differ on the "efficient" government topic. In fact, Roosevelt's speeches revealed his close agreement with the Republican platform in this area, except for his numerous attacks on the GOP Congress. His denunciation of contemporary inefficiencies were bound to reflect adversely on two consecutive terms of Democratic executive control. Rather than expend excessive effort in defending Congress, the Republican campaigners could have shown the difference between Cox and Roosevelt in emphasizing "governmental efficiency." If Cox was forced to concur with his running mate on the need to alter Federal inadequacies, possibly he could have been led into renouncing a

---

359 As quoted in Cleveland News, October 20, 1920.
360 As quoted in Ibid.
361 Ibid.
considerable portion of the Wilson system. But this circumstance was not forthcoming, and "efficient" government never became a thriving campaign issue.

Progressivism

Party leaders forecasted a 1920 controversy over the continuation of so-called "progressive" legislation. Without bothering to define the term, they attempted to gain the ballots of former Progressive Party members and independent voters. In 1920, the progressives lacked liberal reform proposals upon which to build a national following. One Democratic editorial admitted, "If his [Bryan's] platform of 1896 or 1900 were spread out today, but few planks would be found that have not been enacted into the laws under the very Republican administrations which he could not overthrow." Wilson supported still more progressive ideas, and apparently the 1920 campaigners were hesitant to oppose political doctrine which proved to be popular during the early twentieth century. Anyone who scorned "progress" was called "reactionary," and the Democrats immediately identified him with the Mark Hanna-William McKinley era.

[^363]: Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.
[^364]: Hapgood, The Independent, CIII, 40.
identification by claiming that the McKinley brand implied someone highly progressive. Whatever "progressivism" might mean to the individual voter, both major parties claimed to be its sole friend and exponent.

The Democratic hierarchy became quite exuberant on this subject, and developed different shades of opinion regarding the emphasis to be placed on "progress." The new chairman, George White, saw the independent vote as a "controlling factor" in the election and declared, "The campaign will determine whether the country wishes to return from progressive, forward-looking principles of government to a reactionary regime." The outgoing chairman, Homer Cummings, predicted the League of Nations would be the major issue, but White foresaw "progressivism" as a dominant force over any consideration of the League. In revealing the Democratic slogan, "Peace, Progress, and Prosperity," the new chairman reduced the League to "a secondary chief issue." He further attempted to define "progressivism" as a strong appeal to the "laboring class," with a special emphasis on such things as "workingmen's compensation, good roads," and those measures found

365 Talcott Williams, "The Republican Tide for Harding," The Independent, CIII (July 10, 1920), 43.
367 As quoted in Ibid., July 27; 30, 1920.
in Cox's gubernatorial record. The following day, an editorial singled out White's "elastic" term, "progressivism," and felt that he reversed "the decisions of the convention" by subordinating the League issue. With Cox "inclined to progressive policies," his program was to embody a "spirit of progress."

Democratic strategy in the West envisioned the necessity of closely identifying their candidates with progressive ideals. In Seattle, Cox spoke about "progress vs. reaction"; in Portland, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco, he developed "progressivism"; in Idaho and eastern Oregon, he referred to "peace and progress"; and in Cheyenne and Omaha, he talked about "progress." He even praised Hiram Johnson, the California Republican, expressing respect for his "candor" in opposing "reaction," and noting Johnson's fight for ex-President Roosevelt. Cox hinted that, if elected, he would include Herbert Hoover in his Cabinet.

---

368 As quoted in Ibid., July 30, 1920.
369 Ibid., July 31, 1920.
372 As quoted in Wheeling Register, September 12-28, 1920.
373 As quoted in Ibid., September 18, 1920.
374 Ibid., September 19, 1920.
Lawrence disagreed with the need for the Governor's western progressive overtures:

Much of his [Cox's] talk of progressivism was sound doctrine, but in reality, it is old stuff to the west. They passed their workmen's compensation laws years ago. It is incredible to them that anybody should argue progressivism.

That's the line of thought in the northwest and when confronted with the Cox charge that Harding is reactionary, the significant thing is that the people out here want concrete proof of Harding reactionaryism and they don't like to see one candidate knocking the other.

... The West might have been aroused on a moral issue if Cox had one to present; if he had allowed his campaign managers to discuss Mr. Harding and if he had confined himself to clear[-]cut statements about what he would do that the Wilson administration hasn't done.375

Cox tried to praise the Democratic progressive philosophy of William Jennings Bryan376 and the Republican progressive philosophy of former President Theodore Roosevelt.377 Several days later, a prominent Democratic newspaper preferred to think of Bryan as one possessing "lofty altruism" and "superlative idiocy."378 The same publication eulogized the deceased Republican as: "Roosevelt the

375Hartford Times, September 17, 1920.
376Editorial, Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.
377Louisville Evening Post, October 9, 1920.
378Editorial, Cincinnati Enquirer, October 20, 1920.
soldier, Roosevelt the statesman, Roosevelt the man of letters — in each capacity he proved himself the strenuous and forceful agent of unqualified democracy." The Democratic Text Book "proved" GOP incompetence in the Spanish-American War by using the "Rough Rider's" own words. Furthermore, it printed excerpts from Harding's Marion [Ohio] Star which referred to Teddy as "lawless, insincere, selfish, and unscrupulous." Therefore, in 1920 the Democrats were confused, and often embarrassed, by the prominent progressives in their own ranks; yet, they made a vigorous attempt to capture the image of the great "Bull Moose," the Republican progressive supreme, the bitter opponent of Woodrow Wilson.

Viewing the unfolding strategy with alarm, Harding reminded Cox of his pledge to follow Wilson's foreign policy. He also snapped up White's "progressivism" remarks as proof of the opposition's intent to "soft pedal" the League of Nations issue. The Republican press retorted, "Harding is the true progressive this year, because he is seeking to re[-]establish the responsibility of Presidents and parties to the masses of American

---

380 Pp. 221-222.
381 As quoted, p. 269.
Nevertheless, Harding never became preoccupied with the "progress vs. reaction" controversy.

Apparently following a master Democratic plan, FDR developed many "progressive" points. His acceptance address answered the GOP cry for "normalcy" with the reminder that the "'good old days' are gone past forever"; and recommended that the new women voters "throw their weight into the scale of progress." He preceded Cox into the West, and promised "a continuation of progress." In Tacoma, Washington, he identified a "reactionary" as a member "of that little group which for many years has been in close touch with special interests throughout the Nation and has shown by its whole record that it cares more for its pockets and domination of the Country by a few select friends than it does for the broad interest of the people throughout the Nation." At San Francisco, he indicated that "the really big fundamental difference between the candidates" and "between the party platforms in

---

385 Carbon typescript (complete), in Ibid., Chicago, Illinois, August 11, 1920, p. 11.
this campaign . . . is the question of progress against reaction."387 Returning eastward to Delphi and Monticello, Indiana, he stated, "The big issue of this campaign is progressivism vs. reactionism."388

Roosevelt continued to expound "the fundamental of progress versus reaction" in the East, by contrasting the Democratic position of "going forward" to the Republican program of "turning back" in "the march of progress."389 This same conflict within the GOP "in 1912 made necessary the revolt of the progressive element of the party."390 The attempt to win the support of former Progressive Party members was unmistakably clear. Immediately thereafter, in Boston, he paid glowing tribute to "the far-seeing, Progressive Republicans in the House and Senate."391 These were not to be confused with "the little knot of selfish Senators," which included Senator Harding, "who all their lives had fought a

---


388 As quoted in Indianapolis News, August 30, 1920.


390 Ibid., Worcester, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 2.

391 Ibid., Boston, Massachusetts, September 15, 1920, p. 3.
losing battle against progress."^392 Trying to isolate these undesirables in his final pre-election press statement, FDR told how "the Republican managers have shown a synical [sic] and contemptuous disregard of everything that progressives have stood for in both parties."^393

Like Cox, he tried to use the Teddy Roosevelt popularity against the GOP. One instance, among many, occurred at Cumberland, Maryland, when he declared on his uncle's birthday anniversary, "I wish Theodore Roosevelt were alive today. He at least had definite convictions. He was not afraid to take a position and maintain it. He never wobbled."^394 FDR conveniently ignored Teddy's heated criticism of Woodrow Wilson, and it was "impossible for anyone in his right mind to suppose that Theodore Roosevelt would be giving any comfort to the Democratic party, if he were alive today."^395

Summing up this entire encounter from the Democratic point of view, one editorial declared:

---

^392 Ibid., New York City, October 30, 1920, p. 3.
^393 Ibid., October 31, 1920, p. 1.
^394 Ibid., Cumberland, Maryland, October 27, 1920, p. 2.
Democratic progress vs. Republican reaction is the issue which includes all issues. It fits with admirable precision every question at stake in the campaign, national and international, domestic or of foreign policy. The League of Nations is the league of progress — progress of civilization, progress of humanity, progress of justice, progress of right. Rejection of the League of Nations is world reaction, reaction against all the higher instincts and nobler aspirations of mankind, reaction against peace, reaction against law, substitution of war for peace, of disintegration and havoc for prosperity and order.596

If these thoughts are accepted, "progressivism" became an all-inclusive generality and not a specific issue.

Regardless of their feverish efforts, the Democratic campaigners were plagued, as in many other cases, with resentment against the President. A later historian, Herbert F. Margulies, found in Wisconsin that "the name 'Wilson' was far from synonymous with either reform or 'idealism.'" He observed that Wilson did not look progressive when "war-bond quotas were arbitrarily prescribed and enforced by extra-legal committees, persons were ostracized and persecuted in the courts for the expression of opinion; newspapers were banned from the mails . . . . It was Harding who benefited from the wave of discontent among progressive Republicans and Democrats."397 Therefore, FDR's reputation of

396 Buffalo Times, September 25, 1920.

being "an out-and-out Progressive Democrat" likely worked to his disadvantage on election day.

The country was not receptive to "progress" in 1920. The Democratic nominees found their program unpalatable in view of Wilson's Administration. Ironically, Roosevelt left much the same feeling after his death in 1945. At that time, one biographer noted: "If it [the country] was not tired of Roosevelt the Just, it was tired of Roosevelt the Doer; it wanted now no doers; it wanted relaxers in the high positions of state." And so it was after FDR's first national campaign, with Harding and the Republicans as the chosen "relaxers" in 1920.

"Progressivism" was not an issue. Many words were written and spoken in an effort to develop a neat concept of "progress versus reaction." But these efforts only produced symptoms of the real underlying controversies, which usually involved the League of Nations, the protective tariff, or the Democratic Administration.

---


Summary

From the economic subjects, which involved capital, labor, and agriculture, only one question became an issue in 1920. The Democrats desired a continuation of tariff for revenue only, while the Republicans requested a return to the high protective tables.

Although the country was enmeshed in complicated social problems, no campaign issues in this area were forthcoming.

On the other hand, political subjects suggested four clear-cut issues to the nominees. First, the Democrats asked for America's immediate entry into the League of Nations, with only minor reservations. The Republicans vacillated on this subject, sometimes opposing the League, sometimes recommending the formation of "an association of nations," but never assenting to the country's membership in the world organization then in operation.

Second, the Administration, popularly referred to as "Wilsonism," became an issue. The Democrats gave lip service to their party's record of service, admitting the necessity for only a few corrections. The Republicans launched a bitter campaign against Wilson, declaring that his entire executive effort resulted in monstrous failure.

Third, the Democrats charged their opponents with unethical campaign financing in collecting a huge "slush fund," and insinuated frequent violations of the Corrupt Practices Act. Of
course, the GOP denied the charges and the issue was pursued less intensely as the campaign progressed.

Fourth, campaigning methods, which evolved from Democratic ill-regard for the Republican "front porch" campaign, briskly developed into an early issue. It subsided and took on other characteristics as Harding, and later Coolidge, made short speaking tours into several sections of the country.

Other economic, social, and political subjects resulted in minor disputes, but never blazed into heated issues. Possibly, the League of Nations controversy became the dominant issue; however, it was not the sole consideration of the 1920 campaigners.

What became of these, and other, political disagreements in the twenties? Russel B. Nye surmised, "If a survey had been made of all the issues and problems current in American life during the period of 1920 to 1928, it would have concluded that not a single one was handled, if at all, with any energy or efficiency." 400

Many critics accused the major party leaders with evading the issues. The nominees were also busy leveling such charges at each other in 1920. Arthur N. Holcombe observed, "The bipartisan system, its critics say, results in a series of sham battles between two rival sets of politicians, in which those who cast the bulk of the ballots have little to gain beyond the satisfaction

400 *Midwestern Progressive Politics*, p. 320.
of participating on the winning side. Holcombe felt that this system left the voter little choice.

This observation leads to the final consideration. Regardless of the number of issues observed, it must be admitted that the nominees on both sides often devoted considerable effort to evading a direct ideological clash. Was such a practice detrimental to the body politic? Edward McChesney Sait, in analyzing individual party practices, attempted to justify the practice:

In the first place, they are capitalist parties in the sense that they adhere to the existing social régime and resolutely oppose the collectivist or communist solution . . . . In the second place, assuming that the parties entertain hopes of more or less immediate success at the polls, they must propose only what has, according to reasonable expectation, some chance of acceptance by the majority of the voters . . . . if in America the platforms of the major parties are sometimes very much alike, the explanation is that on most political questions no party could take a different line without abandoning its expectations of victory.

Regardless of personal opinion, these explanations may clarify, in part, why the multiple economic and social questions were left virtually untouched in 1920.

401 The Political Parties of To-day: A Study in Republican and Democratic Politics (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1924), p. 313.

402 American Parties and Elections, pp. 202-204.
CHAPTER III

FDR'S SPEECH PREPARATION, CAMPAIGN OF 1920

Introduction

Thonssen and Baird observe, "The preparation and background that the speaker brings to the process of logical invention figures strongly in the determination of argumentative soundness and integrity." Chapter One of this study revealed the major aspects in Franklin D. Roosevelt's national political background. The second chapter investigated the issues which evolved in 1920.

The authors of Speech Criticism further explain: "Fuller appreciation of a speaker and his speeches results from acquiring insight into the way he went about preparing his talks." This chapter deals specifically with Roosevelt's preparation of those speeches that he delivered in the 1920 campaign.

The nominee surrounded himself with his initial group of speech writers, critics, and advisors. This practice became a rather permanent, and controversial, adjunct to his future speech preparation procedures.

---


2Ibid., p. 436.
In order to present a clearer understanding of Roosevelt's speech preparation, and the men involved, this chapter is divided as follows: The "advance man," the secretariat, sources of ideas, writing the speeches, and the itinerary.

The "Advance Man"

FDR's unsuccessful excursion into the arena of national politics promoted a close association between himself and a young wire service correspondent, Stephen T. Early. This thirty-two year old Virginian was a member of the United Press, Washington staff, 1908-13; an Associated Press reporter, Washington office, 1913-17; and an infantry captain during World War I. He rejoined the Associated Press at the conclusion of hostilities.3 "Observant and capable,"4 he was a serious worker, alternately described as being "a big, good-looking Irishman," yet, "brilliant and brittle."5


Early eventually became press secretary for Roosevelt during his Presidential years, and was destined to remain a close confidant longer than any other intimate advisor. Unlike later New Deal personalities, not one member of the 1920 campaign party ever produced a published account of his experiences. But Early's papers, interspersed with the Roosevelt documents, offer invaluable information concerning the campaign. The Louis McHenry Howe papers, located in a separate file at Hyde Park, yield additional material.

The practice of using an observer to precede a political campaigner was not new. Governor Cox, the Democratic nominee for President in 1920, was employing a similar maneuver in his own campaign. However, the use of coded messages to relay numerous facts and suggestions to a speaker several days, or even several hours, before his entry into a state was probably unique at this time.

This section investigates three aspects of Roosevelt's 1920 "advance man": his duties, his coded communications, and his general contributions. The term "advance man" is used frequently in letters, telegrams, and memoranda of the period.

---

7Letter, McCarthy to Early, September 4, 1920. All letters, memoranda, speeches, itineraries, telegrams, and press releases referred to herein are located in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.
Duties of the "Advance Man"

Franklin D. Roosevelt decided to run an extremely active campaign for office in 1920. This effort represented perhaps the most energetic Vice-Presidential campaign of all time.

In order to carry out the endeavor, an agent was chosen to precede the speaker and to report his findings directly to the candidate. Late in October, as the tour throughout a major portion of the country drew to a close, the "advance man" summarized his duties as follows:

By 'advance work' he [FDR] means to see that there is no conflict between State schedule and his itinerary; that transportation facilities are arranged either by train or automobile, according to itineraries; that arrangements be made for meals for the party . . .

In addition[,] any information of sufficient importance relative to local conditions, political, industrial[,] etc. should be given Mr. Roosevelt in advance of his arrival at any given place.8

The first paragraph includes some of the routine and mechanical duties involved. However, the final statement deals with items of observation and research that had to be noted, evaluated, and concisely reported or discarded as being of no significance. In order for the plan to be effective, an intelligent and qualified observer had to be selected carefully.

8Memorandum, Early to McCarthy, October 25, 1920.
Stephen T. Early was described by Roosevelt as "the ideal man for me to have on my speaking tour, and I cannot think of anyone else who exactly meets the qualifications I require." Correspondence during the campaign clearly indicates that Steve Early had won, also, the respect and confidence of Roosevelt's trusted secretary, Louis McHenry Howe. Therefore arrangements were made for Early to take a leave of absence, which was later extended to include practically the entire campaign.

Steve Early was one member of a campaign team. His messages were relayed to the railway car, "Westboro," carrying the Roosevelt staff, including Marvin H. McIntyre, publicity man and speech writer from the National Committee; Renah F. Camalier, secretary; James P. Sullivan, stenographer; and Thomas M. Lynch, transportation agent. Louis Howe accompanied FDR on the second trip into the West, "working up speeches and assisting in the publicity." During the remainder of the campaign, Howe stayed in Washington to aid Gordon Woodbury, Roosevelt's replacement as Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Charles H. McCarthy, a former

---

10 "FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920"; "Howe Papers."
11 Memorandum, Early to McCarthy, October 25, 1920.
12 Letter, FDR to White, October 8, 1920.
assistant in the Navy Department, directed the national campaign headquarters in New York City, handling most of the routine correspondence. Early actively corresponded with FDR, McIntyre, McCarthy, and Howe during the campaign.  

The "advance man" contacted newspapermen, politicians, businessmen, and the general public; however, the brief, rear platform addresses did not receive as thorough "advance work" as the major addresses in large cities. Nevertheless, Early always tried to keep "the Boss" well-informed on any current facts, or rumors, pertaining to a specific locale. In addition to identifying a problem, he frequently attempted to suggest the solution that seemed to be the most feasible one at the time. After surveying the arrangements, the political climate, and the general conditions, the "advance man" composed an analysis of each prospective speaking engagement.

On numerous occasions, Early assisted local committees in preparation for the candidate's appearance. Those in charge of arrangements in Chicago, Kenosha, Racine, and Milwaukee, did not know when Mr. Roosevelt was scheduled to arrive.  

Democrats in Bismarck, North Dakota, were "sorely disappointed" over being

---

13 "FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920"; "Howe Papers."

14 Letter, Early to Howe, August 10, 1920, "Howe Papers."
neglected in a revised itinerary of the state. As a possible solution, a "rear end platform speech" was "strongly" advised. The candidate was informed that the itinerary for Pittsfield, Massachusetts, "arrives you here one hour too late," being based on standard rather than daylight saving time. A correction was imperative in order to obtain an audience. At Dunkirk, New York, Early regarded it "impossible" to get a crowd because of a rival Republican gathering, while the Washington and Oregon arrangements provoked outright feuding between Democratic officials of the two states, with the "advance man" in a rather unenviable position. The Washington itinerary was recommended. Three days later he lamented, "I do not know yet what the Boss did in Washington." Newspapers of the period clearly reveal that Early's advice concerning the change in itinerary was accepted without the slightest alteration. The "advance man" assisted in resolving all of the aforementioned problems prior to the candidate's arrival.

15 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 14, 1920.
16 Telegram, Early to FDR, September 12, 1920.
17 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 20, 1920, "Howe Papers."
18 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 19, 1920.
19 Letter, Early to Howe, August 22, 1920.
As indicated, many obstacles involved with local arrangements often grew directly from the local political climate. Factional difficulties became apparent and Early found that two opposing groups were planning to converge on Albany, New York, and "kidnap the Boss," returning him to Schenectady as an indication of FDR's personal endorsement. Early recommended that "the two delegations, if possible, should be united and return as one."²⁰

In Springfield, Massachusetts, he noted "bad blood" existing between two local party officials; in Cincinnati, there was a race issue in the state ticket; and the situation in Cleveland made it "inadvisable" to discuss local conditions or candidates.²¹

There were other delicate problems involving arrangements. Referring to a later Presidential campaign, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman reviewed some of the "nice questions of protocol which might seem trivial," but in reality were quite important, as follows:

Which local politicians would ride on the campaign train from one station to another; whom the President would talk with between and at various stops; who would be on the rear platform with him when he made extemporaneous speeches at stations . . . . These little details never occur to the newspaper reader who sees a picture of the President on the rear

²⁰Telegram, Early to McIntyre, September 19, 1920, "Howe Papers."

²¹Telegrams, Early to FDR, September 13; October 15; 19, 1920.
platform of the train surrounded by six or seven people, or who reads that State Committeeman John Jones got on at one station and got off at another in order to make way for Congressman James Smith. All this, however, is carefully prearranged, and President Roosevelt used to take a keen personal interest in the arrangements; whenever he had the time, he would participate in them himself. 22

Steve Early had to take "a keen personal interest" in such arrangements in 1920. Most of his telegrams gave specific instructions concerning private and public meetings. In Montana, Governor Stewart and Lieutenant Governor McDowell joined FDR at Billings and accompanied him to Butte. 23 Before moving into Syracuse, the candidate was informed that "Kelly meet you Oneida also Hitchcock"; at Rochester, "Hiram Wood Democratic nominee Congress will preside and joins your party at Victor"; the Clarksburg, West Virginia, delegation "meets you Grafton returning home"; then the Charleston, West Virginia, delegation "meets you" at Point Pleasant. 24 In addition, Early arranged meetings with prominent local personalities. At Salt Lake City, the candidate was instructed to see "C W Penrose LDS Church Office A W Ives Zion Saving Bank Culbert Lothon Judge Bldg"; in Indianapolis, Walter Myers, "who made seconding speech for your nomination,"


23 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 16, 1920.

24 Telegrams, Early to FDR, September 21; 22; 27; 29, 1920.
desired a conference; and FDR was to telegraph for an engagement "with Rev Lucius W Thayer Mrs Mary I Wood Miss Martha Kimball," Republican leaders in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. On the other hand, he was instructed to refrain from supporting, contacting, or making any public reference to John T. McGraw of West Virginia. Available correspondence indicates that the nominee apparently never challenged a single one of these, or similar, recommendations.

Local arrangements and politics had to be considered secondary to the national political situation. Correspondence during this period voiced open pessimism concerning Democratic chances at the polls in November. As the country clamored for "a change," the leading Democrat, Woodrow Wilson, remained in sickroom seclusion at the White House. Such topics as the League of Nations, prohibition, agriculture, governmental control of industries, taxation, tariffs, and even Wilson's administration provoked points of controversy. In addition to the two major political camps, the Single Tax Party, the Socialist Party, the Socialist-Labor Party, the Farmer-Labor Party, the American Party, the Prohibition Party, remnants of the old Progressive Party, and

---

25 Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 25; 30; Early to McCarthy, September 11, 1920.

26 Telegram, Early to FDR, September 27, 1920.
the ever-present independents operated in varying degrees of strength throughout the country.

The key issue, the League of Nations, introduced an international flavor into the campaign. In Worcester, Massachusetts, Early called FDR's attention to 20,000 Irishmen, 30,000 Swedes, 12,000 Frenchmen, and 20,000 Italians, concluding that a majority were against the League. At Grand Rapids, Michigan, he noted that the Dutch, the Poles, the Irish, and the Germans were all "off reservation," or opposed to the League. Early found the conditions in Boston duplicated in many areas, "Irish strength must be considered in majority as hostile" to the League of Nations.

Other subjects likewise were a matter of national concern. In Minneapolis, Early telegraphed that the Anti-Saloon League "controls state"; while he indicated that prohibition sentiment in Manchester, New Hampshire, was divided between wet and dry. In Omaha, Nebraska, FDR was asked to "review Democratic record on agriculture"; Clarksburg, West Virginia, awaited a speech treating, in addition to the League of Nations, war

---

27. Telegram, Early to FDR, September 13, 1920.
28. Telegram, Early to FDR, October 17, 1920.
29. Telegram, Early to FDR, September 12, 1920.
30. Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 11; September 12, 1920.
expenditures, profiteers, and high taxes; Charleston, West Virginia, was "anxious for something on deflation of currency"; while at Syracuse, he was requested to "make drive on reactionary policies Republican party"; and, from Massachusetts, "Tariff is issue . . . Your tariff statement would be timely . . ." The bitterness toward the Wilson Administration was intense in many areas. From Sioux Falls, South Dakota, Early summed up his feelings by stating succinctly, "I wish he [Wilson] would give free reins to Cox & R. If the people here could be told that Wilson had stepped aside, it would mean a lot of votes." However, as a former member of the Wilson Administration, FDR was politically helpless to resolve this dilemma.

In comparison with the political issues, the general conditions suggested not only subjects to be developed, but gave FDR an opportunity to express his governmental philosophy more freely. Early was cognizant of this fruitful area of development and constantly called Roosevelt's attention to such topics as natural resources, women voters, cost of living, and labor conditions. In Fargo, North Dakota, part of the grain crop of the previous year was "unmarketed . . . confidence in Federal

31 Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 27; September 27; 29; 21; 13, 1920.

32 Letter, Early to Howe, August 12, 1920.
Reserve to attend situation plus statement that Administration is alive to troubles would have cheering effect through state."\textsuperscript{33} Billings, Montana, felt that the Federal government should give special recognition to the development of its resources. "Suggest something on irrigation figuratively moving Montana nearer coasts \textsuperscript{[sic]}."\textsuperscript{34} At Crawfordsville, Indiana, the advance representative asked Roosevelt to make an appeal for female support inasmuch as there were "more women registered this county than men."\textsuperscript{35} The high cost of living was a "knotty problem" in Portland, Oregon, and the candidate should "offer something . . . good agricultural program needed."\textsuperscript{36} The workers in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, "dislike Saturday half holiday without pay . . . workers do not understand they had representative on board."\textsuperscript{37}

The "advance man" assumed additional obligations other than those involved with arrangements, politics, or general conditions. Following national controversy over a speech Mr. Roosevelt delivered at Butte, Montana, Mr. Early attempted to convince Associated Press officials to assign a regular staff correspondent

\textsuperscript{33}Telegram, Early to FDR, August 14, 1920.
\textsuperscript{34}Telegram, Early to FDR, August 15, 1920.
\textsuperscript{35}Telegram, Early to FDR, October 11, 1920.
\textsuperscript{36}Telegram, Early to FDR, August 19, 1920.
\textsuperscript{37}Telegram, Early to FDR, September 11, 1920.
to accompany the candidate "in order that it might not be placed in the position of misrepresenting Mr. Roosevelt." His appeal could have had some effect. The Associated Press assigned a political reporter, Stanley Prenosil, to cover the second tour into the West. The "advance man" was observant of any news outlets providing favorable publicity. His messages called the campaigner's attention to friendly editors, or newspapers, that should be accommodated with copies of a proposed speech. However, with apparent disgust, the former correspondent noted, "There is nothing approaching a Democratic newspaper in Seattle." A bank director had mentioned the fact that the Post-Intelligencer "could be bought and was a good proposition commercially without regard to its political value in this campaign." A similar situation existed in Syracuse; but there was no suggestion that a local newspaper was for sale.

Material for speeches was in constant demand. On one occasion, Early wrote, "Suggest that you refer to Wilson's Seattle speech of last summer"; and, in Indianapolis, he called attention

38 Memorandum, Early to Howe, September 8, 1920.
40 Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.
41 Letter, Early to Howe, September 21, 1920, "Howe Papers."
to a nineteenth century speech, "The Holy Sepulcher," delivered by Senator Daniel W. Voorhees of Indiana. Also, Early relayed information relative to recent speeches by members of the opposing party. From Spokane he wrote, "Senator Borah speaks tonight in Cour [sic] d'Alene [Idaho]. Have arranged for his speech to be taken and a copy of it delivered to your train before you arrive at Rathdrum." At Wheeling, after listening to Senator Harding, Early sent a long telegram explaining the Republican's "chief points," and emphasized that the speaker received a "big" demonstration "from packed auditorium."

The forerunner's crowded schedule offered only a few opportunities for him to observe the Vice-Presidential prospect in action. However, he used these occasions to mingle in the audience, listening to the auditors' reactions, and later offering suggestions relative to the speaker's delivery and conduct. In Minnesota, he observed that "the Boss . . . is speaking easier, going good and will be a finished product of oratory before we see New York again." At Billings, the speaker was informed,

---


43 Letter, Early to McIntyre, August 17, 1920.

44 Telegram, Early to FDR, September 28, 1920.

45 Letter, Early to Howe, August 14, 1920.
"Montana asks rough[,] ready stuff"; in Deer Lodge, Montana, a "rough[,] peppy[,] Americanism speech" seemed in order, plus a "snappy appearance at Anaconda with typical Roosevelt conduct before six thousand."46 Later in the campaign, it was reported, "Boston wants to see the Boss in his FIGHTING togs"; and Martinsburg, West Virginia, would require a "good mixing exhibition."47 Although these comments lack the preciseness of technical language that may be preferred, they, nevertheless, portray some indication of the vocal and physical delivery, as well as social practices, expected from the campaigner.

The Coded Communications

The telegram below represents one of the messages transmitted to Vice-Presidential candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt during his 1920 campaign. Forty-one telegrams of this type are extant in the Roosevelt Library, covering the campaign trail across the United States from August through October:

A591NA 214 NL 1/70 1920 AUG 11 PM 9 58
MINNEAPOLIS MINN 12
FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT
TRAIN 155 C & NW RY DUE 415PM MILWAUKEE WIS
FOR MCINTYRE COLON TELEGRAPH TRIBUNE DAILY NEWS JOURNAL
ASSOCIATED UNITED AND WESTERN NEWSPAPER UNION 200 NORTH
THIRD STREET MINNEAPOLIS ALSO PIONEER EXPRESS DISPATCH

46 Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 15; 16, 1920.

47 Letter, Early to McIntyre, September 14; Telegram, Early to FDR, September 27, 1920.
Stephen Early was faced with transmitting many facts and suggestions to Franklin D. Roosevelt's rapidly pursuing campaign train; to Charles H. McCarthy in New York City; and, for two-thirds of the campaign, to Louis Howe in Washington. Most of his contact with Howe and McCarthy was accomplished through the mail, while a major portion of his communications with McIntyre and Roosevelt involved relaying information by telegraph. No available source discloses the origin or purpose of the code. Apparently, a concise, relatively inexpensive system of communication was desired. A simple code not only solved these problems,
but provided an element of secrecy as well. With these symbols, the reader can decipher the preceding telegram. Although its author is unknown, a copy of the following code is available at the Roosevelt Library:

Sentiment decidedly wet .................. Black
Sentiment divided on wet and dry ........ White
Sentiment decidedly dry .................. Blue
Urge pledge yourself ................... Green
Do not support or make public reference.. Red
Advisable to see ........................ ONE (1)
Should not see .......................... TWO (2)
Telegraph for engagements with .......... THREE (3)
Democrats [sic] here ..................... FOUR (4)
Republicans here ....................... FIVE (5)
Non-partisans ........................... SIX (6)
Factional differences exist which you should evade ...................... SEVEN (7)
Capital................................ EIGHT (8)
Labor .................................. NINE (9)
League of Nations ...................... TEN (10)
Farmers ................................ ELEVEN (11)
You will be urged ....................... TWELVE (12)
You will be urged to endorse .......... THIRTEEN (13)
Progressive ............................ FOURTEEN (14)
Independent ................................ FIFTEEN (15)
Profiteers .............................. SIXTEEN (16)
High cost of living ..................... SEVENTEEN (17)
High taxes repulsive .................... EIGHTEEN (18)
Believe should be more equitably levied. NINETEEN (19)

The coded messages varied in length and followed no set pattern of organization. Each one usually included references to the physical, political, or general conditions of several locales within a particular state. Often an informative remark was followed by a specific suggestion. The prospective audience not

---

49 "Howe Papers."
only was analyzed, but appropriate topics, major points, and sources were mentioned. A portion of this material was transferred into code and telegraphed to the candidate.

The colors were chosen quite logically to represent symbolically the longer messages. The reader thinks of "red" as connoting danger; "blue" as being prudish, or relating to "blue laws"; and "green" as signaling "OK," or in a "go condition." The difference between "semi[-]black," which appeared only once, and "white" never was clarified. Evidently, "ten" was selected as the symbol for the League inasmuch as Article Ten of the Covenant presented the major point of political controversy. The remaining numbers apparently were assigned at random.

The five colors and nineteen numbers were used liberally in Early's transmissions. For some mysterious reason, "twenty" appeared in two messages. The context implies reference to a branch of labor. In another telegram, "twenty[-]four" and "twenty[-]five" were used to identify speakers by number rather than by name. These dispatches are the only examples on file indicating later additions to the code.

---

50 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 11, 1920.
51 Telegrams, Early to FDR, September 27; October 11, 1920.
52 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 10, 1920.
A record of an occasional telephone conversation is available, however, due to the exigencies of national campaigning in 1920, the telegraph provided the most practical means of communication at Early's disposal. These coded telegrams offer an excellent indication of the observations made by Roosevelt's "advance man."

General Contributions of the "Advance Man"

Any evaluation of Steve Early's role in 1920 must, necessarily, consider his contributions to the candidate's major goals. Although he lost, Roosevelt found it to be a "damn fine sail."

The experience offered the future President a chance to become acquainted with many community problems first-hand; to form political friendships and associations which helped him in the later national campaigns; and to obtain valuable public

---

53 For example, see Memorandum, McCarthy to FDR, September 11, 1920.


speaking experience. This final consideration led Roosevelt to remark, prior to his 1932 western tour, "I am glad that I had that 1920 experience, otherwise I should be worried by the prospect . . .".

Steve Early's coded communications introduced FDR to many of the community problems and political associates. These same telegrams also furnished the candidate with ideas and material that ultimately appeared in actual speeches. Careful scrutiny of the telegrams, the speech manuscripts, and the reports in contemporary newspapers make it possible to trace directly the influence of the "advance man."

FDR needed publicity. Referring to national campaigns, in general, one historian concluded that "it is impossible to secure the most effective newspaper publicity. The fragmentary remarks delivered from the tail-end of a car or the more formal speeches, in which the tired mind, incapable of developing new thoughts,

---


58 As quoted in Carroll Kilpatrick, editor, Roosevelt and Daniels: A Friendship in Politics (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1952), p. 120.

59 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
traverses familiar ground, yield little copy to the corres-
pondents." The many acquaintances of a wire service reporter
helped to provide coverage that, otherwise, may have been
nonexistent. From Seattle Early noted, "Have been to the papers
personally today and the Times and P I both will carry a story
tomorrow on the Boss' arrival Friday. I was desperate." In
Chicago, there were "facilities for handling any press matter you
desire . . . It will be mimeographed and mailed [to] two hundred
papers" in the area. A number of the acquaintances offered
confidential information that was passed on to the candidate prior
to his arrival. At times, the "advance man" asked the campaign
party to give select newsmen special consideration. He advised,
"Wire city editors Cleveland Press afternoon Scripps paper and
Plain Dealer morning paper both friendly inviting representa-
tive[s] be you[r] guests while here." After 1932, his attitude

---

60 Edward McChesney Sait, American Parties and Elections
61 Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.
62 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 10, 1920.
63 For examples, see Letter, Early to Howe, August 10;
Telegram, Early to FDR, September 13, 1920.
64 For example, see Telegram, Early to FDR, September 22,
1920.
65 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 19, 1920.
toward favoritism changed markedly. Grace Tully remarked, "Press Secretary Steve Early had cautioned the President strongly from the beginning against the habit of treating some of the press on a more favored basis than the entire group." Obviously, twelve years later, he was not "desperate" for publicity. Early's efforts could have aided the candidate in obtaining a "good press" even in some Republican newspapers. Furthermore, his knowledge of newspaper deadline requirements assisted in gaining outlets for publicity that may have gone unnoticed.

Overlooking Early's influence at this time, many biographers have miscalculated seriously the number of speeches Roosevelt delivered. Most writers have assumed eight hundred to one thousand speeches were presented. Itineraries on file appear to confirm this estimate. However, the telegrams reveal the number of times Early made alterations in the itinerary immediately prior to the candidate's arrival. In the final pre-election address, Mr. Roosevelt claimed a record by delivering 469 speeches during the

---


67 For examples, see Telegram, Early to FDR, August 9, "Speech File"; Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.

68 For example, see Telegram, Manchester [New Hampshire] Mirror to McIntyre, September 12, 1920.

69 "FDR Itineraries, Campaign of 1920."
campaign. After careful perusal, even this total appears to be a liberal estimate. Furthermore, writers tend to classify Early as only a publicity man or a reporter. Of course, he contributed markedly in both of these areas, but he also authored numerous and important suggestions. Only Freidel seems to appreciate some of Early's personal contributions. Seemingly, because Stephen Early left no separate collection of personal papers, or authored no autobiography, historians have neglected to record fully his contributions during this significant period of Roosevelt's public life.

However, it is erroneous to imply that the "advance man" was either infallible in his judgments or non-emotional in his observations. He elatedly reported that "the political man of the A. P.," after traveling through Wisconsin, Missouri, and Indiana, "says that in his opinion Harding's selection has boosted the chances 100% for a Democratic victory." A week later, he declared enthusiastically, "From the mountain tops of Butte, I today proclaim Montana for the Democracy." Montana voted almost


71 Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal, p. 79.

72 Letter, Early to Howe, August 10, 1920, "Howe Papers."

73 Letter, Early to Howe, August 16, 1920.
two-to-one in support of the Republican nominee in November, as he easily carried all states outside of the "solid South." Concerning the League issue, Early predicted Irish opposition in many states, leading him to contend, "New Hampshire is hopeless." Yet, he exercised wishful thinking by asking later, "Who can tell now what an Irishman will do 6 weeks hence?" Political expediency replaced absolute accuracy when he recommended telling the new women voters that "they owe their right to vote to the Democrats." The suffrage amendment was a product of bi-partisan support. After observing laxity on the part of Democratic leaders in New York, he curtly ended one letter by inquiring, "Can something be done to stimulate interest in the Cox-Roosevelt campaign?" Noting the anti-prohibition attitude in Chicago, the forward observer humorously concluded that the people were "actually satisfied with supply on hand. Best you use red."

74 Letter, Early to Howe, September 12, 1920.
75 Letter, Early to Howe, September 19, 1920, "Howe Papers."
76 Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.
77 Letter, Early to Howe, September 21, 1920, "Howe Papers."
78 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 9, 1920, "Speech File."
Finally, the campaign enriched the political and geographical knowledge of the man who was to become a Presidential secretary from 1933 to 1945. The experience undoubtedly developed his appreciation of the problems and the difficulties involved in campaigning. According to Judge Rosenman, this knowledge and experience paid dividends during the New Deal period when Early served as the Chief Executive's unofficial speech critic and advisor. Soon after the 1920 campaign opened, he evaluated his own role as follows: "Things that I have been able to arrange would have caused real embarrassment had there been no man ahead and the main party should have arrived and found conditions as I did ... The job is a real one and keeps you on the jump every moment and on the train every night." In requesting an extension of the former correspondent's leave of absence, Louis Howe maintained, "Mr. Early has been of absolutely inestimable service to Mr. Roosevelt ... "

Early's contributions remain significant even when analyzed forty years in retrospect:

1. The coded messages described, and sometimes altered, the speaker's schedule, transportation, and accommodations.

---

79 Working with Roosevelt, p. 453.
80 Letter, Early to Howe, August 10, 1920, "Howe Papers."
81 Letter, Howe to Bailey, August 24, 1920.
2. The campaigner's delivery was evaluated and platform decorum for future addresses was recommended.

3. The telegrams suggested speech topics, constructive speech material, rebuttal arguments, and sources of information.

4. Appropriate comments were advanced regarding the specific audience and occasion. Popular opinion on key issues was predicted in various geographical areas. Local factional differences usually were arbitrated to insure overt harmony.

5. Favorable publicity outlets were recruited to inform the electorate of FDR's appearance.

The individual undertaking so many duties directly involving the speaker, the proposed speech, the audience, and the occasion is an invaluable participant in any political endeavor. Early demonstrated an acute ability to perform the assignment successfully. Frequently, his many suggestions were adopted in Roosevelt's addresses and policies. His influence during the candidate's first national campaign is probably more penetrating than studies have heretofore indicated. Nevertheless, in being removed physically from the speaking performance, the obscure Virginian lacked glamour and attention, usually going unnoticed when a final summation of the campaign was made. In appointing him press secretary, unofficial speech critic, and forecaster of
For services rendered, Stephen T. Early was reimbursed for his expenses totaling $1615.65.83 This investment now seems meager when compared to the contributions of Roosevelt's 1920 "advance man."

The Secretariat

Certainly Steve Early was an important member of Roosevelt's secretariat at this time. But his unique contributions were reviewed separately in order to show how they were peculiarly different, in many respects, from those of the remaining secretarial members.

Charles Willis Thompson, writing in mid-August, 1920, made the following comments relative to the proposed campaign of Governor Cox:

When the newspaper reader reads, he probably thinks of Cox or whoever may be the candidate as traveling around by himself, with perhaps a secretary. The truth is that a Presidential tour is rather a grand affair, even with such a man as Bryan, who seeks to reduce it to the lowest terms. The candidate usually has to have more than one

82 Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, p. 453; Tully, F. D. R. My Boss, p. 94.

83 Letters, Early to FDR, November 10; FDR to Early, December 21, 1920.
stenographer, since nobody can take several speeches a day in shorthand and hope to have them ready in time, and besides his duties are not limited to taking speeches but to being at the candidate's beck and call whenever an idea strikes him and taking rough drafts in advance. The stenographers on such trips have to be men far above the ordinary.

Then the National Committee usually or frequently has somebody along. There is a man to look after the itinerary and keep the National Committee in its place, if it can be done. There is a secretary or two, unless the stenographer supplies that place, as he does if the candidate has enough confidence in him.84

From the standpoint of personnel, this analysis rather accurately describes the Roosevelt staff. Apparently, he succeeded in obtaining "men far above the ordinary," because a biographer noted "that the campaign gave him opportunity to build up what became a permanent secretariat."85 This section will recount the duties and the contributions of Marvin H. McIntyre, Louis McHenry Howe, Charles H. McCarthy, Renah F. Camalier, James P. Sullivan, and Thomas M. Lynch, during the 1920 campaign.

Marvin H. McIntyre

Marvin Hunter McIntyre, slightly less than three years the candidate's senior, was born at La Grange, Kentucky, and attended Vanderbilt University. He was engaged by railroad and banking


firms before going into newspaper work in 1908. In 1918, the Kentuckian became special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy in charge of public relations. He remained in this position two years after the Republican landslide of 1920. "Running mate [to Early] McIntyre was a different breed of Southerner. Happy go lucky and fond of people," his associates considered him to be "lovable and affable." With Roosevelt specializing in labor negotiations, the two men worked together on numerous occasions in the Navy Department. McIntyre was a member of the secretariat until his death in 1943, functioning as the appointment secretary from "the day Roosevelt entered the White House." The exact duties of the Kentuckian in 1920 are difficult to determine. Freidel characterized him as the one "who took charge of speech writing and publicity on the train"; Hatch said that he "managed the car"; and Burns cautiously classified him as "a general assistant," which could be a valid description.

86 Who's Who in America, XXII (1942), 1504.
89 Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, pp. 410-411.
90 Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal, p. 78.
91 Franklin D. Roosevelt, p. 123.
of any subordinate party worker. At any rate, he was the man from "the National Committee," and served as the liaison between party headquarters and the nominee. Due to the shortage of material, some speculation is unavoidable in defining McIntyre's specific duties. However, extant correspondence emphasized his responsibilities in the following areas: 1. speech writing; 2. publicity; 3. miscellaneous jobs, such as those entailing correspondence, itinerary, and expenditures.

Speech planning and writing was the foremost task of those on the "Westboro." The telegraphic message in the preceding section is prefaced with the words, "For McIntyre." More than half of the existing telegrams from Early to FDR bear this inscription, which indicated the Kentuckian's paramount role in speech development. Most of the earlier telegrams begin in this manner. Possibly, the campaigners took it for granted that later messages would be handed directly to "Mac," or, in Early's haste to relay information, the designation could have been forgotten.

These telegrams usually described the number of speeches to be delivered at a specific locale; the time limits for each; the anticipated audiences; the topics of interest; the points to be developed, or avoided; and the sources for certain arguments. Following these directions, and using previously prepared

---

93 Letter, FDR to White, October 8, 1920.
material, McIntyre proceeded to collaborate with FDR and the available assistants in planning, developing, and typing future addresses.  

McIntyre's speech efforts did not end with the production of the manuscript. Regarding a group of Presidential addresses, Earnest Brandenburg relates, "Copies of Roosevelt's speeches were released to the press before they were actually delivered ..."  

This practice was not uncommon in 1920. Early's telegrams contained many directions similar to the following: "New[s]papers ask advance speech ... If possible mail advance special delivery to Roy C Kates Managing Editor Times Union"; "Essential advance speech for here"; "... paper here asks full advance as early as possible"; "... please have advance speech ready ... state headquarters requests extra copies for distribution to small state papers." Texts of complete addresses and extracts from proposed speeches many times carried the inscription: "Release

---

94 This procedure is described more explicitly in the next two sections of this chapter.

95 "The Preparation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Speeches," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXV (April, 1949), 221.

96 Telegrams, Early to FDR, September 22; 27; 28; 29, 1920.

97 For example, see carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Chicago, Illinois, August 11, 1920, 12 pp.

98 For example, see carbon typescript (extracts), in Ibid., Helena, Montana, August 18, 1920, 4 pp.
Sometimes McIntyre passed out the texts of forthcoming addresses to the news media immediately upon arrival in a city. After he distributed extracts in Hartford, Connecticut, a local Republican publication complained that FDR did not "deliver an address anything like the propaganda contained in the prepared copy." However, this response was not typical. If other publications had similar complaints, their expressions were not put into print.

Speeches did not command all of McIntyre's attention. He also prepared and distributed press statements; tapped new publicity outlets; coordinated meetings between the candidate and local celebrities; and ordered political material for numerous committees. Departing from a strenuous Indiana tour, McIntyre was asked to "wire personal message greeting to people [of] Ohio upon your entry [into] state." On top of his pressing duties in Dayton, Ohio, he was expected to "Wire tonight two hundred word statement" to the Cleveland Press. On occasion, being experienced in this endeavor, he wrote up a full newspaper report of a Roosevelt appearance, complete with extracts from the

---

99 Hartford Courant, September 18, 1920.
100 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 15, 1920.
101 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 19, 1920.
In New Hampshire, he was asked to call the Manchester Mirror and to report the "Portsmouth doings by noon if possible," because the editor was "shorthanded men." McIntyre promptly complied with this request. The Wheeling Register was assured that "H.M. [sic] McIntyre newspaper man with Mr. Roosevelt will give you resume" of the West Virginia addresses. The following message from the Pueblo, Colorado, Star Journal is typical of the requests for advanced publicity: "Have your press department shoot me some dope from now until you arrive ..." This one paper was asking for a steady supply of data eight days prior to Roosevelt's arrival. Scrawled on the bottom of the telegram were these words: "Sent to McIntyre to comply with request." Of course, the campaigners welcomed all publicity outlets, but such demands were particularly time

102 For example, see carbon typescript of press release, in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Brooklyn, New York, September 6, 1920, 4 pp.

103 Telegram, Manchester Mirror to McIntyre, September 12, 1920.

104 Telegram, Early to FDR, September 12, 1920.

105 Telegram, McIntyre to Manchester Mirror, September 12, 1920.

106 Telegram, McCarthy to Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.

107 Telegram, McCafferty to FDR, September 26, 1920.
Yet, "Mac" found time to write "to all of the movie people asking them as a personal favor" to cover certain FDR political meetings.\textsuperscript{108} An International Film Service Company executive was impressed to the point of declaring that the nominee "should be congratulated on having a live publicity man."\textsuperscript{109}

Early's telegrams introduced many local personalities who could materially assist the campaigner in cities and junctions along the route. McIntyre supervised the meetings and appointments between these people and the nominee. During the 1932 and 1936 campaigns, he "was a marvel of tact and firmness in these matters."\textsuperscript{110} With no evidence to the contrary, he probably was equally efficient in 1920.

There was a constant demand for campaign literature, posters, and buttons. The "advance man" passed these appeals to the "Westboro," and "Mac" had to requisition them from national headquarters. Early's first telegram noted: "Absolutely essential that [Bourke] Cochran have literature including acceptance speeches [and] platform poster photographs distributed immediately [to] all advance points stop Great demand by local committees who [are]\textsuperscript{108, 109, 110}

\textsuperscript{108}Letter, McIntyre to McCarthy, September 3, 1920.
\textsuperscript{109}Letter, Hertrick to McIntyre, September 7, 1920.
\textsuperscript{110}Rosenman, \textit{Working with Roosevelt}, p. 113.
entirely without such material stop Wire Cochran that effect."\textsuperscript{111}

Midway into the final campaign month, the "advance man" continued to issue similar appeals.\textsuperscript{112}

Besides speech writing and publicity, McIntyre assumed miscellaneous obligations, such as those which involved correspondence, itinerary, and expenditures. A staggering volume of letters and telegrams from public and private sources was forwarded to the railway car. Routine matters were handled by the secretary and the stenographer on board. But, as manager of the car and as representative of the National Committee, undoubtedly many of the more serious items were brought to McIntyre's attention.\textsuperscript{113}

The speaker's itinerary was a constant and nagging difficulty. As previously noted, Early recommended alterations in many states and made a few changes on his own. A constant flow of "tentative" itineraries were typed in New York City and forwarded to the "Westboro." Many Democratic officials and private citizens became self-appointed "experts" on "where" and "when" the campaign

\textsuperscript{111} Telegram, Early to FDR, August 10, 1920, "Speech File."

\textsuperscript{112} For example, see Telegram, Early to FDR, October 14, 1920.

\textsuperscript{113} A closer investigation of this aspect is described under "Charles H. McCarthy" in this section.
party should travel. They seemed to exercise extreme dexterity and initiative in making their wishes known. McIntyre, haunted with multiple problems already, evolved as the arbiter of these disputes. He coordinated Early's alterations with Mr. Roosevelt's final decision, and in the meantime attempted to pacify disconsolate committeemen, headquarters officials, and "booster club" chairmen. Apparently, the itinerary was confused sufficiently by the end of the first western trip to necessitate McIntyre's personal attention in New York, while the candidate took a brief vacation off the coast of Maine. From Eastport, Roosevelt telegraphed his requests directly to the Kentuckian. On one occasion, McCarthy, in a five-page letter addressed to McIntyre, detailed "the changes he [FDR] wants made if possible." These messages indicated McIntyre's significant place in the area of schedule planning.

Democratic campaign headquarters should have assumed complete control and responsibility of financial obligations. Yet, in regard to Early's expense account, the New York office decided

114 For a fuller description, see "The Itinerary" in this section.

115 Telegram, FDR to McIntyre, September 8, 1920.

"to hold it until Monday, and take it up with McIntyre."\textsuperscript{117} It can easily be concluded that the Hyde Park Democrat contributed substantially to the pecuniary support of his political adventure.\textsuperscript{118} "Mac" apparently had some control over these disbursements.

In summary, the major duties of the Kentuckian could be divided as follows:

1. Speeches - Early's reports had to be collected and carefully interpreted; material had to be catalogued and filed; "suggestions" from many sources had to be coordinated; press sentiment from all sections had to be noted; strategy of the opposition, as well as that of Cox, had to be checked; final speech drafts had to be written, edited, and typed.

2. Publicity - News items had to be prepared and released; politicians, newspapermen, photographers, and influential citizens had to be greeted at every stop; campaign material for local committees had to be requisitioned from national headquarters.

3. Miscellaneous obligations - Correspondence had to be answered; changes in the itinerary had to be made; some control over expenditures had to be maintained.

\textsuperscript{117}Letter, McCarthy to Early, September 4, 1920.

\textsuperscript{118}Letter, FDR to White, October 8, 1920, shows a contribution of $5,000.
These were the major problems Marvin Hunter McIntyre endured and found to be his constant companions for three long months. Considering the total lack of experience in national campaigning shared by himself and his colleagues, he did an outstanding job. The greatest tribute to his success came in 1932, when he "was in charge of the train" once more.\textsuperscript{119} McIntyre's "sound judgment . . . made him particularly valuable," recalled Sam Rosenman. Furthermore, he "was able to pick up much news about people in official and semiofficial circles that never got into the papers. Unswervingly loyal, he was one of the few men who would frankly speak his mind to the 'Boss' even though what he had to say was thoroughly unpleasant."\textsuperscript{120} Unquestionably, the 1920 experience markedly enhanced the value of his future contributions.

\textbf{Louis McHenry Howe}

Louis McHenry Howe was the third newspaperman directly involved in FDR's 1920 campaign. He was affiliated with the New York Herald from 1888 to 1915, became an assistant in the Navy Department, and served as Roosevelt's personal secretary until his death in 1936.\textsuperscript{121} He worked closely with the budding politician

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} Stiles, \textit{The Man Behind Roosevelt}, p. 208.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Working with Roosevelt, p. 411.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Who's Who in America, XVIII (1934), 1212; \textit{Ibid.}, XIX (1936), 1242.
\end{itemize}
during the Albany days, and successfully managed FDR's 1912 re-election to the State Senate while the candidate lay bedridden with typhoid fever. Understanding and appreciating the power of the press, he "was forced to use political methods never before experienced by the residents of the Hudson Valley," which included full-page advertisements in local newspapers, posters, pamphlets, and letters. Like Josephus Daniels, another newspaperman, "Howe had a great influence on F. D. R., teaching him many facts of political life and making him see that his appeal had to be to many segments of the population." But Louis was not always efficient in handling the minor, everyday details of the Assistant Secretary's office. Writing to his wife in 1916, FDR confided, "Howe goes to Newfoundland tomorrow and I shall try to clean up his back work for him! He is so wonderful on the big things that he lets the routine slide."

Sam Rosenman confessed, "Louis Howe was the strangest person I met around Roosevelt. He had only one loyalty in life — and it was a kind of religion — Franklin D. Roosevelt ... His

---


124 Kilpatrick, Roosevelt and Daniels, pp. vii.

125 As quoted in Elliott Roosevelt, F. D. R. His Personal Letters, II, 330.
own family and his own private life had been completely submerged in the service of his hero." This service, in 1920, included remaining in Washington during August and September to help familiarize FDR's successor, Gordon Woodbury, with his new job; then, joining his chief during the final month of the tour.

There is some disagreement concerning the volume of Howe's political activity in Washington during the first two campaign junkets. A later biographer contended, "Louis settled down happily to watch the daily papers and the Navy pressroom ticker . . ." Another maintained, "Louis was master-minding like crazy." The available correspondence indicates that neither writer accurately visualized Howe's functions at this time. The "short, gnarled, gnome-like, hard-bitten" creature did not become a mere spectator, neither did he actively participate in the campaign with his customary vigor.

Early kept him well-informed about popular sentiment along the route, and often forwarded copies of his coded telegrams.

126 Working with Roosevelt, pp. 24-25.
129 Gosnell, Champion Campaigner, p. 44.
130 For examples, see Letters, Early to Howe, August 14; 16, 1920.
The "advance man" also notified Howe of confidential efforts to obtain full-time Associated Press coverage for FDR. Others briefed him on the developments at headquarters. These letters frequently bore sad and bitter news. For example, one observer concluded:

Evidently they are at sea up there; have no effective organization, no plans that are worth while and everybody is just twiddling their thumbs and marking time.

... If anything worth while is going to be accomplished, somebody who has the ability must get on the job immediately and straighten out this proposition. It is useless for me or any other man to go up there and take any piece-meal part in such a disjointed outfit.132

However, his source of information apparently procrastinated as the "Westboro" left Connecticut and moved the nominee into the Empire State. He briskly expressed his sentiments as follows:

For heaven's sake, give me some information about what is doing in New York State. Are they going to have a separate organization, and if so, who is going to be in charge, and what is doing anyhow? I can't make head or tail about this madhouse of a campaign although I am supposed to be kept closely in touch, etc. etc., with everything that is going on.133

131 Letter, Early to Howe, September 8, 1920.
132 Letter, Sague to Howe, August 31, 1920, "Howe Papers."
Howe was upset over his isolation from the electioneering excitement. In a letter to FDR, Charles McCarthy offered the following solution:

Of course, you know what you want to do the best, but my candid opinion is that Howe knows more about the game than the whole bunch put together here . . . . He could either take charge of Headquarters or I could still remain the nominal head and carry out the executive part of the work, but have him here where he could tell some of these people what to do and to nose around and find out what is not being done.134

This plea never was heeded. With the Republican charges of war extravagance and the congressional investigations of the Navy Department fresh in the public eye, perhaps Roosevelt left Howe in Washington to protect the former Assistant Secretary's past record.

In the meantime, Louis devoted his spare moments to the campaign. McCarthy sent him the following "reminder of a few things you want to do":

1. Write an article on Mr. Roosevelt for the Republican Italian newspaper of New York. You can do this better than I can[;] they want it within the next four or five days.

2. Send on list of those sending letters of congratulations or telegrams— that is, those who may want to carry their good wishes into practical effect— Also their addresses.

3. Have [Fred] Pryor [a clerical assistant] send me those index cards. Also have him get from my office all those Congressional Records and send

134 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, August 27, 1920. Author's italics.
them on by parcel post in separate packages. They contain much good information.

4. Have you the New York State Red Book containing the names of State Senators and Representatives.[?] If so, please let me have it; if not, be good enough to let me know where I can get it. 135

Howe also tried to improve the nominee's newspaper publicity, successfully requested an extension on Early's leave of absence, and on occasion helped to rearrange FDR's itinerary. 136

Joining the party on the final tour, Howe offered some ideas regarding the source and content of future speeches. He scribbled, "This ought to be kept handy for speech [sic] data," on the face of Labor's eleven page analysis of the Democratic platform, and prepared texts for speeches in draft form. But these comments frequently embodied the telegraphed responses of the "advance man." Louis also discussed approaching political meetings with his "Westboro" colleagues; however, his main efforts were devoted to

135 Letter, McCarthy to Howe, August 11, 1920, "Howe Papers." Author's italics.

136 Letter, McCarthy to Howe, August 20, 1920, "Howe Papers."

137 Letter, Howe to Bailey, August 24, 1920.

138 Letters, McCarthy to FDR, August 27; Early to Howe, September 21, 1920, "Howe Papers."

139 Gompers, Valentine, Green, and Woll to Editors, July 13, 1920.

140 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
cultivating the friendship of Mrs. Roosevelt, who began her national campaign experience on this final western trip. He taught her to respect newspapermen, discussed speeches with her, indoctrinated her in the fundamentals of electioneering, and took her on a short sight-seeing excursion.  

Viewed in retrospect, his long-range contributions became significant, but Early and McIntyre exercised far greater overall effect on this campaign than Howe. This strange man, who became known as "that crabby little guy from Fall River," "The Secret High Inquisitor," "The Roving Political Brain Cell," and "The President's Other I," kept up an active correspondence with the 1920 Democratic officials throughout the country. These acquaintances became the "selected list of 2000" during the 1928-1932 campaigns, and were instrumental in putting FDR into the White House. Like Early, Howe "never hesitated to argue" with the Boss "when he thought 'Franklin' was harming his own political advancement. He probably said No to Roosevelt more frequently and loudly than anyone else, and stuck to his position longer." But, unlike Early, "Howe did not play an important part in framing major policies."  

141 Eleanor Roosevelt, This Is My Story, pp. 314-319.  
143 Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, p. 25.
Charles H. McCarthy

When he joined the Navy Department, Roosevelt "inherited" Charles H. McCarthy as his personal secretary. Later, Howe came to Washington as FDR's private secretary, and little time elapsed before "he and McCarthy began to get in each other's way and there were clashes between them. Each was efficient in his own field, but often there were disagreements as to the areas of those fields."144 This friction was apparent during the 1920 campaign. While the Assistant Secretary used Howe to take care of "the big things," he needed "a thoroughgoing hack without brilliancy like the faithful McCarthy to keep things running."145 McCarthy later resigned his Naval duties to become a member of the Emergency Fleet Corporation,146 then, rejoined his former boss as manager of the New York headquarters during the Vice-Presidential campaign.

McCarthy's contributions involved four distinct areas: speech materials; itinerary; publicity; and routine administrative management.

First, in the area of speech materials, the campaign manager forwarded sources, supplied ideas for speech content, and furnished

144 Stiles, The Man Behind Roosevelt, p. 42.
145 As quoted in Elliott Roosevelt, F. D. R. His Personal Letters, II, 330.
audience responses to speeches as the "Westboro" moved from state to state. Across his desk flowed an enormous volume of correspondence and only a selected amount can be analyzed in this section. Private citizens often submitted sources, such as one from Indianapolis who enclosed pages from the *Congressional Record* relating to Harding's "dollar wheat" remarks. These were acknowledged, corrected, and forwarded to FDR.  

On one occasion, Early called after listening to a Coolidge speech in Boston, and McCarthy forwarded the "advance man's" report, plus appropriate press clippings. Also, the manager was alert for sources in and around New York. He sent a steady stream of letters and telegrams which quoted newspaper reports, described personal interviews, named the GOP leaders supporting Cox, identified major religious leaders who favored the League, and summarized recent Democratic speeches. He also sent two copies of *The Democratic Text Book* and supplied the Speakers' Bureau with similar items for use by other party speakers. These materials apparently were useful to the nominee. He wired an

147 Letter, Stuart to FDR, August 21, 1920.

148 Memorandum, McCarthy to FDR, September 11, 1920.

149 For examples, see Letters, McCarthy to FDR, September 14; October 15; Telegrams, McCarthy to FDR, August 24; October 9, 13; 15; 22, 1920.

150 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, September 13; Memorandum, McCarthy to Harrison, September 13, 1920.
assistant in the Navy Department to mail "all editorial clippings you have received" to McCarthy. Then, "Mac" was asked to "bring all New York data available," along with the editorials, in order to give FDR a "complete" briefing on the "New York situation before we start." Then, "Mac" was asked to "bring all New York data available," along with the editorials, in order to give FDR a "complete" briefing on the "New York situation before we start." 152

Ideas for speech content often originated through private correspondence and found their way to the "Westboro." McCarthy read these letters and usually attached a personal note before forwarding them. Referring to a Missouri writer's remarks, he concluded, "This man may be a 'nut' but just the same there is a pretty good suggestion for a speech or part of a speech in Saint Louis, and information on this could be got by Howe in Washington." 153 Concerning a humorous tale by an Alabama Republican, he noted: "Mc:--This is a corking good story. In forwarding it to the Boss suggest to him that he write the man a real personal letter. Perhaps we will convert him yet." 154

A Poughkeepsie, New York, housewife's handwritten letter received an unusual amount of attention. The key paragraph read as follows:

151 Telegram, FDR to Pryor, October 16, 1920.
152 Telegram, FDR to McCarthy, October 16, 1920.
153 Letter, Cumberland to FDR, August 10, 1920.
154 Letter, Bolton to FDR, August 17, 1920.
My husband has always been an old-fashioned dyed-in-the-wool republican [sic]. He has believed the lies and ravings of the republican [sic] politicians until a few nights ago when I read Article X to him and then left him alone with the copy of the League Covenant. Nothing more was said until this morning when he quietly remarked[,] 'I guess I'll have to vote for Cox and Roosevelt. Harding and his gang are fools to think they can deceive the people like this.'

McCarthy acquired the author's permission to publish the letter "without signature," and wired a copy to FDR at Terre Haute, Indiana. The next day, he sent the original transmission, "which is a gem, and explains the situation exactly as it is." In addition, he tried to get it printed "in as many of the New York papers as possible." Immediately recognizing its potential, Roosevelt used the material in a major address at Cincinnati, as follows:

Why let me tell you about the telegram that came to me yesterday, from New England. I will read it to you, and it is from a woman[,] an independent voter back in my own county on the Hudson River. I had known all along that she was favorable to the cause of the League of Nations, but I did not know how her husband was going to vote, ans [sic] she sent me this telegram, and it explains itself . . . . I take off my hat to that woman, I take off my hat to any

---

155 Letter, Bedell to FDR, October 9, 1920.
156 Telegrams, McCarthy to Bedell, October 11; Bedell to McCarthy, October 11; McCarthy to FDR, October 13, 1920.
157 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 14, 1920.
158 Letter, McCarthy to Bedell, October 13, 1920.
woman who has the courage and the nerve to leave her beloved husband all alone with a copy of the League of Nations' Covenant. It was taking great chances, but I will end your suspense and tell you that it all ended well, for while that dangerous Covenant won out against hubby, he survived, too, and the next morning -- it goes on and says, 'nothing more was said until this morning, when he quietly remarked, "I guess I will have to vote for Cox and Roosevelt."

The speaker not only used a private source supplied by McCarthy's office, but rather freely "adapted" the material to fit his own needs. He conveniently developed a sudden acquaintance with the writer, converted a rabid Democrat into "an independent voter," and received a "telegram" rather than a letter. He probably used this example more flippantly than the serious McCarthy intended. Several days later, his Dayton, Ohio, appearance was reported as follows:

The crowd shook with laughter when Roosevelt read a telegram he received from a woman who converted her husband to the league, to drive home his point on the non-partisan view people are taking. The telegram said the woman had left her husband alone with a copy of the league for one whole night. The next morning he told her that he would be compelled to vote for Cox and Roosevelt.

'Just think,' the speaker said, 'This woman left her own beloved husband alone with a copy of that dangerous document. But it all came out right, and they lived happily ever after.'

159 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Cincinnati, Ohio, October 16, 1920, p. 4.
After the audience had subsided Roosevelt continued his discussion of the swing of votes to the Governor.  

The woman reported the incident to encourage a wider distribution of the League Covenant. McCarthy forwarded it to support his argument for the expenditure of more money in New York. Yet, the campaigner treated it lightly, even though he wrote to the housewife: "I am awfully glad to have your letter; I have used it several times in my speeches, without, of course, giving the name of the writer . . . " A week later, the notes for FDR's final major speech reminded him to read the "Husband a Repub" message.  

McCarthy volunteered many of his own ideas for speeches, and several were adopted by the campaigner. His correspondence often reflected extreme degrees of optimism and pessimism. Feeling that conditions were "improving wonderfully" on October 13, he declared, "General opinion here is we will get large silent republican [sic] vote because of League." Possibly grasping this idea, the nominee's Dayton, Ohio, speech of October 19, declared that "men and women in every section of the Country and in every walk of

161 Letter, FDR to Bedell, October 24, 1920.
163 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 13, 1920.
life . . . have kept silent and have watched the progress of the campaign. Now they are coming out openly and showing the result of their silent thought." He telegraphed Cox from Middletown, New York, that "the so-called silent vote has been changing to an outspoken Democratic volley." Six nights later at New York City's Hotel Commodore, he said "that the silent vote of the country . . . is now asserting itself and is making certain the victory of Governor Cox . . . ."

McCarthy's spirits continued to soar as several prominent Republicans came out for Cox. Therefore, he rushed off a second telegram on October 13, and happily declared, "The slogan should be from now on[:] Everybody[']s doing it." Three days later, the Hamilton, Ohio, speech manuscript included the following paragraph:

The signs multiply. I cannot take up a paper in big towns or little towns without finding more lists of people, Republicans, Progressives and Independents, who are switching from Harding to Cox. The new slogan, based on this tremendous

---


167 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 13, 1920.
overturn in sentiment, is going to be from now on—"Everybody is doing it." 168

By apparently presenting this idea extemporaneously, FDR probably strayed from the prepared text. A local newspaper reported:

Roosevelt also attempted to discredit all straw vote figures on the tide of the voting with the statement that 'everybody is flopping to Cox,' and declared that Cox and himself would have almost the entire Republican[,] Democrat and Progressive vote in November. 169

This identical "Everybody is doing it" reference was included in the Port Jervis, New York, manuscript a week after the Hamilton speech. 170 The local paper published the released extracts verbatim, and failed to indicate any changes made by the speaker. 171 In an advanced greeting to the Cincinnati people, Roosevelt wired:

"The new slogan seems to be 'Everybody is doing it.' I refer to the tremendous overturn to Governor Cox that is going on." 172

Portions of a McCarthy telegram, dated October 12, were underlined, edited, and well-worn from possible use by the

172 Cincinnati Post, October 16, 1920.
campaigner. One statement contended, "Great uneasiness at
opponents' quarters and it is believe[d] they are praying for the
hands of the clock to move faster." Seemingly, this passage
influenced the thought and the language employed in several
succeeding speeches. The Niagara Falls manuscript stated "that the
real 'old crowd' Republican managers are dashing madly about
proclaiming their wish that the election might take place tomorrow
instead of the week after next." Adhering more closely to the
McCarty statement, the Binghamton, New York, text mentioned, "The
prayer of Republican leaders that the Election might be held
tomorrow, continues to be heard. Those in the inner circles are
literally panic-stricken over what the next week will bring
forth." An extract from the Kingston, New York, speech noted,
"In the camp of the Republican managers conditions akin to panic
have appeared." Roosevelt recognized McCarthy's contributions to his
speeches. In the midst of his final western tour, he wrote:

---

173 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 12, 1920.

174 Carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File,
Campaign of 1920," Niagara Falls, New York, October 21, 1920, p. 3.
See also, Niagara Falls Gazette, October 22, 1920.

175 Carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File,
Campaign of 1920," Binghamton, New York, October 22, 1920, p. 3.

I was awfully glad to get your telegram about three days ago saying that New York has really waked up to the League of Nations issue . . . Please keep me in touch with this phase of the situation . . . because those people in the West and Middle West always like to know what they are doing and saying in New York. I read your telegram at two or three meetings with great effect.

Have used your idea . . . about Harding being controlled by Wall Street gamblers and money trust interests. 177

Admittedly, the speaker rejected many of "Mac's" suggestions. For example, he paid no attention to the recommendation "that the present Democratic National ticket should come out deliberately for prohibition," because "the people are for it, at least 75 or 80%." 178 Also, he lightly regarded the manager's proposed strategy for speeches in farming areas. 179 Some McCarthy telegrams offered useless minutia, such as the following:

Received word this morning from relatives of mine in New Hampshire who are Republicans who have always voted Republican ticket saying they will vote for Cox and Roosevelt . . . And if your audience in doubt we can furnish names and addresses to them. 180

McCarthy's effectiveness in supplying speech sources and ideas was largely confined to those addresses delivered in the

177 Letter, FDR to McCarthy, October 9, 1920.
179 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 1, 1920.
180 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 14, 1920.
eastern portion of the country. However, his desk served as a "clearing house" for the critiques which came in from all portions of the country. The manager forwarded notations concerning the strengths and the weaknesses found in the political arguments of other speakers. At times, these remarks resulted from his attendance at a speech delivered by a visiting dignitary in New York City. As he ordinarily enclosed newspaper clippings with the letters, or forwarded these under separate cover, FDR had a chance to survey the political tactics of both opponents and allies.

The candidate was furnished with a resume of future speaking engagements by the "advance man"; but he devised no follow-up method to evaluate the effectiveness of his speeches. McCarthy partially filled this need by supplying FDR with newspaper clippings, editorials, letters, and other reports which indicated audience response. He started this practice immediately after the opening of the first tour, and continued to use it throughout the campaign. Undoubtedly, the speaker solicited these critical

181 For examples, see analyses of addresses made by Congressman Britten, Senator Harding, Senator Johnson, and the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. Letters, McCarthy to FDR, September 13; October 15; Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.

182 For example, Ambassador Davis spoke at Cooper Union on October 14. See Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 15, 1920.

183 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, August 13, 1920.

comments, especially after the first western tour. For example, a Boston friend sent the following note to McCarthy: "At Mr. Roosevelt's request, I am sending you herewith five clippings from various papers criticising him for alleged statements at Butte, Montana."\(^5\) The New York Herald continued to make political capital of the Butte address two months after its delivery by quoting from the Butte Daily Post, the Billings Gazette, the Spokane Spokesman-Review, the Anaconda Standard, and the Butte Daily Miner.\(^6\) The campaign manager became a veritable one-man clipping service by promptly informing the candidate of these, and other, responses.\(^7\) He was assisted in this endeavor, possibly at Mr. Roosevelt's request, by local committeemen along the route.\(^8\) But the extant correspondence does not indicate a large volume of mail in this category, which might also reflect the pessimistic Democratic prospects for 1920. At any rate, McCarthy performed a significant service in attempting to place speech analyses and critiques at the nominee's disposal.

\(^5\) Letter, Davis to McCarthy, September 3, 1920.

\(^6\) October 18, 1920.

\(^7\) For examples, see Telegram and Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 18, 1920.

\(^8\) For example, see Letter, Norton to FDR Headquarters, September 15, 1920.
The second area of McCarthy's efforts involved the speaker's itinerary. As in each of the other instances, confusion was the order of the day wherever schedule planning was involved. Unlike Early, McIntyre, and Howe, Charles McCarthy seemed to possess little power in this regard. He often thought of himself as being an important cog in determining where the candidate would go; but none of the others involved appeared to pay much attention to his remarks. He received Roosevelt's requests and merely passed them along to the appropriate desk. The following paragraph, in a McCarthy-to-Roosevelt letter, is a confusing, yet typical, survey of the procedure at headquarters:

In the first place I gave them [the Speakers' Bureau] your memorandum which you left with me on August 11th and everything was arranged all right, but then came along the question of your speaking in Brooklyn on Labor Day. The men of the Navy Yard were particularly anxious to make this a banner reception, and Howe came up on August 23rd and arranged that you be switched from Boston to New York on that day. This necessitated re-arranging your other schedule by giving you three days in Maine a little later than the three days you wanted. I am sure Senator Harrison [Chairman of the Speakers' Bureau] and Howe can explain all this to your entire satisfaction.\(^{189}\)

McCarthy appeared to be a messenger boy during this entire transaction. With a small army of individuals already involved, he started "making arrangements" to get a Mr. Gerald McSweeney of the New York Evening Post "to work on your New York itinerary." He

---

\(^{189}\)Letter, McCarthy to FDR, August 27, 1920.
went on to add, "I hope you will approve . . . Mr. McSweeney has some darn good ideas, and I think we can arrange it without getting our wires crossed . . . ."\textsuperscript{190} Senator Harrison took a dim view of McCarthy's efforts, and there is no indication that FDR ever responded to this suggestion. McSweeney's boss settled the problem by refusing to release his employee.\textsuperscript{191} McCarthy never seemed to visualize the total campaign pattern. He only considered FDR, and was oblivious to the efforts of Governor Cox. For this reason, he was preoccupied in urging the Vice-Presidential nominee to concentrate on New York State. While the "Westboro" was traveling through California, he urged the candidate to return to the area with the most electoral votes.\textsuperscript{192} He seemed to think that the East alone could carry the Democrats to victory. His September letters continued to plea for a greater devotion to the Empire State.\textsuperscript{193} Two weeks later, he completely reversed himself while the Roosevelt campaign party pressed westward once more. As if his approval was imperative, "Mac" boasted, "... I insisted that you should go to Colorado, because I know the influence you are going

\textsuperscript{190}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{191}Letter, Gay to McCarthy, August 28, 1920.

\textsuperscript{192}Letter, McCarthy to FDR, August 24, 1920.

\textsuperscript{193}Letter, McCarthy to FDR, September 14, 1920.
to have there regardless of anybody else.194 However, the Colorado National Committeeman insisted on using his own itinerary and Steve Early quickly rushed the changes to FDR.195 Knowing only that the schedule was confused, McCarthy quickly explained, "I understand there was a mix-up in Denver, and am very sorry to hear this, but Senator Harrison will have to take the blame on his own shoulders. He told me of the desire of the Colorado people to change the date, and to this I objected . . . ."196 Of course, no one was to blame except a stubborn Colorado Democrat. The incident failed to ruffle the candidate as he noted, "The Colorado meetings were a fine success. Tell George White [Democratic National Chairman] that Colorado is all right . . . ."197 In itinerary planning, the campaign manager seemed to carry few responsibilities. He wanted to look and sound important on this matter, but his colleagues seemed to pay little attention.

McCarthy's third area of consideration involved publicity. Much like the itinerary "duties," he appeared to dabble in promotional work without ever assuming definite responsibilities. From the beginning, those at headquarters realized "that there is

194Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 1, 1920.
195Telegram, Early to FDR, October 5, 1920.
196Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.
197Letter, FDR to McCarthy, October 9, 1920.
something wrong in the method of getting the proper news back here about Mr. Roosevelt's trip." "Mac" proposed that his friend, McSweeney, meet with Howe "one day next week," and "map out" a solution beginning with the eastern trip.198 Meanwhile, he asked a Poughkeepsie, New York, acquaintance "to induce the officials of the Grange to which Mr. Roosevelt belongs to write a letter to as many Granges . . . as possible . . . calling their attention to the fact that a brother Granger has been nominated as the Vice Presidential Candidate . . . ."199 Several days later, he thought Early should "shoot the names back here" of all non-Democrats who planned to vote for Cox and Roosevelt, "then we can get word to the proper parties in the . . . Committee handling the meetings, and give these people prominent places on the platform."200 Of course, the "advance man's" telegrams to the "Westboro" advised on these matters when the occasion demanded, thus eliminating the time and expense of "funneling" such items through headquarters.

While these ideas probably possessed some merit, they appeared to be pursued on impulse as the products of a momentary "brain storm." Even though Steve Early carefully arranged publicity

198 Letter, McCarthy to Howe, August 20, 1920, "Howe Papers."
200 Letter, McCarthy to Early, September 4, 1920.
outlets along the route, McCarthy felt compelled to wire the editor of the Worcester, Massachusetts, Evening Post: "I want to send this as a personal note of introduction for any member of your staff to mr. roosevelt [sic]."\(^{201}\) The "advance man," who enjoyed the advantage of personal contact, was able to handle such matters more thoroughly and more efficiently.\(^{202}\)

Some of McCarthy's publicity ideas were amazingly inept. Even though faced with a serious financial problem, he wanted to condense a copy of the League Covenant, "and have it handed out by our friends at every Catholic and Protestant Church, especially in the cities we are counting upon." He went on to add "that 95% of the people don't know a damned thing about the League except what they read in Republican newspapers," and this distribution of material would overcome "Republican propaganda [sic]." However, if the campaigner was intrigued by this suggestion, its author warned him: "There is no use suggesting it here at Headquarters . . . ."\(^{203}\)

Apparently rebuffed by silence, the campaign manager passed along a new memorandum that would reach "thousands of people" if it

\(^{201}\) Telegram, McCarthy to Editor, Worcester Evening Post, September 13, 1920.

\(^{202}\) Telegram, Early to FDR, September 13, 1920.

\(^{203}\) Letter, McCarthy to FDR, September 14, 1920.
"could be printed on a post card and mailed to the wounded soldiers as well as parents who lost sons during the war." Portions of this evangelistic message read as follows:

I do not proclaim any other doctrine than was proclaimed by heavenly hosts to the Shepards at Bethlehem— 'Peace on earth, Good will towards men' . . . The dream of earth, the hope of Heaven since the dawn of Creation, was peace— . . . Shall a few reactionary politicians and stay-at-home Senators rob the people . . . of their blood-bought sacrifice[?] . . . God is on our side— the Prince of Peace is our leader. We will triumph for we have the promise that the gates of Hell cannot prevail against us. 204

Its author recommended printing the 338-word passage "as a quotation from your speech" and mailing it to all "religious people of the country." 205 He began drawing up a mailing list of "religious people" by acquiring voter registration rolls from county committee chairmen, 206 and promised "to raise the money if I have to do it myself." 207 Eight days later, as his enthusiasm for the project waned, he recommended using newspaper advertisements. Sufficient funds were not available "to mail this material"; therefore, he

205 Ibid.

206 For example, the Lewis County, New York, Chairman, in sending the only list of "enrolled voters" available at his headquarters, pleaded: "I hope you will have the same returned to me as soon as possible." Letter, Betting to McCarthy, October 7, 1920.

207 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.
passed the entire idea to George White and asked him to work it out with subordinate chairmen. 208

Two weeks before election day, McCarthy superficially pursued publicity ventures without originally establishing any effective organizational chain of communications. Still groping for financial support, he wanted to get printed publicity to registered voters inasmuch as "it would do more good than spending money on speakers because they only reach a small percentage." 209 Perhaps this conclusion was a valid one for some areas of the country. Nevertheless, it was ironic that the headquarters manager expressed great faith in printed materials while his boss carried on an exhaustive speaking campaign. McCarthy's attitude on this matter failed to change even after the nominee began his final New York swing. 210

Charles McCarthy contributed, with varying degrees of effectiveness, to the nominee's speeches, itinerary, and publicity. The fourth area, administrative management, included his routine duties at the New York office. In fairness to the manager, the job was a difficult one. Operating under a strained budget at a time when many people clamored for "a change," his chores became

208 Memorandum, McCarthy to White, October 16, 1920.
209 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 14, 1920.
210 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 22, 1920.
overbearing. In a handwritten note to "the Boss," he lamented that "Pres. Wilson is surrounded like Pres. Taft was with everybody but members and sympathizers of his own party." Also, the major criticisms directed against "headquarters" by disgruntled Democrats were not aimed solely at his office. The Democratic organizational force, which included the National Chairman, the Speakers' Bureau, the Publicity Bureau, the Finance Committee, and their many affiliates, were housed in the same building. "A great deal of the uncertainty of those in charge of Headquarters" was caused by the Senate's Kenyon Committee, which was investigating campaign financing. "A great deal more of the lack of progress" was traced "to the fact that they were marking time awaiting the declaration of Secretary Colby on Woman's Suffrage . . ." 

As the FDR manager, McCarthy was a small cog in the complex machine which depended upon smooth cooperation in order to be effective. He became disgusted with the lack of overall leadership, and in October wrote: "Believe me, we are going ahead on our own hook and I wish to goodness we had done it long ago and that we had established our own separate headquarters where men would come who will not come here." 

211 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, August 28, 1920.
212 Letter, Sague to Howe, August 31, 1920, "Howe Papers."
213 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 18, 1920.
There were mountains of mail to be processed and answered. Apparently, McCarthy inherited a considerable portion of Roosevelt's July administrative obligations, which gathered dust while the nominee prepared his acceptance address. An important letter, sent to the candidate's Navy Department address and dated July 12, was answered finally by "Mac" on August 20.\textsuperscript{214} It was not unusual for later replies to run two and three weeks behind normal schedule. When correspondence was forwarded to the "Westboro," sometimes five weeks elapsed before a response was issued.\textsuperscript{215}

Important items were sent by special delivery to the station master at a forward stop. McCarthy depended upon prompt telegraphic acknowledgement of receipt in order to be sure these data were reaching FDR. He sent a packet on September 29, asked for the proper acknowledgement a week later, and finally wrote: "It is very hard to be kept in the dark when the Western Union is still functioning . . ."\textsuperscript{216} Telegrams to the "Westboro" were not always political in nature. McCarthy kept Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt informed

\textsuperscript{214}Letters, Mott to FDR, July 12; McCarthy to Mott, August 20, 1920.
\textsuperscript{215}For examples, see Letters, Cumberland to FDR, August 10; FDR to Cumberland, September 17, 1920.
\textsuperscript{216}Telegrams, McCarthy to FDR, September 29; October 5; Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.
on the status of their sick son, James. He worked diligently to keep abreast of his routine correspondence obligations.

FDR's difficulties with Tammany Hall were well-known. He probably requested a first-hand account of "the Wigwam's" campaign activity in New York. In September, McCarthy sent Roosevelt a press clipping which described how Tammany was concentrating on re-electing Governor Al Smith at the expense of ignoring the national ticket. This factional split was emphasized again a few days later when he declared that "this good for nothing Tammany bunch" was "doing absolutely nothing" and should be driven "out of the party." He tempered his language the next day by assuring the candidate that the city organization was planning a "whirlwind campaign" for the national ticket during the "last three weeks." He understood this approach because "Tammany got nothing from the present administration during the past eight years, and they feel that they should not be called upon to spend their money for the national ticket . . . all of which sounds reasonable."

217 Telegrams, McCarthy to FDR, October 1; 6, 1920.
219 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 2; Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.
220 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 9, 1920.
221 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 14, 1920.
During the campaign's fading moments, he praised Tammany braves for offering "instructions on the League of Nations" to school children. He added: "If that isn't Americanism functioning one hundred per cent. I don't know what Americanism is. You could probably use this with great effect on Saturday night if you think it advisable."\textsuperscript{222} In the span of a month, he depicted Tammany as being a "good for nothing" bunch, then reversed himself completely and recommended it as a source of "Americanism" worthy of public recognition. Of course, circumstances could justify an alteration in his thinking. But if FDR depended on these reports, he was confused by the end of October.

McCarthy's effectiveness probably was hampered by his expressed dislike for several colleagues. His friction with Howe in the Navy Department reappeared through short, acid comments in the 1920 correspondence. Detecting one minor error in mid-August, he could not resist noting: "This is one on Bro[.] Howe."\textsuperscript{223} He was critical of both Homer Cummings, the former Democratic National Chairman, and FDR in declaring: "Our friend, Homer, could have had this sewed up six weeks ago if he had been the man you have thought he was."\textsuperscript{224} He showed disgust for "Steve Early's friend Lorry

\textsuperscript{222}Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 28, 1920.

\textsuperscript{223}Note attached to Letter, Saulsbury to FDR, August 14, 1920.

\textsuperscript{224}Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 14, 1920.
Jacobs," as if Steve was responsible, and tossed a sarcastic jibe at Senator Harrison in the same letter. He self-righteously transferred to others the blame for any shortcoming, and incessantly complained of hardships which were common to all. Presented in lengthy letters, these immature outpourings of self pity possibly added to the distress of a weary campaigner. However, there is no evidence that FDR ever responded to his manager's caustic remarks.

McCarthy also suffered from an exaggerated feeling of self-importance. Possibly, his managerial responsibilities included holding various conferences, but he seemed to cloak these in secrecy and to overstate their value. He explained:

I had what I consider a very important conference yesterday . . . This meeting was arranged by a good friend of mine . . . . I have arranged with him for a conference early next week with a live wire from Ohio, and will tell you all about it later.

. . . It has come to the stage now where if we can raise the money ourselves and do it legitimately, by George, it ought to be done. Everybody around here is throwing cold water on our efforts to carry New York State, but we are not going to let them get by with it.226

A week later, he secretly confided:

I had a very important conference this morning . . . It is impossible for me to say ah, yes or no now, about the matter, but do not be surprised if you

225 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 18, 1920.
226 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 1, 1920.
hear of the lid being taken off in a certain section. I cannot say more than this now, because I have given my word . . . .

I am going to say a few earnest prayers for what I hope will break between Saturday night and Monday morning. Of course I am only hopeful of this, but if it does happen Cox and Roosevelt will be elected.227

His extant papers do not shed any additional light on these furtive and numerous conferences, which held the promise of favorably influencing the Democratic cause.

The daily meetings with enthusiastic partisans seemed to warp McCarthy's total political perspective. In September, he observed: "Things are beginning to liven up a little here now . . . ."; by October, he noted: "Things certainly begin to look mighty good . . . ."; then, after several discouraging meetings a week later, he said: "There is about as much life in this place as there is in the man in the moon . . . ."228 Thereafter, talks with party officials in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, stirred renewed waves of exultation and convinced him that these states were a cinch to go Democratic.229

227Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.
228Letters, McCarthy to FDR, September 13; October 1; 8, 1920.
229Letters, McCarthy to FDR, October 18; 28; Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 19, 1920.
In the area of administrative management, McCarthy did a satisfactory job. Marguerite "Missy" LeHand, who later became FDR's personal secretary, served as a clerical assistant in the New York office during the 1920 campaign. A person possessing "great dignity and charm, tactful in her dealings with people... and whole-heartedly loyal to Franklin Roosevelt," she was a great asset. Initials on extant letters show that "Missy" and her boss handled most, if not all, of the outgoing paperwork. The manager also informed the campaigner about political developments, attended conferences, and attempted to coordinate this work with higher party officials. He was less successful in each of these undertakings. Harboring resentment toward others and being emotionally swayed by questionable sources, he frequently failed to analyze a situation correctly.

After considering McCarthy's contributions to the candidate's speeches, itinerary, publicity, and campaign management, it was obvious that he dabbled in many political areas. Possibly for this reason, he was less influential during the campaign than Early or McIntyre, and his contributions were less significant. He presented fatuous ideas which were naive beyond description; then, in the next communication, offered an item worthy of

---

230 Tully, F. D. R. My Boss, p. 338.
inclusion in a major address. Extant correspondence involving Early, McIntyre, and Howe do not reveal this inconsistency in their performances.

McCarthy was not temperamentally suited to the task, nor did he demonstrate sufficient political acumen. His day-to-day service gave credence to FDR's 1916 evaluation, which classified McCarthy as a "hack without brilliancy." Nevertheless, he held a responsible position in the secretariat and provided the nominee with many materials that ultimately were used in the speeches.

While a critic can be severe in evaluating the campaign manager, one factor cannot be ignored. It was McCarthy, more than anyone else, who furnished the speaker with critiques of past appearances. From the miscellaneous assortment of letters, telegrams, news clippings, and editorials forwarded from the New York office, FDR could ferret out some reactions to his 1920 remarks. This highly significant contribution could have offset McCarthy's many shortcomings.

Renah F. Camalier, James P. Sullivan, Thomas M. Lynch

In addition to Roosevelt and McIntyre, the permanent "Westboro" party included Renah F. Camalier, James P. Sullivan, and Thomas M. Lynch. The latter three maintained no file of personal papers and there are only a few isolated references to
their work. Apparently, they only took a secondary part in the planning, or in the writing, of speeches.

Camalier received $62.50 per week as Roosevelt's personal secretary, Sullivan received the same amount as stenographer, and Lynch was paid $50 a week to take "charge of transportation." Both Camalier and Sullivan handled chores which involved routine dictation, typing, and filing. There is evidence that the secretary transcribed several major speeches during their delivery. For example, one address bore the initials "CAM," and carried the following notation: "Delivered by Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt at Cincinnati, Ohio, Saturday night, October 16, 1920 [sic]. Reported by R. F. Camalier that same night."232

In private life, Sullivan was the assistant to the president of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad. He was asked to report at the Hyde Park notification ceremony in order to make preparations for leaving immediately on the first western tour. FDR wrote, "I really didn't expect to get the help of such a valuable man. Don't kid yourself, I expect to get a hell of a lot of work out of you." Undoubtedly, a considerable

231Letter, FDR to White, October 8, 1920.


portion of the available speech manuscripts, letters, and memoranda dealing with the 1920 campaign were originally typed by Camalier and Sullivan. At times when the others were busy, the stenographer copied, and passed along, pertinent information from local officials at the various stops.234

As transportation agent Thomas Lynch had to adjust a rather flexible itinerary with available timetables and to keep the party moving on schedule. There were also local transportation complications, as side trips by automobiles to isolated locales were employed to give FDR additional engagements. The "advance man" tried to arrange such matters as best he could, but the many small details became Lynch's concern after the official party arrived. The transportation specialist constantly worked with committeemen to coordinate these preparations. At times, he circulated among the auditors and reported the observed responses.235 However, the repetitious speeches and the monotonous traveling made constant listening an uninviting chore. In Illinois, the "Westboro" staff was "much more anxious to get to

234For example, see Letter, Sullivan to FDR, August 27, 1920.

the Country Club for a round of golf than to take lunch with the Kiwanis club or to hear the talk [by FDR].”

Although the contributions of these men appeared to be minor in comparison with other members of the secretariat, their service cannot be taken lightly in making a final analysis of the 1920 campaign.

Summary

Rexford G. Tugwell caustically referred to the 1920 effort as "Franklin's campaign circus." Perhaps he scoffed at the number of people involved in the act. However, the national tours not only provided valuable experience for the nominee, but gave him a chance to test a secretariat under three months of intense pressure. For the most part, it proved to be a durable and a valuable group.

The "advance man" returned reports concerning approaching speaking engagements. Marvin H. McIntyre received and interpreted these coded messages. He planned speeches, handled publicity, and supervised clerical functions, with the assistance of Renah F. Camalier, James P. Sullivan, and Thomas M. Lynch.

Louis McHenry Howe remained in Washington for two-thirds of the campaign, actively participating in only the final tour.

---

237 The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 126.
While his political contributions were less significant than those of either Early or McIntyre, he worked with speeches and personally indoctrinated Mrs. Roosevelt in the fundamentals of electioneering. Early's references to McIntyre in letters to Howe indicated that the three were working more closely together than the casual observer may suspect.

Charles H. McCarthy, the erratic campaign manager, made some contributions to the total effort. Less capable than Early, McIntyre, or Howe, he kept a steady stream of information flowing to the "Westboro." His most valuable contribution, although it probably was not recognized, consisted of supplying the party with assorted critiques on the candidate's past appearances.

Early and McIntyre stand out as the secretarial stalwarts during this period. But all of the group, including "Missy" LeHand, deserve recognition for their individual labors.

In commenting on FDR's many advisors, "experts," and "brain trusts," one news correspondent contended that they "had been assembled by Roosevelt simply to enable him to do certain things at certain times."238 This definition applied to the entourage, which experienced its initial nationwide political exposure in 1920, and formed the nucleus of the later New Deal secretariat.

Sources of Ideas

The two preceding sections in this chapter disclosed the prominent role played by Roosevelt's secretariat in offering sources of speech materials. This section deals with many additional items which were brought to the candidate's attention through various channels. Thonssen and Baird offered the following considerations when investigating a speaker's sources: "Do they stem directly from his reading, the nature of which is ascertainable? from his public and private experiences? from his consultations and conferences with others?" 239

This section reveals FDR's major sources of ideas, in the 1920 campaign, by using the suggested tripartite division.

Reading

The speaker's immediate staff played a significant part in offering a continuous flow of source information throughout the campaign. Steve Early was alert, especially, for the remarks by major Republican speakers. On more than one occasion, he zealously relayed comments made by Borah, Hoover, Watson, and Harding. In moving ahead of the main party, he often attended political meetings in other cities and later sent "a good line," or "a pointer" back to McIntyre. Also, he listened to many

239Speech Criticism, p. 436.
suggestions by local Democratic officials, weighed these in view of other known circumstances, condensed the ideas into a sentence or two, and passed his reflections to the train manager. His offerings were usually brief, to the point, and required further research before becoming appropriate for delivery. But these evaluations were priceless in channeling the nominee's thinking into several specific areas. Early realized the value of immediately refuting opponents' arguments and his data were usually geared in this direction.240

Charles H. McCarthy sent practically a daily packet of materials from his New York office for delivery to the "Westboro." His specialty seemed to be current news clippings. He extracted many write-ups in major city dailies from all sections of the country, although he sent a preponderance of New York publications. Undoubtedly, this procedure was in keeping with FDR's wishes because the items frequently originated from Democratic officials who forwarded the data to headquarters. His addresses indicated a vast knowledge of contemporary newspaper sentiment from all parts of the country. McCarthy also furnished copies of the Congressional Record, the campaign text book, and numerous letters from private citizens. When the speaker needed more newspaper

240 Some representative messages include: Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 17; 19; 30; September 13; 21; 28; October 3; 13; 14; Letter, Early to McIntyre, September 14, 1920.
sources he contacted his New York headquarters. In addition, he engaged an Albany firm, the Capital City News Bureau, to clip daily editorial and news releases from most of the New York State papers. These were sent to McCarthy who relayed them to the traveling party. The candidate was acutely sensitive to the daily press reports and followed them closely. 241

The speaker had access to reading materials other than those supplied by his immediate staff. He obtained reports published by the Federal Farm Loan Board and the American Federation of Labor, copies of congressional speeches delivered by members of both parties, reactions of noted educators, such as F. W. Taussig, Professor of Economics at Harvard, and ideas and writings from several publishers. His materials included correspondence from active political figures, such as Senator Harry New, Chairman of the Republican Speakers’ Bureau, Governor Riggs of Alaska, Senator Pittman of Nevada, Judge Robert S. Marx of the Ohio Superior Court, Senator Pat Harrison, and Democratic Chairman George White. 242 Private citizens were able, on occasion, to get letters and telegrams directly to the candidate despite the campaign rush and confusion. A Minnesota man sent excerpts from President Theodore

241Some representative McCarthy messages include: Letters, Davis to McCarthy, September 3; McCarthy to FDR, September 13; October 15; Memorandum, McCarthy to FDR, September 11; Telegrams, McCarthy to FDR, August 24; October 9; 15; 18; 22, 1920.

242"FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920."
Roosevelt's 1910 lecture at Harvard; one from Illinois offered a critique on "Republican legislation"; and several citizens sent more newspaper clippings. Most of these latter messages were sent during the initial tour and dwindled to a trickle as the weeks wore on.

All of these items constituted a large file of sources. Nevertheless, FDR contacted both Governor Cox and the Democratic Publicity Bureau for additional data.

Roosevelt's speeches disclosed the frequent application of these sources. From the newspapers he quoted or paraphrased remarks made by contemporary politicians, including Cox, Wilson, Harding, Taft, Johnson, Hughes, Beveridge, New, Coolidge, Penrose, Lodge, Brandegee, Smoot, and Morrow. He noted a published American Bar Association report, the "falsehoods" of a "Republican press," and even quoted from the syndicated "Bugs Baer" column.

His citations from legislative action indicated a knowledge of the Aldrich Banking Law, the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Farm Loan Act, the Merchant Marine Act, the Logan Act, the Federal Trade Commission, and many more.

For examples, see Letters, Benson to FDR, August 15; Von Arx to FDR, August 17; Norton to FDR, September 15; Telegram, Groves to FDR, August 25, 1920.

For examples, see Letter, FDR to Godsey, September 22; Telegram, FDR to Cox, October 3, 1920.
Older historical sources cited in his speeches included the Magna Carta, a volume of George Washington's addresses to Congress, the "Federalist Papers," the Monroe Doctrine, the Emancipation Proclamation, and, of course, the League of Nations Covenant.

Some miscellaneous ideas evolved from campaign pamphlets and Republican billboard advertisements.\(^\text{245}\)

Public and Private Experiences

Roosevelt repeatedly called attention to his public and private experiences. At this time, his public undertakings were limited to those in the New York State Legislature and in the Navy Department at Washington. He proudly noted his work on behalf of labor groups, his advocacy of a strong Navy, and his efforts to achieve economy in government. After calling attention to a specific oil contract, he concluded: "Now that is what the Government has done right here to help you - I think I might almost say what I have done to help you, because this whole matter came under me as Assistant Secretary of the Navy."\(^\text{246}\) He boasted that he knew the sentiment of Central and South American countries toward the United States because: "I have been running Haiti and

\(^{245}\)See "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."

\(^{246}\)Carbon typescript (extracts), in Ibid., New Bedford, Massachusetts, September 16, 1920, p. 3.
San Domingo for the past seven years." Also, his recent European trips were made possible by Naval assignments. He spoke about seeing trench warfare on the first visit in 1918, and returning with Woodrow Wilson after the second excursion in 1919. He was not particularly modest about these experiences. A Democratic newspaper inaccurately reported: "Mr. Roosevelt, however, is not running for the Vice Presidency on his war record. He never talks of it because that is a personal matter."

The 1920 campaign tours offered a cumulative source of ideas, both public and private in nature. The nominee mentioned meeting "thousands" of people "belonging to every party." From such contacts, he deduced that religious and educational leaders supported the Democratic fight for the League; the "West is progressive"; that "progressive thinking" was evident everywhere; that the people were uninformed on the League because the GOP press refused to publish the Covenant. He was encouraged by national disgust over the Republican convention, nominees, and methods; by voters who started "doing their own thinking"; and by Harding's refusal to visit the Far West. Naturally, these

---

247 Carbon typescript (complete), in Ibid., San Francisco, California, August 23, 1920, p. 10.

248 Editorial, Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.

249 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
experiences were interpreted subjectively from highly partisan situations.

Private experiences were used from time to time. FDR's great-grandfather was a member of the New York State Convention called to ratify the Federal Constitution; and, of course, he never ceased to refer subtly to President Theodore Roosevelt as if he shared in his famous kinsman's intimate political secrets.

Consultations and Conferences with Others

Roosevelt was involved in many conferences throughout the 1920 campaign. He had top-level talks with ranking Democratic officials, consultations with his secretariat, meetings with party officials along the route, and impromptu exchanges with individual citizens at the stopping points. FDR's high-level conferences took place as follows:

July 12 - Columbus, Ohio, met Cox at the Governor's Mansion;

July 18 - Washington, D. C., conferred with Cox and Wilson at the White House;

July 20 - Columbus, Ohio, discussed future plans with Cox and Democratic Chairman White; also, had a session with the Democratic National Committee;

August 2 - Washington, D. C., met Chairman White at Democratic headquarters;
August 7 - Dayton, Ohio, attended Cox's acceptance speech and the two nominees had a private talk;

August 9 - Hyde Park, New York, presented acceptance speech and met with many present and former national Democratic leaders;

August 31 - Columbus, Ohio, discussed the first western tour with Cox at the State Fair Grounds; and

October 3 - Terre Haute, Indiana, exchanged information with Cox in a railway car relative to the Governor's western swing and FDR's eastern tour. 250

These meetings with Cox were especially important. The candidates traded their first-hand impressions and mutually decided upon a unified course of campaign strategy to follow. 251 As the junior candidate, Roosevelt probably acquiesced to Cox's attitude toward the major issues, although the men appeared to be in agreement on most subjects. Those topics which were not discussed fully, or left completely untouched, were developed further through typed memoranda. 252 For supplementary material, FDR wrote to some of his old friends in Washington. 253

250 New York Times, July 13; 19; 21; August 3; 8; 10; September 1; October 4, 1920.


252 For example, see undated Memorandum, FDR to Cox.

253 For example, see Letter, FDR to Tumulty, October 17, 1920.
These top-level meetings established the general campaign policy. In order to put the plan into action, conferences with the traveling secretariat and the staff at the New York office were necessary. The nominee was in constant communication with McIntyre, Camalier, Sullivan, and Lynch. Early infrequently visited the "Westboro" for short meetings. During the final tour, Howe and Mrs. Roosevelt were available for personal consultations. Few written records remain which explain these meetings, but the candidate's wife recalled:

In the evenings, after they [the campaign party] got back to the train, all the men sat together in the end of the car and discussed the experiences of the day from their various points of view and the campaign in general from the point of view of what news might be coming in from newspapers and dispatches.

Frequently for relaxation they started to play a card game, which went on until late . . . Little did I realize in those days how much he [FDR] received through these contacts . . .

. . . Romeo, the porter on our car, was studying for the ministry and always was called upon to lend his Bible when questions of accuracy in quoting the Scripture were involved. The poor man slept in the end of the car where the men talked and could never go to bed until they did . . . .

When FDR returned to the East in September, he visited the New York office several times and conferred with politicians and campaign workers.  

254 This Is My Story, pp. 315-316.

255 For example, one letter requesting such a meeting noted: "I will be in my office on Monday morning, Labor Day." Letter, FDR to Battle, September 3, 1920.
The lower echelon conferences were supplemented by innumerable meetings with minor Democratic officials along the route. Early arranged many of these discussions at practically every stop, with the other secretaries handling still more arrangements upon arrival at cities and cross-road junctions. One local committee boarded the train and accompanied the party to Colorado Springs. During the interval, "Mr. Roosevelt asked numerous questions on the general aspect of the campaign here and of the reception which was accorded his running mate, Governor Cox, in this state." At Danville, Illinois, Early arranged for a delegation to meet the "Westboro" in advance of its arrival "with full reports [on] local conditions."^257

Finally, FDR apparently had a number of meetings with individual citizens who were not directly involved in Democratic politics. He mentioned being "in intimate contact" with members and leaders of the American Legion before his nomination, recalled a chat with James Bryce, "the famous English historian," and "having conversed as lately as this Spring with a great many personal friends in the Republican camp . . ."^258 He told about

^256 Colorado Springs Telegraph, October 6, 1920.
^257 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 10, 1920.
"two dozen Republicans" visiting him after "the meeting in Wheeling last night," and "That literally hundreds of Republicans and Independents" expressed their intentions to vote for Cox. Throughout the campaign, he mentioned consultations with others who were identified obscurely as follows: "a man and a woman," "a man at a small station in Kansas," "a man in Colorado," an ex-soldier "in Quincy, Ill.," a "prominent Republican in Marion, Ind.," and the "head of a large church in New York." Whether these "talks" ever took place remains a matter of conjecture. The examples were used to show why the "average" voter in a certain locale should vote the Democratic ticket. Exceptionally lengthy quotations were credited to these conferees and they usually repeated a point that the nominee made in earlier speeches at another city. Charles McCarthy wrote to the candidate and told about an appointment with a Jewish lawyer. Thereafter, on numerous occasions, FDR described meeting a successful, Hebrew businessman "from Southern Indiana," whose story was amazingly similar to the one expressed by McCarthy's Jewish lawyer acquaintance.


261 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, September 14, 1920.
Merriman Smith, United Press White House Correspondent, related how FDR used similar sources in his later press conferences:

He loved to tell parables. And after he told them a few times, he was dead certain that they were true.

It seems a garage mechanic friend of his 'dropped in' for a chat . . . He claimed a lot of friends in comparatively low stations of life. I regarded them as his imaginary playmates because I doubted seriously one of them ever existed. He told often of a Chinese laundryman he knew, a baseball player, a small dirt farmer, a garage man.262

Therefore these individual citizens presented the most questionable source of information. Fortunately top-level officials, the immediate staff, and local Democrats added to the list of conferees.

His reading, his public and private experiences, his consultations and conferences with others, blended together to give Roosevelt excellent sources from which to draw campaign speech materials. His reading offered an especially important area for ideas. During the campaign, Eleanor Roosevelt noted that her husband and Louis Howe possessed "a fund of general information and had done so much reading on various subjects. They had apparently retained all the knowledge which they had acquired

through books or travel or from any other source." The candidate and his associates made liberal use of these sources in 1920.

**Writing the Speeches**

Unfortunately, a text, such as the one produced by Sam Rosenman which explained the gubernatorial and the Presidential campaigns, is not available for describing the procedure used in developing Roosevelt's 1920 addresses. However, the extant files do indicate the probable methods employed and the major figures involved. Therefore, from available material this section reconstructs the system of speech writing during the Vice-Presidential campaign.

Although the national tour began at Chicago, August 11, the initial political address took place at FDR's notification ceremony in Hyde Park, August 9. The candidate realized the significance of his first national address and devoted considerable time to its preparation. He took a six-day vacation at Campobello during the last week in July in order to devote daily attention to the speech. By July 31 the first draft was completed and he returned to Washington, D. C.

---

263 *This Is My Story*, p. 319.

264 *Working with Roosevelt*.

Having decided upon an ambitious tour of the West immediately following his notification, he likely spent some time thinking and writing about several of the future appearances. In Washington, he conferred with Democratic officials and made a number of recorded, or "canned," political addresses for future use. He proceeded to Dayton, Ohio, for Cox's notification on August 7. Therefore, he produced the first speech in the seclusion of an island vacation and had sufficient time to check with ranking Democratic officials before delivering it at Hyde Park.

The seventeen page typewritten manuscript is the only 1920 composition which bears the designation: "This is the original reading copy later bound up." However, like many of his other texts, it underwent last minute editing and handwritten corrections. It left ample marginal spaces for the speaker to scribble in his various notations. It was conceived, written, typed, and delivered before the campaign secretariat was formed. Furthermore, it developed, in general, those national and international topics which were to become of more specific import to different audiences throughout the country.

---

266 Ibid., August 3, 1920.
267 Ibid., August 8, 1920.
FDR was impressed with Rosenman's "red manila envelopes, each properly labeled by subject matter," which were used for handy reference to the 1928 issues. Although less organized and less complete, the system used in 1920 was similar. Records at Hyde Park indicate some data bearing the following designations:

- Agriculture I
- Agriculture II
- Taxation
- Lodge
- Hays

At this late date, a complete reproduction of the speech material file is not possible. Because of the haphazard preservation of records, an accurate file probably was unavailable immediately following the campaign. These crudely catalogued materials were used to prepare pre-conceived responses to anticipated issues. Early's telegrams indicated that the entire staff worked together in developing many of the political positions which appeared in Roosevelt's speeches. Because the candidate seemingly prepared the acceptance address unassisted, he probably researched most of the data before placing it in the file.

Other general material, much of it gathered en route, was not filed under specific designations. A printed article,

---

268 Working with Roosevelt, p. 15.

269 For example, see Telegram, Early to FDR, September 13, 1920.
"Illiteracy and the War," was marked, "For your speech." A ten page publication, "Farm Mortgage Loans Under Democratic Administration," was saved for future reference. A speech by Senator Pat Harrison, "Federal Farm-Loan Bonds," bears the encircled direction, "Don't use in South & North Dakota." Senator Gronna of North Dakota took sharp issue with Harrison on the Senate floor, and someone had the foresight to prevent any embarrassments by using this material.

Back in New York, McCarthy's office maintained another collection of information. The nominee notified him to meet the train at Dunkirk and "to bring all New York data available." McCarthy wrote a reminder across the telegram to "Get I File." FDR actively participated in assembling some of the collection. One newspaper reported:

Evening papers had been brought into the car at Frankfort [Kentucky]. Mr. Harding had not yet answered Mr. Roosevelt's question regarding what kind of a league he wanted and he had decided to repeat that question at Louisville. A clipping was found containing the exact phraseology of the question, and Mr. Roosevelt wanted to paste the clipping on a card. 'Let me do it,' said R. F. Camalier his secretary. And as Roosevelt

---

270 "FDR Correspondence File, Campaign of 1920."

271 Authored by Hon. Asbury F. Lever, Member of the Federal Farm Loan Board. Filed in Ibid.

272 Delivered in U. S. Senate, May 19, 1920. Filed in Ibid.

273 Telegram, FDR to McCarthy, October 16, 1920.
took the clipping to mount it himself Camalier turned to a newspaper man on the train and said: 'That man won't let me do anything for him.' And he is that way with all of them. What Mr. Roosevelt can do for himself he asks no man to do.274

Of course, such statements by a partisan Democratic press were intended to promote favorable publicity for the nominee. But he probably did enjoy finding his own information when time permitted.

Therefore, the "Westboro" party had some previously prepared data at its finger tips upon the receipt of a telegram from Early describing future engagements. The "advance man" frequently offered recommendations on how to prepare specific arguments. From Billings, Montana, he suggested this illustration of the League of Nations: "Two kinds business men comma one makes only verbal agreements comma other writes agreements"; at Terre Haute, Indiana, he asked for an answer to the "We want a change" cry with "Why change," followed by a tribute to former Senator Daniel W. Voorhees "with reference to educational advancement comma appointment women to federal offices and Brandeis to Supreme Court"; in Boston, he noted: "Coolidge attacks Administration charging that it spent money to win the war. Admit that money was spent and BOAST that it did trick ... ."275

274Louisville Times, October 2, 1920.

275Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 15; October 11; Letter, Early to McIntyre, September 14, 1920.
These suggestions, together with those from McCarthy and local politicians, were compiled as typewritten memoranda, which were usually two pages of short paragraphs in easy to read prose. The memoranda were supplemented with compilations of forthcoming rear platform addresses, timely speech topics, and significant local characteristics, such as the following list for the Kentucky tour:

Guthrie: Agricultural. League.
Hopkinsville: Agricultural.
Nortonville: Mines, coal and agricultural.
Earlington: Mining town, coal.
Madisonville: Agricultural and mining.
Lunch- Henderson: Labor, mining, manufacturing and agricultural in main
Owensboro: Agricultural. Manufacturing and labor.
Livermore: "
Central City: Labor and mines
Russelville: RR men and agricultural in main
Bowling Green: Agricultural and Oil. 276

Next, "suggestions" for future major speeches were typed on about two pages by various members of the campaign party. The group then met at one end of the "Westboro" and discussed their individual recommendations. FDR actively contributed to this preparatory period by scribbling his own thoughts on Navy Department memoranda, or on Democratic letterhead stationery. One notation read:

276 Memorandum, authorship unknown, "Howe Papers."
L. of N.
Great moral
persuasive restraint-

U. S. Constit.

Germany will not
have fought

Monroe Doct.

These thoughts often were extended into a completely handwritten speech, using lined paper or party stationery. After listening to the suggestions from others, the candidate sometimes made additions in shorthand at the end of his copy.

The advisory group consisted of McIntyre, Camalier, Sullivan, and Lynch throughout the three tours. Others who sat in from time to time included Stanley Prenosil, Associated Press correspondent; Lorry Jacobs, Newspaper Enterprise Association reporter; Robert S. Marx, Ohio Superior Court Judge; Louis Howe; and Mrs. Roosevelt. Prenosil and Jacobs were helpful in predicting press reaction and in offering publicity outlets; Marx was a personal friend of Cox and advised FDR on how to coordinate his campaign with the Governor's; Howe worked in conjunction with the permanent "Westboro" staff.

\[\text{277}^{\text{"FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920"; Holograph (complete), in \textit{Ibid.}, Omaha, Nebraska, August 28, 1920, 11 pp.; "1920 Campaign Notes For A Speech," 2 pp.}}\]

\[\text{278}^{\text{For example, see \textit{Ibid.}}}\]

\[\text{279}^{\text{Letter, FDR to Andersson, September 22, 1920; Eleanor Roosevelt, \textit{This Is My Story}, p. 316.}}\]
Judge Marx reviewed Cox's experience and achievements in a prepared speech scheduled immediately preceding many of Roosevelt's eastern addresses. The Vice-Presidential nominee was impressed with Marx's address and requested that the Judge accompany him through New York State in September because "His presentation of Governor Cox's story is just as important as my speeches." When the jurist found it impossible to continue on the "Westboro" in October, FDR obtained a copy of the four-page single-spaced manuscript and proudly labeled each page "The Record." Presumably, other speakers adapted this "Record" and used it at the various stops. Therefore, planning not only included the preparation of a particular speech for the candidate but often involved decisions relative to the format for an entire meeting.

However, inter-personal relationships lacked harmony on occasion. Howe became jealous of anyone who "got too close" to FDR, consequently, in October, the 130-pound Louis challenged the 200-pound Camalier to a fist fight. But these outbreaks were rare and never seemed to upset the nominee's composure.

---

280 Telegram, FDR to Harrison, September 19, 1920.

281 Letter, Marx to FDR, October 5, 1920.

The group meetings probably were not unlike those mentioned by Rosenman during the 1928 campaign. He and FDR met at mealtime, or in an automobile, to determine subject matter and specific language for a forthcoming address. In 1920 the nominee used a larger body to reach such decisions, and, as a result of the Vice-Presidential experience, he possibly felt that a single advisor promoted better results. Also, in 1928, two large buses were used to accompany the automobiles, with considerable writing, consulting, typing, and mimeographing performed while the vehicles were "actually speeding along the road." This work had to be accomplished in the railway car in 1920. Once the group entered automobiles, all of the addresses for the day were completed and in FDR's possession. Therefore, the private car introduced certain handicaps which were corrected in later campaigns.

After the meetings, speeches needed to be developed and polished in their final form. Roosevelt wrote numerous addresses in longhand and dictated others to the busy stenographer. The staff discussions added to his general knowledge of local circumstances and guided his preparation of future remarks. In working with him several years later, Rosenman noted:

I had never met anybody who could grasp the facts of a complicated problem as quickly and as thoroughly as he [FDR]. He could listen attentively to a brief statement of the facts, and then dictate them into a

---

speech; or, then and there, walk onto a platform or rise at a banquet table and talk about them before an audience as though he had had a lifelong familiarity with them.  

In the meantime, associates compiled several pages of copy for the candidate's consideration. FDR carefully read these manuscripts, inked in corrections, and decided how the data should be used. For the eastern tour, a typewritten document bore the inscription: "Dictated by Judge Marx 9-16-20." The nominee changed several phrases and marked through other statements by noting: "Mc= Not good now," or "Not good." Presumably, these comments were directed to Marvin McIntyre who was charged with re-writing duties. Across a carefully typed manuscript is written: "Mr. Howe's suggestions for Denver Speech Oct 7 1920." Some of the ideas were retained, but, as Rosenman observed:

Frequently and continuously in the process of speech writing he [FDR] would make copious corrections of language in his own hand — shortening a sentence here or making a phrase there more pungent and striking than it was. He had a marked ability to contract a long sentence into a shorter and more effective one.

A statement by Marx originally read: "This confession of his [Harding's] political faith was probably prompted by the news from

---

284Ibid., p. 22.


286Ibid., Denver, Colorado, October 7, 1920, 4 pp.

287Working with Roosevelt, p. 143.
the independent thinking and independent voting West and Northwest of how the Independents, whose voters in 1916 proved so decisive, are going to vote this year." FDR shortened the sentence, as follows: "This confession of his political faith was probably prompted by the reports of how the independent thinking voter of the West and Northwest, who in 1916 proved so decisive, are [sic] going to vote this year." Although sometimes grammatically inaccurate in his hasty alterations, he possessed the writing ability which Rosenman recognized later.

Roosevelt was aided considerably by others in composing these 1920 addresses. However, the final production was always his own. He used the suggestions of a rather large staff, but dictated the last draft after giving due consideration to their advice. He often scribbled additional remarks, or eliminated whole paragraphs, on the final copy. Most of the data filed under "Speech Material & Suggestions" and "Speech File, 1920 Unidentified Material" were dictated by the candidate. They probably include early drafts of speeches which he polished and completed for later delivery. Also, he wrote his own press statements for release to the wire services and dictated most of the information published as "interviews." Kentucky reporters heard McIntyre say:

288 Letter, FDR to White, October 8, 1920.
289 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
"We all help him [FDR] prepare a dandy speech, but he never uses it. No one can tell Franklin Roosevelt what to say." 290

The exigencies of national electioneering made it impossible to write each speech in full before its presentation. Governor Cox observed:

Campaigning in the Far West presented many difficulties. The three hours' difference in time made it imperative for us to send out advance press notices during the night; otherwise, we would have missed all the next day's morning papers in the East and some of the early afternoon editions, too . . .

. . . There was no written speech. What you had to say had to be drawn out of thin air . . . . 291

Of course, Roosevelt did not rely on the "thin air" method, but he found the pressure for advanced copies to be an eastern, as well as a western, problem. The Associated Press requested texts of the Maine addresses five days before their delivery. 292

However, newspapers rarely published a complete speech, therefore, McIntyre passed out "extracts" which developed the speaker's major points. After he gained experience, the nominee probably used "extracts" for his reading copy. He jotted the following major points on the first page of his Spokane, Washington, extract:

---

290 As quoted in Louisville Times, October 2, 1920.


292 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, August 19, 1920.
These points either led into the body of typed material, or
recalled previously prepared inserts which he included at Spokane.
With the heavy schedule in Washington State, it was probably
impossible to finish a manuscript for the speaker and a separate
condensation for the press. The candidate chose to concentrate on
readying the press material and to speak extemporaneously from a
copy of the "extracts." In later campaigns for the Presidency,
most of his speeches "had to be written one after another while
the train was making its way around the country."294 This same
preparation format was followed in 1920, which provided valuable
experience for the latter tours.

While Roosevelt devoted considerable time to the prepa-
ration of major addresses, his heavy itinerary made it utterly
impracticable to dedicate equal attention to the brief, rear
platform appearances. He spoke twenty-six times in Washington
State in two days, ten times in central and western Indiana on

293Carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File,

294Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt, p. 121.
October 13, and twelve times in Winchester County, New York, on October 29. A cancelled speech in Idaho offered additional time to prepare for Washington and a three-day vacation in September provided some opportunity to consider future engagements. But these short interludes gave the candidate only time to catch his breath. The cumbersome schedule made it necessary to resort to repetition in speech content. Mrs. Roosevelt mentioned being present "when Franklin was making the same speech for the umptny-umptth time . . . ."  

Identical manuscripts are on file for Butte and Helena, Montana; for Albany, Schenectady, and Troy, New York; and for an afternoon at Cincinnati and a night at Grand Rapids, Michigan. These are only a few of the duplications among the minor addresses. Steve Early understood the pressures involved in speech preparation and encouraged these restatements. From Massachusetts, he telegraphed: "Situation in Springfield similar . . . ."


297 This Is My Story, p. 318.

298 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920."
to that in Pittsfield"; and in West Virginia: "Mannington desires same subjects as Fairmont." 299

Rather than produce completely new manuscripts, previously used texts often were altered by using inserts. This procedure included eliminating some dated material and replacing it with more relevant data. In other instances, it meant substituting a less popular issue for one that Early felt would generate a better response. These inserts were dictated by Roosevelt and frequently consisted of a single typewritten page. This procedure was used in order to tailor an address to a particular audience. The original text was designated with Arabic numbers, while the additions usually carried alphabetic symbols or Roman numerals. The Seattle speech included pages "A" through "E" preceding the numbered pages; the St. Louis address was prefaced with page "I"; and a frequently used insert was labeled "B." As the campaign progressed, the inserts were neither lettered nor numbered until they were placed into a speech and assigned the proper Arabic number.

The New York themes are basically the same, except for the reshuffling of these inserts. The pages were used over and over by simply altering a few transitional sentences and changing a few page numbers. Every one of a half dozen speeches delivered

299 Telegrams, Early to FDR, September 13; 28, 1920.
in Brooklyn on a single day included a page which began, "Tomorrow is Theodore Roosevelt's birthday."

After using the inserts week after week, the candidate called them by name and entered them into an address while it was being delivered. Those most frequently developed were: "Al Smith"; "Man who wanted to"; "Husband a Repub"; "Woman in France"; "Everybody is doing it"; and "Here is a straw in the wind." The inserts went through the same preparatory steps as the complete addresses. At times, the nominee read portions of a McCarthy telegram which predicted a gigantic shift in the Democrat's favor, or used an Early message as a reminder to greet "gold star" mothers, disabled veterans, and Irish voters. These communications, in effect, became speech inserts, or portions of the speech notes.

It was possible, after analyzing a telegram from the "advance man," to produce a new speech rapidly by grabbing an old text, editing out several paragraphs, entering the necessary inserts, and writing the appropriate transitions. This system of "patchwork" was performed on an assembly line basis as the "Westboro" moved along between the frequent stops.

300 "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920"; "Unidentified Speeches, Statements, & Incomplete Items."

301 Letters, FDR to McCarthy, October 9; Early to McIntyre, September 14; Telegrams, McCarthy to FDR, October 12; Early to FDR, October 11, 1920.
Rosenman recalled the use of inserts and corrections in 1928, when Roosevelt gave him his "first lesson in how to pull a speech together and pep it up." The future President's 1920 speech writing method was similar to the steps he continued to employ years later, which included: assembling source material; jotting down notations; writing out complete speeches; considering the suggestions of others; conferring with a small advisory group; re-writing the original speeches; condensing lengthy sentences; preparing inserts; and, finally, making additional corrections on the finished draft. However, during the Vice-Presidential race, he was less organized and he surrounded himself with a larger group of advisors and pseudo-advisors. Nevertheless, the 1920 experience taught him many lessons in speech writing that were destined to be used in the more successful state and national campaigns.

The Itinerary

The previous sections of this chapter revealed what the speaker used for source material, how his addresses were written, and who took part in these undertakings. Another important facet of speech preparation involved where the messages were to be presented. As shown, Early, McIntyre, Howe, McCarthy, and Lynch exercised varying degrees of power over the candidate's itinerary.

---

302 Working with Roosevelt, pp. 19, 22.
A contemporary writer, Charles Willis Thompson, tried to explain the complications in planning a national political tour as follows:

He [the candidate] is the mere slave of the National Committee, of men sitting at desks in New York or Chicago, with railroad maps before them, unable to see the human being whom they are sending ruthlessly over this track and the other. They, in their turn, tend to become servants of the local committees, though whether they do depends pretty much on their own character. If the sub-committee in charge of the candidate has backbone enough, it will stand out against the bullying or the pleading of the local committee. But it is pretty hard, back in New York and Chicago, to withstand the pleading or thinly disguised browbeating of the local committee of Red County, Michinois . . . .

FDR used the general organizational format described by Thompson, except for several major innovations. As the campaign progressed, he partially freed himself from National Committee enslavement. Also, his itinerary "sub-committee" was a loose-knit, far-flung unit which included Early, McIntyre, Howe, McCarthy, and Lynch. Professor Sait describes an ambitious political tour as "madness— stark, staring insane confusion" involving "good men . . . who campaign themselves silly over the brass rail of a back platform."304

In order to investigate the evolutionary development of itinerary planning, the campaign schedule is analyzed month-by-month.

304 American Parties and Elections, p. 625; Sait is quoting Behind the Scenes in Politics by an anonymous author, p. 74.
August

Roosevelt opened his national tour in Chicago, August 11, and Cox began at Camp Perry, Ohio, August 12. Immediately after his Chicago address, the junior candidate's August trail traversed Wisconsin, Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. He spoke in each of these states except Idaho and Nevada. In the meantime, his running mate pursued a far more abbreviated schedule in the middle western area.

The nominees did not control completely their own personal travel plans. The overall pattern was established after careful contemplation by the Democratic National Committee. At headquarters, the timetables were typed under the direction of George White, National Chairman, Senator Pat Harrison, Chairman of the Speakers' Bureau, C. E. McCullough, transportation chief, and Charles H. McCarthy, FDR headquarters manager. A constant flow of "proposed" itineraries, "tentative" itineraries, and "revised" itineraries resulted. These schedules revealed the time and place of departures, the railway lines, the train numbers, the time and place of arrivals, appointments for speeches, accommodations for eating and sleeping, and transportation provisions for side trips. The nine major rail lines, many "feeder" lines,

---

305 Chicago Herald and Examiner, August 13, 1920.

306 See "FDR Itineraries, Campaign of 1920."
and countless automobiles used in August contributed to the confusion.

However, Roosevelt courageously took the plans in hand and began the western swing. His "advance man" soon realized that the headquarters' tables only touched the major cities within each state. In collaboration with local committees, he set up new speaking dates along the route. With the tour hardly a week old, he asked to be notified about all "changes" in the itinerary. Apparently, the New York office began grinding out alterations as the train pulled out of the Chicago station. When a conflict began unfolding in Washington and Oregon, Early vowed to "straighten this out." From that moment on throughout the campaign, he became the chief figure in the campaigner's itinerary "sub-committee." Realizing the difficulty of clearing these matters through an eastern headquarters, he took upon himself the responsibility for making definite commitments. FDR respected Early's independence and judgment, and allowed the ex-correspondent to dictate the desirable changes. There is no evidence that the nominee ever challenged these modifications.

---

307 For example, in North Dakota, he scheduled new meetings at Valley City, Jamestown, and Bismarck before the tour was three days old. See Telegram, Early to FDR, August 14, 1920.

308 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 16, 1920.

309 Letter, Early to Howe, August 16, 1920.
The opening month produced its share of hazards. Roosevelt was forced to make a dangerously "swift trip by automobile from Coeur d'Alene, Idaho," in order to keep a speaking engagement. At Ellensburg, Washington, a "freight wreck delayed the special train . . . and only ten minutes could be given to the stop in that city." In another small western town, he was awakened, serenaded, and called out to the hotel balcony. Attired in pajamas and a bathrobe, "he talked to the crowd that had assumed large proportions." Traveling through northern California, he was delayed by "a reactionary freight car"; and at Fresno he spoke bareheaded for thirty minutes during the "most violent thunder storm in years . . . but the crowd stayed, and Roosevelt said he did not mind a summer shower."

Early was a day or two ahead, making changes and attempting to solidify the loosely organized "tentative" itineraries; McIntyre and Lynch adjusted schedules to fit Early's alterations; McCarthy wrote daily letters begging the New Yorker to return to his home state; Harrison received "numberless requests from the West" for new

310 Seattle Star, August 19, 1920.
engagements; and Howe was confined to his Navy Department office. The nominee expressed some discontent, but Senator Harrison thought he "should take the assignments given" and that most of his time "should be spent in the West." \(^{315}\)

Willing to follow the National Committee's directions at the beginning of August, the candidate became progressively more independent toward the end of the first western tour. He relied almost entirely on arrangements made by his personal staff as the "Westboro" swung toward the New England states.

**September**

Roosevelt opened the month of September with a vigorous three-day campaign in Maine prior to that state's traditionally early fall elections. He returned to New York to spend Labor Day, September 6, in Brooklyn, and then took a brief vacation at Campobello Island. This rest period was cut short by the untimely death of Uncle Warren Delano at Barrytown, New York. Upon returning for the funeral, the nominee authorized the release of his proposed Bangor, Maine, address as a press statement. Next, he traveled through New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and West Virginia. He delivered speeches in all of these states except Maryland during September.

\(^{314}\) Letter, McCarthy to FDR, August 24, 1920.

\(^{315}\) Letter, McCarthy to FDR, August 27, 1920.
In the same month, Cox crossed Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas. He spoke in every state but Illinois. When the Vice-Presidential candidate visited the East, the Presidential nominee moved into the West. At the end of September, they were preparing to exchange territories once more. While Roosevelt never argued with this general strategy, he reserved more control than the Democratic National Committee over his itinerary within certain areas and particular states.

National headquarters continued to develop typewritten itineraries, but FDR stepped in and made personal suggestions. In a memorandum to Senator Harrison he offered the following "idea":

I should start in New Hampshire on Monday, the 13th, including the evening, then on Tuesday get out to Western Massachusetts. In other words to the country as nearly as possible to Northampton and Holyoke that day - also Springfield the same day. Wednesday that I should take in Worcester and Boston. Thursday that I should take in New Bedford for a noon meeting, Fall River for a late afternoon meeting when the factories close, and Providence, R. I. for evening meeting. This is all to do in Providence. I decline to go to Newport. Friday or Saturday that I should speak in Connecticut, but to tell the Connecticut people that I wish to speak not merely in Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport, but that I insist on their taking me into some of the smaller towns which are heavily Republican. Saturday night meeting of that week I should like to have as close as possible to New York, so that I could come into New York after the meeting (any old train) because I want to take the morning train to Hyde Park that Sunday
morning. Or id [sic] they arrange the evening meeting for me in Danbury, Connecticut, I will be able to motor home that same night. Try to arrange for Danbury meeting. I have a special reason why I want to be in Danbury.

Contemporary newspapers revealed that the candidate's "idea" was adopted, down to his final wish regarding Danbury.

While resting at Campobello, FDR allowed McIntyre to work on his forthcoming schedule at the New York office, but kept in constant touch with his associate. He took great interest in helping to formulate plans for the New York State tour. A one-page "proposed itinerary" was typed which supposedly outlined dates for the final ten days in September. Roosevelt made extensive, handwritten alterations to this schedule before returning it for revision. Even in the midst of a busy campaign, he rigidly held to family tradition by insisting on a day off in order to enroll his son in Groton. He sometimes spelled out his preferences to McCarthy, who passed the data to McIntyre. This information was

316 Memorandum, FDR to Harrison, September 2, 1920.


318 Telegrams, FDR to McIntyre, September 8; 10, 1920.

re-typed and became a single-spaced, five-page itinerary for the same ten day period. Far more complete than the August timetables, this document identified many specific buildings where meetings would be held, attempted to list each city scheduled for rear platform addresses, designated places where automobiles were needed, and provided for the movement of the "Westboro" to advantageous points. For example, a portion of this itinerary reads as follows:

In day coach account no track connections at Ogdensburg between N. Y. C. & H. R. & Rutland. Special car will be moved empty leaving Ogdensburg at 1:00 P.M. on N. Y. C. & H. R. Train #94-9 via DeKalb Jct. arriving Norwood 3:00 P.M. and there attached to rear of Rutland train #6 at 4:10 P.M. for further movement. 320

These preparations forced the proposed routes to be typed and re-typed, but the extra effort probably eliminated some of the former difficulties. Certainly Early was freed from many itinerary harassments, especially those which involved minor side trips and rear platform addresses. Even this attention to detail did not solve all dilemmas. At Pittsfield, Massachusetts, no provision was made for daylight saving time; in Schenectady, Troy, and Albany, New York, the routes created "several wrinkles of minor importance" which Early "smoothed out"; from Morgantown to Fairmont, West Virginia, rail travel was substituted for "auto trip over bad roads"
by the alert "advance man"; and at Wheeling the National Committee shifted the candidate's railroad schedule.\footnote{321}{Telegrams, Early to FDR, September 12; 19; 28; Letter, Early to Howe, September 19, 1920, "Howe Papers."

There were fewer unalterable hazards during September. FDR was "kidnapped" by a factional group at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, and carried to Holyoke, thus leaving a party of "more than 100 prominent Democratic men and women waiting at the Springfield Union Station . . . ." The group mistook a local postmaster for the candidate, but everything ended "well enough to discount an untoward incident.\footnote{322}{Springfield [Massachusetts] Union, September 15, 1920.} One Massachusetts speech had to be delivered from the rear of an automobile.\footnote{323}{Ibid.; Springfield [Massachusetts] Republican, September 15, 1920.} At Friendly, West Virginia, the candidate was called upon for an impromptu address in the rain, where he spoke "for nearly 15 minutes" while clad in a raincoat.\footnote{324}{Charleston [West Virginia] Gazette, October 1, 1920.}

All in all, the September tour was better planned and progressed more smoothly than the initial western jaunt. Roosevelt took an active part in overseeing the details and relied more on his secretariat to help in the preparatory stages. Early was relieved of many minor details which seemed to confront him constantly in August. Also, the candidate was physically closer to
headquarters, and took the liberty to offer several administrative suggestions to Chairman White and Senator Harrison. 325

October

The final month of campaigning found PDR pushing westward once more. He delivered speeches in Kentucky, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, and Iowa, before moving eastward into Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, and Maryland. At the same time, Cox left Oklahoma and proceeded into Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and West Virginia. The Governor ended his campaign in Toledo, Ohio. Unlike his running mate, he tended to move through a state quickly, even traveling through several states on a Sunday, then back-tracked through these same areas at a later date. Roosevelt spent more time in the West and in New England, while Cox out-distanced PDR in his native middle western area.

Apparently, the Vice-Presidential candidate was denied sufficient time to contemplate and to revise his third tour. The itineraries do not reveal the detailed completeness noted in the eastern swing. Written recommendations and revamped schedules are missing also. Similarly to the August trip, many October

325 Unsigned Memorandum to Harrison, September 3; Memorandum, FDR to White, September 6; Letter, FDR to Harrison, September 22, 1920.
preparations were handled en route with McCarthy as the liaison man between the "Westboro" and headquarters. 326

Problems developed immediately. On October 1, the train reached Mount Sterling an hour late and the delay caused repercussions throughout the Kentucky tour. 327 The Frankfort stop was not included on the itinerary until the day FDR arrived, "and the large crowd was a complete surprise to members of the Roosevelt party." 328 The nominee moved into Louisville that night and delivered his address more than two hours behind schedule. He was still forty minutes late at Henderson the following day and had to cut the length of his speech. 329 Poor planning was partially responsible for these failures. Of course, eager audiences detained the popular young man, but by October this was not an entirely unexpected obstacle.

A local committee conflict forced Early to revise completely a full day's schedule in Colorado, after the National Committee took no action. 330 Several days later at Des Moines, FDR received the following wire from a Kansas Democratic Committee Chairman:

326 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 1, 1920.
327 Louisville Times, October 1, 1920.
328 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 1, 1920.
329 Louisville Herald, October 2; Evansville [Indiana] Courier, October 3, 1920.
330 Telegrams, Saunders to FDR; Early to FDR, October 5, 1920.
YOUR TRAIN ARRIVES KANSAS CITY MO TOO LATE OCT 9 FOR YOU TO ADDRESS MEETING KANSAS CITY KANS. WE WANT YOU AND WILL SEND AEROPLANE TO SEDALIA TO MEET YOU IF YOU WILL AGREE TO THIS METHOD OF TRANSPORTATION. THIS IS ONLY CHANCE OF TEN THOUSAND KANSAS WORKING MEN TO HEAR YOU. WE GUARANTEE SAFE HUNDRED FIFTY HORSE POWER MACHINE AND EXPERT PILOT TEN YEAR EXPERIENCED AND ARMY INSTRUCTOR. PLEASE WIRE ME AT ONCE IF YOU WILL COME. [sic] SO ARRANGEMENTS MAYBE [sic] COMPLETED. DISTANCE TO BE TRAVELED ABOUT EIGHTY MILES. PAT HARRISON SUGGESTED WE WIRE YOU DIRECT.331

Although it meant one more speaking engagement and an added strain, the candidate probably realized the publicity benefits to be derived from such a novel, daring, and risky mode of travel. After all, Cousin Teddy gained some renown a month earlier by riding "an aeroplane" from Joplin, Missouri, to Vineta, Oklahoma. He was involved in two aircraft accidents on the same day, escaped unhurt, and continued his trip to Okmulgee, Oklahoma, in a third machine.332

The Vice-Presidential candidate made the eighty-six mile trip safely in sixty-five minutes, circling the adjoining cities before landing at Kellerstrass Field at Kansas City, Kansas. The uncommon transportation device drew as much attention as the speech he presented after his auspicious arrival.333

While these radical changes were unfolding, he took an active part in formulating itinerary projects for late October. The

331 Telegram, Melott to FDR, October 8, 1920.
332 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 9, 1920.
333 For example, see Kansas City [Missouri] Post, October 10, 1920.
National Committee no longer issued schedules without receiving the
candidate's prior approval. The final swing through New York,
Maryland, and New Jersey was undergoing close scrutiny by FDR as he
made his way across the Mississippi. 334 These timetables were
subjected to several typed revisions in order to prevent costly
travel errors during the final ten days. 335 But the Democratic
prospect offered to upset these arrangements for the opportunity to
debate his GOP adversary. He wired the following message to the
Speakers' Bureau:

Have just read of your offer for joint debate between
Governor Cox and Senator Harding . . . Why leave me
out? I would be charmed to discuss the League and
lots of other things with Governor Coolidge any time,
any place. I authorize you to act as my second and
to attend to the preliminaries. 336

Unfortunately, Governor Coolidge "did not favor such a method of
campaigning," and departed on a short southern tour. 337

Intermittently FDR was plagued with certain obstructions
in October. There was an attempt to seek alternate speaking sites
in case inclement weather forced cancellation of outdoor

334 Unsigned

334 Unsigned Memorandum to Harrison, October 7; Letters, FDR
to McCarthy, October 9; McCullough to McCarthy, October 12; McCarthy
to FDR, October 14; Memorandum, Peckering to McCarthy, October 11,
1920.

335 "FDR Itineraries, Campaign of 1920."

336 Telegram, FDR to Harrison, October 14, 1920.

meetings. Little could be done, however, to avoid adverse automobile road conditions. In a single day, the candidate endured more than 100 miles of bumpy, dusty, Indiana "highway" in order to make ten speeches to isolated audiences. It was not uncommon to use twenty-five automobiles to usher his party into a small town in a veritable, man-made dust storm. On one such excursion near Lagoda, Indiana, his vehicle lost a tire and he "narrowly escaped injury." After two days of physical turmoil, he telegraphed Early from Marion, Indiana: "Object seriously to large number of small meetings and electric line unless special car is provided . . . . If weather cold or stormy, automobile trips highly undesirable, and outdoor meetings subject to cancellation if raining." Nevertheless, a Cumberland, Maryland, speech was delivered during the final week "in a drizzle from the steps of the City Hall," and a second address was given during a hard rain.

FDR was unhappy about itinerary developments for October. He curtly informed the Speakers' Bureau Chairman: "Several

---

338 For example; see Lawrence [Kansas] Journal-World, October 4, 1920.


340 Telegram, FDR to Early, October 15, 1920.

341 Baltimore Sun, October 28, 1920.
places lately received notice my coming only two or three days in advance though we knew of dates two weeks ago.\textsuperscript{342} He had to warn McCarthy that the New York City and Brooklyn schedule was "too much," and that Yonkers was not the proper place to wind up the campaign. He told the manager to "make it clear that I am not in position to be carted around to small meetings in many districts," and suggested Buffalo as the final speech. Furthermore, he asked for the committee "to work in important places in Maryland before speaking Baltimore in evening," to include some Connecticut addresses, and to reserve November 1 for a "Poughkeepsie non partisan meeting."\textsuperscript{343}

Nevertheless, he was "carted around" New York City for eight addresses on October 25, delivered seven Brooklyn speeches on October 26, and held his final campaign meeting in Madison Square Garden rather than Buffalo.\textsuperscript{344} However, some of his requests were granted. After McCarthy wired, "No other meeting [in] Maryland possible because you could not get to Hagerstown or Cumberland,"\textsuperscript{345} he delivered two speeches in a Cumberland rainstorm before

\textsuperscript{342}Telegram, FDR to Harrison, October 18, 1920.
\textsuperscript{343}Telegram, FDR to McCarthy, October 16, 1920.
\textsuperscript{345}Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 18, 1920.
proceeding into Baltimore. His request to speak in Connecticut was realized, and he appeared at the "Poughkeepsie non partisan meeting" the day before balloting.

The mistakes and misunderstandings which complicated the August itinerary probably were passed off as the honest errors of beginners. In the Far West, the nominee quickly learned to place more faith in Early's judgment, rather than rely on a distant and bureaucratic National Committee.

In September, he took an active part in planning and in formulating his timetables. The result was rewarding and numerous difficulties were eliminated.

Isolated in the West and Middle West during most of October, the old problems evolved once more. The itinerary was not satisfactory. The candidate became irritated with the blunders of a recalcitrant and poorly directed headquarters as the third tour drew to a close. Too many men were involved, and McCarthy failed miserably in giving FDR the assistance necessary for a smooth operation. The candidate, with the primary assistance of his accompanying secretariat, never became a "mere slave of the National Committee." But neither was he successful in completely freeing himself from the Committee's interference and control.

\[346\] Baltimore Sun, October 28, 1920.

Summary

After preparing the long acceptance speech, Roosevelt assembled a secretariat to assist him on his three national political tours in 1920. Stephen T. Early, a correspondent on leave from the Associated Press, served as the "advance man" and preceded the campaign party as it moved across the country. He used coded telegrams to relay information relative to future speaking engagements. Marvin H. McIntyre, the "Westboro" manager, received and interpreted these messages in addition to overseeing an assortment of other details. Renah F. Camalier, secretary; James P. Sullivan, stenographer; and Thomas M. Lynch, transportation agent, helped in handling the various clerical duties en route.

These men assisted the candidate in gathering source material and in writing the speeches. From time to time, they were aided by Louis Howe, Judge Robert S. Marx, Stanley Prenosil, Lorry Jacobs, and Mrs. Roosevelt. Charles H. McCarthy managed the nominee's New York City headquarters and maintained contact with the traveling party.

Source material evolved from FDR's reading, experience, and conferences. His colleagues suggested many items which ultimately were used in the speeches. However, he supervised the research, the planning, and the writing of these addresses. In the final analysis, they were always products of his own development.
Itinerary planning was a major weakness which improved only when the candidate actively participated in its formulation. Both western schedules suffered from the poor administration of the Democratic National Committee and its subordinate bureaus.

The Vice-Presidential campaign offered FDR invaluable experience in speech preparation, although mistakes were made. His advisory staff was too large, his headquarters office was not managed competently, and his itinerary was "supervised" by too many people. However, in later years he retained his basic 1920 pattern of speech writing, formed an excellent secretariat from those who assisted him at this time, and pursued a similar route in campaigning for the Presidency in 1932. Even though he never became Vice-President, the 1920 effort was a profitable one.
CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST CAMPAIGN TOUR, AUGUST 9 - AUGUST 31

Introduction

Preceding chapters analyzed Roosevelt's national political background, the issues apparent in 1920, and the candidate's speech preparation procedures. The next three chapters investigate selected major speeches delivered during each of the three campaign tours. These addresses were presented to large audiences of several thousand auditors in important cities throughout the country. They were longer in length than the rear platform presentations and usually developed several political issues. All but the Hyde Park acceptance speech were scheduled during prime evening hours, and with the exception of the initial address they were designated as "major" speeches in Stephen T. Early's telegrams.

Contemporary newspapers confirm the delivery of eighty-three speeches by the Vice-Presidential candidate during the first campaign tour, from August 9 through August 31. Possibly additional minor addresses were given with limited, or nonexistent, news coverage. From this total, eleven complete speeches and eleven excerpts of speeches are extant in the Roosevelt Library. This chapter analyzes the Hyde Park acceptance speech, the opening campaign message at Chicago, and the Seattle address. A critique
of each oration includes an investigation of audience, occasion, and setting; choice of subject and speech goal; premises and methods of proof; speech structure; use of language; delivery; and a final evaluation.

Hyde Park

Audience, Occasion, and Setting

Thomssen and Baird emphasize the value of analyzing "audience characteristics" and the "temper and tone of the occasion."\(^1\)

Roosevelt gave careful consideration to the proposed audience, occasion, and setting for the notification festivities. In fact, his July vacation on Campobello Island afforded him considerable time to contemplate all aspects of this opening address. Once the campaign began, he never enjoyed such extensive leisure again. He kept in close contact with the men in charge of local arrangements, including Thomas Lynch, an old friend, and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., the former Ambassador to Turkey. They prepared to handle a large crowd, to provide sufficient parking for automobiles, to distribute 15,000 invitations, to schedule preliminary speakers, and to welcome Democratic dignitaries. Morgenthau decided that it was "best for your sake not to have Cox come on" the program and

reported that everyone was "working harmoniously." Roosevelt was concerned about those people who "will come up on yachts," and made provisions for an adequate landing with a hoisted American flag directing them to the dock.

The family's ancestral estate was gaily decorated with flags and bunting. The speaker's stand was placed on the wide stone porch in front of seats provided for his mother; his wife; his children; other members of his immediate family; William Gibbs McAdoo, the former Secretary of the Treasury; Byron R. Newton, the collector of the port of New York; John K. Sague, the appraiser of the port; William C. Redfield, the former Secretary of Commerce; Josephus Daniels, the Secretary of the Navy; George R. Lunn, the mayor of Schenectady; Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York; and other notables. George White presided over the ceremonies and introduced Homer S. Cummings, the chairman of the notification committee. One publication noted: "It is a wonderful front porch — a long, broad, stone veranda of a beautiful two and a half story stucco house, with stone wings, and vines, shrubbery and palms to make it homelike."

Letter, Morgenthau to FDR, July 29, 1920. All letters, memoranda, speeches, itineraries, and telegrams referred to herein are located in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.

Letter, FDR to Plog, July 28, 1920.


Morgenthau formed an official "reception committee" from a large group of New York State political figures. The arrival of Governor Smith and Lieutenant Governor Harry C. Walker evoked a noisy demonstration. When the Governor alighted from his automobile, the band played "Tammany" and "Another Little Drink Wouldn't Do Us Any Harm," as "the crowd went wild over their Chief Executive" during this prohibition era. The New York Times tried to minimize former ill-feelings between the New York City Democratic organization and the candidate by reporting that "Tammany turned out in great numbers . . . buried the hatchet . . . and they are behind their former critic." But the publication noted the absence of the Tammany chieftain, Charles F. Murphy, without admitting a division in party ranks. Tammany's lack of enthusiasm for the national ticket, first noted at San Francisco and re-emphasized at Hyde Park continued to plague Democratic hopefuls throughout the campaign.

The audience totaled "10,000 people from the high-ways and byways of Dutchess county and from hamlets, towns and cities along the Hudson River Valley and delegates from the four corners of the country." They covered the spacious lawns, remained seated in hundreds of automobiles, and clustered about the porch.

7 Ibid.
It was a great crowd — neighbors and neighbors' children, old men and women, misses and matrons, boys and girls in their teens, business men and women, professional men and women, political men and women. There were great cheers at the candidate's initial appearance; his speech of acceptance was interrupted by frequent outbursts of applause; but for the most part his auditors followed his lines earnestly and intently, nodding their approval. One old woman in black, standing almost in front of the veranda from where he spoke, pointed her flag every time he made a period, her face wreathed in smiles.9

Republicans and Democrats "joined in acknowledging the honor that has come to one of their neighbors."10 The existence of Republicans "was indicated by a big Harding-Coolidge sign in a conspicuous part of the main street and a Harding poster in a window on the way to the notification exercises. It was a saloon window, at that."11

The ceremonies were simple and it was more like "an Old Home Week" than the "Stiff Occasion" that many expected. The activities were scheduled to begin at three o'clock in the afternoon, but they were late getting started. Many people stood "in the rays of a hot boiling sun, but the heat and delay were both born[e] patiently under the promise that the candidate was about to appear." Suddenly a bell tolled three times and the candidate was escorted past the band which occupied a covered porch. Silence fell over the crowd

as the musicians played "The Star Spangled Banner," and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., acting as master of ceremonies, introduced George H. White, the presiding officer of the meeting. White introduced Reverend E. P. Newton, rector of Hyde Park's Saint James Episcopal Church, who offered the invocation. Homer Cummings followed with the official notification address, and launched an attack on the Republican Congress. FDR responded by accepting the nomination. The meeting closed when Reverend Father Morley, of the Hyde Park Roman Catholic Church, pronounced the benediction. "A hundred cameras clicked and clicked," pictorially recording these historic events.12

The crowd pressed forward at the conclusion, surrounding and congratulating the nominee by greeting him with handshakes and cheering. The candidate responded with "a good hearty grip and a good hardy smile, grin or a laugh, accompanied by a word here and there."13 "He always loved electioneering; cheering crowds, and people to meet — thousands of people who all seemed to wish him well, whatever their politics. The enthusiastic receptions fooled him into forgetting that the cause was lost."14 As the listeners


formed small groups on the lawn, discussing the events of the day, waiters supplied them with soft drinks, crackers, and sandwiches. Although the proposed schedule was delayed, the meeting was highly successful due to competent and meticulous planning.

Choice of Subject and Speech Goal

On initial observation, Roosevelt's speech goal appeared to have been fourfold:

1. To accept the Vice-Presidential nomination;
2. To express his own national and international political philosophy;
3. To stimulate the partisan Democrats to work vigorously for the party ticket; and
4. To appeal for support from neutral and partisan Republican voters.

However, the speech exemplified a patently single objective. The candidate attempted to enlist support for the continuance of progressivism. On the basis of popular sentiment, opposition to this philosophy could be expected from blocs of Democratic, Republican, third party, and independent voters. After all, the Republican ticket and platform were pledged to oppose Wilson's progressive ideals, and the Democrats needed forty-four roll calls to nominate a progressive candidate at San Francisco. In addition,

the huge New York City machine, Tammany Hall, was timid in endorsing wholeheartedly the candidacy of the progressive Roosevelt. Also, the third parties, which normally opposed reactionary points of view, were weak in 1920. Therefore, FDR delivered an argumentative speech at Hyde Park. He sought "to change attitudes and beliefs" among all listeners opposed to the continuance of progressivism; and to gain "mental agreement" by convincing them that he was right.

In order to effect this goal, he chose to speak, primarily, on the pressing international problems by emphasizing America's need to play an even larger role in world affairs, as opposed to becoming a "hermit nation, dreaming of the past." Nationally, he suggested that many contemporary problems could be solved by a reorganization of governmental machinery. In each instance, he declared that Governor Cox, as "a proved executive," was the man fully equipped to lead the nation toward "organized progress at home." His speech


17 Bound typescript reading copy (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Hyde Park, New York, August 9, 1920, p. 2. All quotations from the acceptance address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR Hyde Park Speech.

18 Ibid., pp. 3, 1. All italics used in the quotations of this address are those of the speaker. As indicated, many words were not underlined completely.
was an attempt to show that the Democratic Party answered the demand for proven, progressive leadership. In so doing, he firmly supported joining the League of Nations and recalled the promises expounded in the Democratic platform.

The choice of subject and the speech goal were wisely selected for the Hyde Park audience, occasion, and setting. The huge audience represented marked differences in age, education, sex, and political sentiment. FDR recognized his obligation to convince these listeners that his progressive, political philosophy was sound, at a time when the popular trend favored a return to the reactionary principles of isolationism and laissez faire. He revealed "a steady broadening of interests" in his first speech delivered to a national audience.\(^\text{19}\) In expressing these interests, he "was flinging his philosophy right in the teeth of a nation that was roaring off on a mad career of uncontrolled expansion . . . . It took courage to make it, as it did to stand for full international cooperation."\(^\text{20}\)

---


\(^{20}\) Hatch, \textit{Franklin D. Roosevelt}, p. 122.
Premises and Methods of Proof

The following statements of Thonssen and Baird form a bases upon which to survey the premises postulated in Roosevelt's acceptance speech:

But, in the main, the ideas which live within the memories of succeeding generations, and the ideas whose integrity is tested and appraised more often in later history, are the ones which deliberative speakers have developed in addresses on the burning issues of their time. Hence, they are ideas directed to expediency of certain conduct or action. 21

In the acceptance speech, FDR chose to expound on "the burning issues" facing the nation in 1920 and to recommend "certain conduct or action." He avoided specific economic and social problems. He attempted to concentrate on political topics by favoring America's entry into the League of Nations and by endorsing a continuation of "progress." As previously indicated in Chapter II, these were prime issues in 1920.

Although he failed to develop an orderly continuum of "inferred facts," 22 his premises suggested the following hypothetical syllogism:

Major premise: If the United States is to solve its national and international problems, the progressive Democratic Party must control the executive and the legislative branches of government.

---

21 Speech Criticism, p. 334.
22 For an explanation, see Gray and Braden, Public Speaking, pp. 281, 293-296.
Minor premise: The United States must solve its national and international problems.

Conclusion: Therefore, the progressive Democratic Party must control the executive and the legislative branches of government.

The conditional clause, or antecedent, of the major premise was stated early in the speech: "Two great problems will confront the next administration; our relations with the world and the pressing need of organized progress at home." The fact that international and national "problems" existed probably met little opposition, but the trend in voter sentiment was moving away from programs which advocated "progress." Therefore, the antecedent introduced a controversial point early in the address.

The main clause, or consequent, offered several recommendations for action:

In our world problems, we must either shut our eyes, . . . or, we must open our eyes and see that . . . it [is] impossible to be in this world and not of it . . . .

As for our home problem, we have . . . the need for the kind of re-organization which only a clear thinking business man, experienced in the technicalities of government procedure, can carry out. Such a man we have.

---

... Progress will come not through the talkers, but through the doers.

... Appeals to the Republican House and Senate in the last session fell on apparently deaf ears.24

These, and similar, statements were scattered throughout the seventeen-page reading manuscript. The syllogistic premises did not follow an orderly progression of thought, but they suggested the main tenets of the speaker's thinking.

The minor premise affirmed the antecedent on the subject of governmental problems, and the conclusion affirmed the consequent of progressive Democratic leadership. The nominee tried to impress upon his hearers the urgency of immediate action by warning:

America's opportunity is at hand. We can lead the world by a great example, we can prove this nation a living, growing thing, with policies that are adequate to new conditions. In a thousand ways this is our hour of test.25

From this speech can be gathered several concepts of political philosophy which FDR reaffirmed throughout the campaign and put into practical application less than a decade later. Among these, the following ideas stand out:

1. The country should actively participate in world affairs, as opposed to a policy of isolationism.

24 Ibid., pp. 2, 3, 10, 12.
25 Ibid., p. 15.
2. Considerable power should be vested in a strong Federal government which would be stimulated by a reorganization of "governmental machinery."

3. The nation should continue to endorse progressive ideals, although President Wilson's progressive programs were not mentioned.

4. Executive leadership should fall upon those with experience "in the technicalities of governmental procedure."

In delivering an argumentative address, which sought mental agreement from the auditors, Roosevelt was obligated to offer substantial proof to support his controversial contentions. This support should have taken the form of logical evidence. Thonssen and Baird point out that "the constituents of logical proof are evidence and argument or reasoning." Gray and Braden conclude: "Facts for a speech normally come in three forms: testimony, statistics, and examples." Therefore, the Hyde Park address needed an ample portion of logical proof in order to gain the auditors' mental agreement. However, in this category, FDR presented general examples which were based, seemingly, on his personal governmental experience. He asked the nation not to "shut our eyes, sell our newly built merchant marine to more far-seeing foreign powers, crush utterly by embargo and harassing legislation

---

26 *Speech Criticism*, p. 341. Author's italics.

27 *Public Speaking*, p. 285.
our foreign trade, close our ports, build an impregnable wall of costly armaments . . ." If America did so, it would live "as the Orient used to live." He drew an analogy between Oriental isolationism of the past and American isolationism of 1920.

Referring to the "home problem," he urged the audience to support Governor Cox, "who has so successfully reformed the business management of his own State," and, therefore, "is obviously capable of doing greater things." Once again, FDR used an example analogously. However, he failed to identify Cox's specific gubernatorial accomplishments which were comparable to the contemporary national problems. The analogy between the League of Nations and the Federal Constitution was developed more skillfully than those previously noted. FDR used more specific comparisons, and referred to statistical fact, as emphasized in the following quotation:

We must indeed be, above all things, businesslike and practical in this peace treaty making business of ours. The League of Nations is a practical solution of a practical situation. It is no more perfect than our original Constitution, which has been amended 18 times and will soon, we hope, be amended the 19th, was perfect. It is not anti-national, it is anti-war . . . That such an object should be contrary to American policy is unthinkable . . .

---

28 FDR Hyde Park Speech, p. 2.
29 Ibid., p. 3.
30 Ibid., p. 7.
Thonssen and Baird maintain "that the analogy is useful chiefly as a reinforcer or illustrator of argument, rather than as an exacting argument in its own right . . . " Roosevelt violated this dictum inasmuch as he appeared to use analogy "as an exacting argument," and as the sole support for some contentions. This form of reasoning became a primary, rather than a supplementary, method of logical proof. Perhaps each analogy was valid, however, more details relative to Oriental isolationism and Cox's gubernatorial record would have improved these comparisons. In each case, the speaker should have reinforced his analogies more substantially with "other forms of reasoning."

Roosevelt used examples, statistics, definitions, testimony, and personal experience. However, many of these proofs were too general to be of real value in a speech intended to gain mental agreement. He referred to "the archaic shortcomings of our governmental machinery" to indicate the need for a "kind of re-organization"; and offered "the pledges given in the platform of the Democratic party" as evidence that "our party will accomplish clear aims." The general populace could not deny some of the areas suggested for future improvement:

31Speech Criticism, p. 349.
32See Gray and Braden, Public Speaking, p. 302.
33FDR Hyde Park Speech, pp. 3, 10.
If we raise the standard of education, of physical fitness, of moral sense, the generations to come will have no difficulty in coping with the problems of material economics.

So also with regard to the further development of our natural resources. . . . We need, not merely thrift by saving, but thrift by the proper use of what we have at hand. Our efforts in the past have been scattered. . . . Every dollar of our expenditures for port facilities, for inland waterways, for flood control, for the reclamation of swamp and arid lands, for highways, for public buildings, shall be expended only by trained men in accordance with a continuing plan.

. . . . the methods of the legislative branch of the National Government, especially in the upper House require drastic changes.

. . . The functions of the departments should be re-distributed along common-sense lines, and methods provided to standardize and prevent duplication of effort.\(^{34}\)

These were examples of topics needing immediate improvement, but they were not described in sufficient detail,\(^{35}\) and the speaker did not disclose any specific solutions. He passed the blame to the Republican Congress for its inaction and noted that "Congress only can authorize the remedy."\(^{36}\) This admission pinpointed an obvious weakness in the candidate's argument. While he extolled the virtues and qualifications of the Democratic Presidential nominee, he seemingly admitted that Cox, if elected, would be powerless to

\(^{34}\) Ibid., pp. 10-12.

\(^{35}\) See Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 345.

\(^{36}\) FDR Hyde Park Speech, p. 13.
effect necessary solutions unless he enjoyed a sympathetic Congress. Yet, he devoted little time to the forthcoming congressional elections, and placed ultimate importance on a continued Democratic executive leadership. He consoled his listeners by assuring: "Definite and continuing study shall be made of our industrial, fiscal and social problems. Definite and continuing action shall result therefrom, and neither the study nor the action shall be left to emotional caprice or the opportunism of any groups of men." 37

Just how such idealistic ambitions could be resolved was never disclosed. At a time when Woodrow Wilson was receiving wide-spread criticism, FDR chose to request an unqualified vote of confidence for the Democratic Party. His logical proof suffered from the inept use of vague examples. This problem was compounded by his failure to offer reasonable solutions for the current political shortcomings.

The address was practically devoid of statistics which lent force to the various contentions. FDR did refer to the eighteen Constitutional Amendments, "the majority of the most efficient Government employes" who leave Federal service, and the opportunity to save "millions of dollars" by reclassifying governmental positions. 38 With constitutional amendments constantly in the news,

37 Ibid., p. 16.
38 Ibid., pp. 7, 13.
this item was commonly known by politically-conscious voters. The latter two references were oversimplifications. The listeners were not told the approximate number of annual Federal resignations, the definition of an "efficient" employee, the exact amount of money to be saved, nor the provisions of a reclassification plan. Roosevelt explained such a program, in greater detail, in previous speeches. But he apparently assumed that all 10,000 auditors were well-informed on his earlier proposals relative to governmental reform. Once again, the lack of specific detail weakened his argument.39 Considering his interest and personal experience with this subject, the speaker could have dramatized and enforced his references by using precise cases.40

Roosevelt formulated several definitions in this address in an attempt to strengthen his argument:

A man who opposes concrete reforms and improvements in international relations is of necessity a reactionary, or at least a conservative in viewing his home problems . . .

The golden rule of the true public servant is to give his work the same or even higher interest and efficiency than he would give to his private affairs.41

40 See Grey and Braden, Public Speaking, pp. 288-289.
41 FDR Hyde Park Speech, pp. 9, 11.
By "reforms and improvements," he referred, presumably, to the proposal to join the League of Nations. By "reactionary," he referred to those who advocated a return to "normalcy." This definition was directed, of course, against the Republican Presidential nominee. The "golden rule" definition carried little logical impact, and was not clarified through the use of specific examples. The candidate seemingly attempted to assure the listeners that a Democratic leadership would not tolerate wasteful practices in government manpower. One attempt at definition simply invited a need for further clarification. For example, he stated: "'Peace' must mean peace that will last. A practical, workable, permanent, enforceable kind of a peace that will hold as tightly as the business contracts of the individual." Possibly no one disagreed with these general terms, but they failed to show how such a desirable international condition could be achieved. His definitions not only failed to "make clear the meanings of concepts without relying upon the terms themselves," but they often lacked "instant intelligibility value." However, he did not depend upon the definitive method extensively to enforce his arguments.

43 Ibid., p. 7.
44 See Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 345.
Neither did testimony nor personal experience constitute significant factual evidence. The speaker loosely referred to a quotation being uttered by "Some people," and recalled "that part of Lincoln's immortal phrase which speaks of 'Government for the People'." The first citation lacked documentation and did not evaluate the reliability and the competency of the authorities. The second reference was a commonly recognized quotation, but it did not specifically pertain to the contemporary problems. The candidate made only one reference to his former government service in stating: "I may be pardoned if I draw on my experience of over seven years in an administrative position . . ." There was no reason for him to ask forgiveness. Indeed, this personal experience should have provided a rich source of examples necessary to support his points and to enhance his ethical appeal. On the contrary, he chose to introduce general statements that often failed to illustrate his ideas properly.

Roosevelt's lack of logical content led some writers to brand the Hyde Park speech as being "vague." Undoubtedly this

\[46\] Ibid., pp. 11-12.
condemnation was justified after examining flagrant shortcomings in the use of examples, statistics, definitions, testimony, and personal experience.

However, personal experience can be classified also as a product of ethical proof, more specifically, high character in ethical proof. In using references to high character, the speaker "associates either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated . . . ." FDR did not limit his ethical appeals to the exordium and the peroration, but chose to use this method continuously throughout the address. The opening statement declared: "I accept the nomination for the office of Vice-President with humbleness, and with a deep wish to give to our beloved country the best that is in me." Later, he called for "a new note of fairness and generosity . . . . We oppose money in politics, we oppose the private control of national finances, we oppose the treating of human beings as commodities, we oppose the saloon-bossed city, we oppose starvation wages, we oppose rule by groups or cliques." He closed by expressing faith in "the Guiding Spirit of our land."

---

48 Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 387.
49 Ibid.
51 Ibid., pp. 4, 15-16.
52 Ibid., p. 17.
Additional attention can be focused upon the probity of character by linking "the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous . . ." Roosevelt exploited this technique in pointing to "the dictation of narrow partisans who whisper 'party' or of selfish interests that murmur 'profits' . . . Littleness, meanness, falsehood, extreme partisanship - these are not in accord with the American spirit." He further attempted to remove an unfavorable impression of his cause by promising to protect the Constitution against any threatened League of Nations encroachments.

Roosevelt tried to expand on his ethical appeal by creating the impression of sagacity, and using "what is popularly called common sense" in showing "integrity and wisdom." He stood for "no equivocation, no vagueness, no double dealing with the people . . ." In a spirit of tact and moderation, he further declared: "To this future I dedicate myself, willing whatever may be the choice of the people to continue to help as best I am able."

---

56 Thonssen and Baird, *Speech Criticism*, p. 387.
57 *FDR Hyde Park Speech*, pp. 8, 17.
Along with references to high character and sagacity, FDR did not neglect efforts to instill good will. He recalled the efforts "of the millions of splendid Americans who served in that whirlwind of war . . ." and expressed his "faith that this nation has no selfish destiny, faith that our people . . . are not afraid to do their part." Therefore, his message included frequent attempts to enlist the respect and the attention of the audience. Being a young and a relative newcomer to national politics, perhaps he felt compelled to integrate strong ethical appeals into the acceptance address. Yet, both classical and modern rhetoricians "looked upon logical argument as the most important element" in a speech. Ethos was necessary, but its presentation should not have been made at the expense of factual evidence. After all, the audience was well aware that the candidate "brought greater honor" to Hyde Park "than the oldest and most optimistic citizen ever had any right to dream of . . . ." With fewer references to ethos and greater attention to inductive arguments from causation and specific instance, the speech would have contained more effective methods of proof.

58 Ibid., pp. 8, 9.
59 Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 384.
Emotional proof is defined as discourse which "includes all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas."

Facing an enthusiastic, noisy, excited group of listeners in gaily decorated outdoor surroundings, FDR chose to emphasize "higher," or altruistic, motives. His emotional proofs were divided into those concerned with international and national issues. He appealed to feelings of patriotism, fair-play, justice, compassion, honesty, unselfishness, service, and general morality. Internationally, he introduced the following emotional proofs:

... We must see that it is impossible to avoid, except by monastic seclusion, those honorable and intimate foreign relations which the fearful-hearted shudderingly miscall by that Devil's catch word 'international complications'...

To this end the democratic party offers a treaty of peace, which, to make it a real treaty for a real peace MUST include a League of Nations; because this peace treaty, if our best and bravest are not to have died in vain, must be no thinly disguised armistice devised by cynical statesmen to mask their preparations for a renewal of greed-inspired conquests later on... Through it we may with nearly every other duly constituted government in the whole world throw our moral force and our potential power into the scale of peace... The League will not die. An idea does not die which meets the call of the hearts of our mothers...

---

61 Thonessen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 358.

62 See Gray and Braden, Public Speaking, p. 55.
We can well rejoice in our great land, in our
great citizenship brought hither out of many kindreds
and tongues, but to fulfill our true destiny we must
be glad also for the opportunity for greater
service . . .

. . . It is a plan of hope. In this, chiefly let
it be our aim to build up, not to tear down.63

Many of these utterances were cheered loudly, but the one
which gave vent to the most exuberant outward demonstration of the
audience "which all but drowned the noise caused by the arrival of
an aeroplane"64 read as follows:

. . . To the cry of the French at Verdun; 'They
shall not pass'; the cheer of our own men in the
Argonne; 'We shall go through' — we must add this;
'It shall not occur again'. This is the positive
declaration of our own wills; that the world shall
be saved from a repetition of this crime.65

Similar appeals were made to enforce his arguments on
national issues. A sample survey reveals the following statements:

Much has been said of late about good Americanism.
It is right that it should have been said, and it is
right that every chance should be seized to repeat the
basic truths underlying our prosperity and our national
existence itself . . .

. . . We can never go back. The 'good old days' are
gone forever; we have no regrets. For our eyes are
trained ahead—forward to better new days. In this
faith I am strengthened by the firm belief that women
of this nation, now about to receive the National

63 FDR Hyde Park Speech, pp. 2-3, 6-9, 15.
65 FDR Hyde Park Speech, p. 6.
franchise, will throw their weight into the scale of progress and will be unbound by partisan prejudices and a too narrow outlook on national problems.\textsuperscript{66}

He further mentioned the "golden rule of the true public servant" and "a spirit of unselfishness" as opposed to "the formation of cliques or oligarchies in the Senate to the retarding of public business."\textsuperscript{67} Several of these comments were directed at "lower" motives\textsuperscript{68} in an effort to place the opposing party in an unfavorable, or dishonorable, position. However, this practice was not reprehensible. As indicated by contemporary reports, the candidate's use of emotional proofs probably was the strongest facet of his invention.\textsuperscript{69}

Nevertheless, he often failed to enhance the emotional portions with proper logical evidence. For example, he never supported factually his contentions that the League of Nations "meets the call of the hearts of our mothers," or that the new women voters "will throw their weight into the scale of progress" unaffected by "partisan prejudices." As shown in Chapter II, subsequent studies proved this final remark to be false along with

\textsuperscript{66}Ibid., pp. 3-4, 14-15.

\textsuperscript{67}Ibid., pp. 11, 14.

\textsuperscript{68}Gray and Braden, \textit{Public Speaking}, p. 55.

his reference to national "prosperity." In addition, statements about "good Americanism" were never clearly defined and seemingly were uttered solely for their emotive rather than their referential value.  

Speech Structure

Referring to the structure of public address, Speech Criticism states, "In its broadest sense, disposition embraces the following matters: the emergence of a central theme, the general method of arrangement adopted for the speech, and the order in which the parts of the discourse are developed."  

Roosevelt stated his central theme no less than six times in this seventeen-page address. In the introduction, his thesis emerged three times in the following forms:

... In him [James M. Cox] I recognize one who can lead this nation forward in an unhalting march of progress ...  

... These matters will require the guiding hand of a President who can see his country above his party, and who, having a clear vision of things as they are, has also the independence, courage and skill to guide us along the road to things as they should be ....  

... I as a citizen believe that this year we should choose as President a proved executive.-We need to do things; not to talk about them.  

---

70 See Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 368.

71 Ibid., p. 393. Author's italics.

72 FDR Hyde Park Speech, pp. 1-3.
Following a development of the first point, he reminded the listeners: "Progress will come not through the talkers, but through the doers." In developing the second point, he recalled: "It is a particular pleasure to know that if we are sustained by the people in this election, the country will have as its chief executive a man who has already amply established his reputation as a successful administrator." Finally, the conclusion implied the qualifications of Governor Cox by declaring: "It is the faith which is in me that makes me very certain that America will choose the path of progress and set aside the doctrines of despair, the whispering of cowardice, the narrow road to yesterday."

Therefore, the speaker stated his purpose clearly, concisely, and repetitiously in this address. None but the inattentive could have misunderstood his central thought.

The speech followed a logical method of arrangement. In the introduction, FDR revealed the major divisions of his material, although he failed to use "signposts" in making these ideas even more vivid to his auditors: "Two great problems will confront the

---
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next administration; our relations with the world and the pressing need of organized progress at home." He proceeded to preview these points more completely before expanding each one in the body of the address. This preview was a precise development of the speaker's major contentions, and led directly into a hypothetical syllogism in the body of the address:

**Major premise:** If we are going to participate peacefully in world affairs, we must join the League of Nations.

**Minor premise:** We must participate peacefully in world affairs.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, we must join the League of Nations.

Thus, the speaker took great care in expanding his first point. He suggested that international problems could be solved by American participation in the League.

The preview of home problems likewise followed a hypothetical syllogistic order:

**Major premise:** If all national problems are to be solved we must have progressive Democratic leadership.

**Minor premise:** We must solve all national problems.

**Conclusion:** Therefore, we need progressive Democratic leadership.

---

Of course, the Democratic Party solidly supported America's entry into the League of Nations. Consequently, FDR attempted to show that both international and national problems could be handled by the election of a Democratic President. The structure of each division ultimately returned to the central theme as the only course left to follow.

Roosevelt's major contentions can be briefed\(^7\) as follows:

I. We must solve our international problems, for
   A. The successful fulfillment of our recent military participation.
   B. The preservation of world order for succeeding generations.
   C. The moral obligation we owe to those who sacrificed their lives.
   D. The successful establishment of the League of Nations.

II. We must solve our national problems, for
   A. We need a better educational system.
   B. We need to improve working conditions.
   C. We need to preserve our resources.
   D. We need more "efficient" governmental machinery.

The rhetorical order of the Hyde Park address revealed the tripartite division of introduction, body, and conclusion. These divisions were distinctly apparent. The introduction was devoted to an acceptance of "the nomination for the office of Vice-President with humbleness," a clear statement of the central theme, and a preview of the two major points. The discussion, or body, of the address was concerned with an explanation of international and national problems. The conclusion summarized the importance of solving these problems and restated the central thesis.

Willard Saulsbury, a former senator from Delaware, praised the speech "on both its form and matter" in referring to it as "a masterpiece." On the other hand, Samuel I. Rosenman recalled during the 1928 campaign that FDR did not have "the orderly kind of mind that separates material into individual compartments." Although the Hyde Park address cannot be classified "a masterpiece," the speaker demonstrated clearer structure than Rosenman observed in the first gubernatorial campaign.

81 Letter, Saulsbury to FDR, August 14, 1920.
Use of Language

Franklin Roosevelt attempted to use clear, vivid, and impressive language. Several studies, which concentrated on other periods of his public speaking career, found his sentence length to average from sixteen to twenty-seven words. The mean sentence-length for the Hyde Park address was 23.9. This figure appears to show the candidate's awareness that short sentences contributed toward clarity in the 1920 acceptance speech. However, a closer analysis reveals that the mean sentence-length in the introduction and conclusion exceeded twenty-nine words, while the development of the two major points in the body employed means of 24.4 and 21.0, respectively. The longest sentence in the address, which is found in the exordium, totaled 104 words. Other extended sentences, varying in length from forty to seventy-seven words, were used intermittently throughout. Nevertheless, the speaker generally uttered short, concise statements in developing the body of the speech. As a further indication of overall simplicity, the New York World reported that the advanced manuscript, which contained "only 3,114 words," was "the shortest acceptance speech

83 See Gray and Braden, Public Speaking, pp. 393-395.

of the principal candidates of the two major parties and is divided almost equally between foreign and domestic issues."  

The speaker made extensive use of the homely expression. In citing Governor Cox's qualifications, FDR called him "a clear thinking business man," one who held "his country above his party." Attributes of patriotism were labeled "good Americanism," "the American spirit," and "a glorious common effort." Rather than become involved in the description of international negotiations, he simply referred to "this peace treaty making business of ours." He wanted governmental reform to proceed "along common-sense lines." He hoped that those who fought for "our beloved country" have not "died in vain." While he could be condemned for using this method to oversimplify, the common idiom probably contributed to the auditors' understanding of several complex topics.

Synonyms and adjunct terms to enhance meaning were inserted to clarify specific remarks. Using a collection of synonyms, the

---
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speaker tried to duplicate closely the number of syllables employed in each word. For example, he called for: "A practical, workable, permanent, enforcible kind of peace"; and pointed to "Littleness, meanness, falsehood, extreme partisanship . . ." However, his rhythm was disrupted in one series of synonyms: "So we shall grow -- sanely, humanly, honorable, happily . . ." Another group of synonyms moved progressively from the more pedantic expression to the use of slang in an attempt to clarify a single idea: "There must be no equivocation, no vagueness, no double dealing with the people on this issue."

The candidate used repetition of specific words to impress an idea upon the audience and to guard against misunderstandings. The following quotations offer examples of this repetitive technique:

It is right that it should have been said, and it is right that every chance should be seized to repeat the basic truths . . . .

. . . The League of Nations is a practical solution of a practical situation . . . It is not anti-national, it is anti-war.

. . . I say so because I have faith -- faith that this nation has no selfish destiny, faith that our

---
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people are looking into the years beyond for better things . . . .

. . . We need, not merely thrift by saving but thrift by the proper use of what we have at hand. 94

Repetition did not always appear only within single statements. At times, words and phrases were repeated after lengthy intervening comments. Early in the speech he said, "Such a man is James M. Cox." Six long sentences of elaboration preceded another similar conclusion: "Such a man we have." 95 In the introduction he maintained, "We need to do things; not to talk about them." After developing his first point in the body of the speech, he reiterated, "Progress will come not through the talkers, but through the doers." 96

Closely associated with repetition was the characteristic of parallel sentence structure. In the following statement he repeated the preposition: "Every dollar of our expenditures for port facilities, for inland waterways, for flood control, for the reclamation of swamp and arid lands, for highways, for public buildings, shall be expended only by trained men in accordance with a continuing plan." 97 Progressing further, he chose to repeat both the pronoun and the verb:

94 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 7, 9, 11.
95 Ibid., pp. 1, 3.
96 Ibid., pp. 3, 10.
97 Ibid., p. 11.
We oppose money in politics, we oppose the private control of national finances, we oppose the treating of human beings as commodities, we oppose the saloon-bossed city, we oppose starvation wages, we oppose the rule by groups or cliques.  

In the conclusion, he used parallel structure to open two consecutive sentences, then followed each one by repetitiously using a preposition:

I look to that future for progress;—progress in the establishment of good will and mutual help among nations, in the ending of wars and the miseries that wars bring, in the international settlement which will make it unnecessary to send again two million of our men across the sea.—I look to our future for progress; in better citizenship, in less waste, in fairer remuneration for our labor, in more efficient governing, in higher standards of life!

Metaphorical phrasing and parallel sentence structure, two distinguishing Rooseveltian stylistic traits, were combined in one lengthy statement:

Today we are offered a seat at the table of the family of nations to the end that smaller peoples may be truly safe to work out their own destiny, to the end that the sword shall not follow on the heels of the merchant, to the end that the burden of increasing armies and navies shall be lifted from the shoulders of a world already staggering under the weight of taxation.

---
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Metaphors, tropes, similes, and figurative analogies were used generously in the acceptance speech. The candidate spoke about "that whirlwind of war," and the advisability of building "an impregnable wall of costly armaments." He was confident in the prospects offered by the League of Nations for the cause of peace:

... the ideal shall not die.

... a peace that will hold as tightly as the business contracts of the individual ... within the reach of humanity ... throw our moral force and our potential power into the scale of peace ... The League will not die.

He continued to express confidence in the country's future under a Democratic Administration "to guide us along the road to things as they should be without swerving one footstep ... For our eyes are trained ahead ... " He called upon "the Guiding Spirit" to "keep our feet on the broad road to a better tomorrow." He urged the "women of this nation" to "throw their weight into the scale of progress ... We cannot anchor our ship of state in this world tempest,--nor can we return to the placid harbor of long years ago.--We must go forward or founder." With less clarity,

---
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he stated: "In the same way we oppose a mere period or com[ma] in our national life."\textsuperscript{106}

Concerning the use of metaphors, Michael M. Osborn and Douglas Ehninger conclude:

One finds in rhetoric—even in 'good' rhetoric—an unusually heavy supply of metaphoric stereotypes—stimuli which call into play well established communal qualifiers. Such conventionalized stimuli not only make for ease and rapidity of comprehension, but may also be an effective means of arousing emotion.\textsuperscript{107}

The ability to utter the striking phrase, another characteristic of his later speaking, was evident also in the 1920 Hyde Park speech. The following statements were typical of this category:

... a hermit nation, dreaming of the past ...
... monastic seclusion ...
... thinly disguised armistice ...
... War may be 'declared'; peace cannot.
... the slacker of peace is a greater menace than the slacker of war.
... The days of 'pork-barrel' legislation are over.
... He [Governor Cox] is an engineer-statesman.
... We can never go back. The 'good old days' are gone past forever; we have no regrets ...

\textsuperscript{106} Ibid., p. 16.

... America's opportunity is at hand ... In a thousand ways this is our hour of test.

... A greater America is our objective. 108

Most of these striking phrases were short, snappy statements which made use of emphatic, rhythmical patterns.

While directing comments to the Republican leadership, FDR utilized an ancient characteristic of political speaking by incorporating bombast, ridicule, and sarcasm. He alluded to "the dictation of narrow partisans who whisper 'party' or of selfish interests that murmur 'profits' ... the fearful-hearted ... trifling men ... cynical statesmen ... the doctrines of despair, the whispering of cowardice, the narrow road to yesterday." 109 He evoked laughter from the audience in "his reference to 'errand boys of politicians,' and his quip at the expense of Senator Harding's pet expression, 'normalcy.'" 110 It was during the presentation of this remark that one reporter recorded the only serious platform alterations in the candidate's prepared speech:

The only important departure Mr. Roosevelt made from his prepared speech was in the paragraph: 'Some people have been saying of late: 'We are tired of progress, we want to go back to where we were before, to go about our own business, to

108 FDR Hyde Park Speech, pp. 2, 6, 8, 9-10, 11, 13, 14-15, 16.

109 Ibid., pp. 2, 3, 5, 6, 17.

restore normal conditions." He paused after 'some people,' and inserted the words 'little people.' And after 'normal conditions' he stopped and said: 'I mean conditions of normalcy.'

However, Roosevelt never unleashed this invective on the rank and file Republican voter. He foresaw his need for GOP support. For this reason, he attacked only the opposition leadership. Sam Rosenman observed this characteristic in the nominee's New Deal speaking:

He [FDR] did not want to alienate them [GOP voters] by attacks on 'Republicans' or even on the 'Republican party,' so he followed a practice that he continued through all his Washington days—centering his attack on the Republican leadership and leaders, rather than on the Republican voters.

This distinction between Republican voters and leaders was made clearly in the Hyde Park address:

The war was won by Republicans as well as by Democrats. Men of all parties served in our armed forces.—Men and women of all parties served the government at home. They strived honestly as Americans, not as mere partisans. Republicans and Democrats alike worked in administrative positions, raised Liberty loans, administered food control, toiled in munition plants, built ships.—The war was brought to a successful conclusion by a glorious common effort—one which in the years to come will be a national pride.

---

111 Ibid.
112 Working with Roosevelt, p. 41. Author's italics.
113 FDR Hyde Park Speech, p. 4.
During a period when the Democrats hoped to attract some of Theodore Roosevelt's old Progressive supporters, FDR refrained from insulting this potential bloc of voters in any way. He praised their patriotism and carefully referred to both "Men and women of all parties."

Practically the entire speech was developed in the first person. FDR used the pronoun "I" twenty-two times, "we" fifty times, and "our" fifty-two times. He utilized the first person plural over four times as often as the singular forms. By making references to "we," "us," "our," and "ours," his style contributed to the "old home-week" atmosphere and probably aided in establishing rapport with the audience. A total of 135 first person derivatives were detected in the 139 sentences. Second and third person pronouns were used sparingly as the speaker identified himself with the listeners in striving toward a common goal. He always stated his central theme and major points in the first person.

Finally, he made special efforts to call attention to specific ideas, such as: "Let us be definite . . . . if there be any citizen who has honest & I emphasize the word honest . . . ."\textsuperscript{114}

Several remarks were handwritten revisions included in the final typed copy. Even though he had several weeks to contemplate and to

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., pp. 4, 7.
prepare this address, he persisted in making alterations on the bound reading manuscript. Sam Rosenman noted this same characteristic in reporting FDR's Presidential speaking.

Those distinctive stylistic traits which became familiar to state and national audiences in later campaigns were prevalent in the 1920 acceptance address. Relatively simple sentences, homely expressions, synonyms, repetition, parallel sentence structure, metaphors, tropes, similes, figurative analogies, striking phrases, ridicule, first person pronominal usage, and "platform authorship" were employed freely for purposes of clarity, vividness, and impressiveness.

Delivery

Authorities are in general agreement that an analysis of speech delivery should include personality, appearance, physical manifestations, and vocal skill. Concerning personality and appearance, Thonssen and Baird state: "The way an orator looks — the way he impresses his hearers as a physical specimen — is an accessory . . . In all probability, rhetorical effectiveness can be enhanced by the impress of a striking personality." The New York

\[\text{115 Working with Roosevelt, p. 143.}\]
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"He [FDR] has a splendid presence, a commanding figure and a magnetic personality." The Peekskill [New York] Evening News writer related:

"... Franklin Roosevelt is a handsome man, far better looking than any of the other candidates on both tickets.

... a Dutchess county man, a native son, a clean-cut young American, who typifies in himself and in his birthright the best traditions of this beloved land. If Dame Fortune smiles upon him as indulgently as the charming women who surrounded him yesterday he will be the next to the youngest vice president."

Finally, the New York World observed:

"Mr. Roosevelt's speech, no less than his extremely amiable personality, won the fervent approval of the crowd...

... He is a tall, upstanding, good looking young man, with regular features, light hair and bronzed complexion. He wore a blue serge suit, stiff collar and blue tie, with a bouquet in his lapel."

Speech Criticism also points to the orator's physical attributes during his presentation:

Observers and critics of oratory look, then, to such physical manifestations as grace of movement on the platform, facility in gesticulation, meaningful use of facial expression, and the effective use of the
eyes as instruments of audience control. Relative to the latter, it may be observed that the rhetoricians have long considered the action of the eyes important in oratory.\footnote{P. 442.}

The New York World drew the following conclusions relative to physical delivery:

There was laughter at the face he \[FDR\] made in referring to obstruction in the Senate, his reference to 'errand boys of politicians,' and his quip at the expense of Senator Harding's pet expression, 'normalcy.'

Mr. Roosevelt has a way of taking off his glasses and smiling broadly when making a humorous point that emphasizes his gift of good fellowship . . . When speaking he used few gestures and stood a good part of the time with his hands clasped behind his back. He read his speech from a manuscript on a music stand.\footnote{August 10, 1920.}

Aside from the normal response of applause, the speech was not completely free from interruptions which called for some adaptation in presentation.

He \[FDR\] showed himself game when the most interesting part of his speech was interrupted by the whirring and buzzing of an airplane which three times passed over Springwood, over the house, the trees and lawn, and each time the speaker was compelled to stop his talking, because he couldn't be heard even by those on the platform. But the interruptions never feared him, didn't even cause him to lose his place, or misplace his emphasis each time he returned to his subject. He smiled the first time the big air bug, buzzing like a barbershop electric massage machine, came along, made a gesture of mock despair and looked
skyward. The crowd followed his lead and rubbered [sic] at the ether. Then when the buzzing of the bug ceased, the speaker renewed and the crowd was again all attention.123

Pictures of the occasion were printed the Sunday following the address. One picture shows the candidate wearing pince-nez, pointing vigorously with his fully extended left arm, and holding his place on the manuscript with the forefinger of his right hand.124 Therefore, he did employ some animation and variety in both gestures and facial expressions. From available reports, these physical attributes were used effectively in the acceptance address.

Finally, an analysis of delivery includes a consideration of the speaker's vocal skill. Contemporary reporters overlooked any extensive treatment of this topic. Thonssen and Baird accurately conclude that the omission of details "seems to be one of the most conspicuous faults" in dealing with vocal delivery.125 The New York Times related that FDR's "clear, resonant voice was heard all over the lawn by the thousands who had gathered to hear him."126 This brief statement represents the general response to FDR's vocal

124Ibid., August 15, 1920.
125Speech Criticism, p. 444.
126August 10, 1920.
skill. The reading copy offers additional clues. The manuscript was typewritten, double-spaced, and provided large margins presumably for last-minute insertions and corrections. Almost one-tenth of the words in the speech were underlined in ink. Apparently this procedure was used to capture rhythm and vocal emphasis, although no consistent method of underscoring adjectives, nouns, verbs, pronouns, or other language forms was followed. The fervent emotional appeals usually carried a large number of underlined words, except for the final page where only a single word was underscored. With no sound recording of this speech available, the investigator can only guess at the intended purposes for the symbols used in the manuscript. However, with no evidence to the contrary, FDR probably used the inked markings to signal necessary changes in vocal emphasis, variety, rate, and inflection. Based on fragmentary extant accounts, the overall delivery appeared to be clear, intelligible, and pleasing.

Final Evaluation

Responses from friends and associates followed in the wake of the acceptance address. An official of the New York Times was moved to include the following statements in a personal letter to the candidate:

I listened yesterday with interest and admiration to the delivery of your address accepting the nomination for Vice-President.
Your manly, eloquent and statesmanlike presentation of the aims of the Democratic party should go a long way to convince the people of their merit and their service to humanity.\textsuperscript{127}

An old friend at Columbia University "read with uncontrolled emotion your masterly address" and found it to be "pitched upon the level of America's highest ideals and noblest emotions. It is great because of its vision and its liberality of spirit."\textsuperscript{128} F. W. Taussig, the head of Harvard University's Department of Economics, assessed the speech as "admirable in matter, diction, spirit; worthy your name, your university, yourself."\textsuperscript{129}

A national weekly publication compared the Hyde Park presentation with the other acceptance speeches as follows:

In vigor, compactness and 'fighting' quality the speech ranks high; higher, possibly, than the acceptance speeches of either Harding or Cox. Perhaps an aspirant for the Presidency must be more careful than a Vice-Presidential candidate to weigh his words and be certain that no phrase will give offense, and thus necessarily loses something of the free movement discernible in the speeches of Coolidge and of Roosevelt.\textsuperscript{130}

Of course, the Republican press was cryptic in evaluating the candidate's effort. A typical opposition editorial called the speech "innocuous" and further observed:

\textsuperscript{127}Letter, Wiley to FDR, August 10, 1920.
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\textsuperscript{130}"The Fourth Acceptance," \textit{The Independent}, CIII (August 21, 1920), 217.
Mr. Roosevelt also wants what we all want; he no doubt is sincere in believing that the Republican party will not bring the millenium to pass, but in view of the results of Democratic control for the past eight years, he has 'some nerve' to ask the American people to believe that the Democratic party should be given another chance. It has had its chance; its day in Court is over.131

Later, historians added their reflective analyses to the contemporary accounts. Frank Freidel surmised: "It was an excellent speech, a clear, well-phrased, logically organized exposition of the campaign issues . . . The acceptance speech set a standard which was difficult if not impossible to maintain."132 Harold P. Gosnell's comments were less praiseworthy: "Some parts of the speech were vague and failed to give a definite course of action, but the spirit of the address was clearly Rooseveltian."133 Rexford G. Tugwell was somewhat sarcastic: "This speech was carefully calculated and constructed. Franklin thought it very good. So did the listeners before him. But he and they were partisans. It was unmistakably reminiscent of the Wilsonian speeches — eloquent and high-minded, but vague."134

133Champion Campaigner, p. 65.
134The Democratic Roosevelt, p. 126.
None of the scanty reviews carefully considered all of the rhetorical qualities. FDR's Hyde Park acceptance speech was delivered from the gaily decorated porch of his family's ancestral estate to an open-air audience of 10,000 noisy local residents and national political leaders. It was presented in response to an address by Homer S. Cummings, the chairman of the notification committee. The choice of subject and speech goal, which consisted of an attempt to convince the auditors that progressive ideals should be continued, were well chosen. This subject was divided into international and national problems that required immediate attention.

The premises were devoted to advocating American participation in world affairs, to strengthening Federal organization, to pressing for progressive legislation, and to endorsing an experienced candidate for President. For proof, the candidate used logical, ethical, and emotional references, but offered insufficient logical evidence for an address calculated to convince his listeners on a controversial subject. This one shortcoming was a serious weakness.

The structure of the speech was clearly divided into a central theme and appropriate major points. Roosevelt was especially careful in his method of arrangement and his rhetorical order in this discourse.
The nominee's style, or use of language, reflected his careful efforts to obtain clarity, vividness, and impressiveness. Included in the variety of stylistic devices were simple sentences, homely expressions, synonyms, repetition, parallel sentence structure, metaphors, similes, figurative analogies, striking phrases, ridicule, and first person pronominal usage.

The speaker's manuscript delivery was marked by an attractive personality and appearance, a pleasing method of physical presentation, and a clear, resonant voice.

Chicago

Audience, Occasion, and Setting

Chicago Democrats were busy planning Roosevelt's reception a full week before his anticipated arrival. He was "especially popular" in the Windy City, yet Steve Early found the arrangements confused upon his arrival. The auditorium was rented and an overflow meeting was expected. Prior to the meeting, a band was scheduled to parade the city streets in order to generate interest and enthusiasm. Publicity was well-handled as

---
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indicated by the "extraordinary" demand for tickets.\textsuperscript{138} Women were encouraged to attend, as emphasized by the following report:

The meeting to-night will be featured by the presence of 500 women, dressed in white, occupying the seats of honor on the stage. Two hundred more seats on the stage will be filled with democratic leaders and the candidates on the regular ticket for county and state offices. Robert M. Sweitzer will preside and will deliver the speech of introduction. Immediately following Mr. Roosevelt's address Former Senator James Hamilton Lewis, the slate candidate for governor, will speak.\textsuperscript{139}

In clarifying the speaking order, Early explained that Roosevelt's time was "unlimited."\textsuperscript{140}

Auditors were admitted to the rally by ticket only:

Those who have not already obtained seats through the precinct captains can secure a limited number this afternoon at the headquarters of the county central committee in the Hotel Sherman, where Mr. Roosevelt plans to stay during his visit in the city.\textsuperscript{141}

The people of Illinois were irritated and economically penalized by a coal shortage which was "more serious than during war or any previous period."\textsuperscript{142} Threshing machines were idle in the

\textsuperscript{138}Telegram, Early to FDR, August 9; Chicago Herald and Examiner, August 11, 1920.

\textsuperscript{139}Chicago Daily News, August 11, 1920.

\textsuperscript{140}Telegram, Early to FDR, August 9, 1920.

\textsuperscript{141}Chicago Daily News, August 11, 1920.

\textsuperscript{142}Telegram, Early to FDR, August 9, 1920.
fields, industrial concerns were "greatly disturbed," and the coal operators "blame railroads charging car shortage while railroads charge conditions due to profiteering thru consignment by dealers of shipments." However, labor conditions were "easing up" and there was no unemployment in Chicago which was "former headquarters" for the "army" of unemployed. The "business world" was not depressed, but exuded considerable optimism as to the future economic outlook.

Five thousand men and women attended Franklin Roosevelt's "oratorical end of the drive for votes," as he "fired the opening gun of the national campaign at the Auditorium Theater." The crowd was noisy and demonstrative. "He referred at one climax to President Wilson by name. A two minute demonstration followed. His speech generally was enthusiastically received. Chicago Democratic leaders were hugely pleased, they said, at the tone and temper of the meeting."

Roosevelt received a royal welcome. "A party of nine prominent democrats planned to meet the train 'down the line' and

---
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bring Mr. Roosevelt and his party of five to the city. A reception was held at the Congress Hotel prior to the 7:30 p.m. auditorium program. The Cook County Democratic Committee operated out of both the Congress and the Sherman Hotels. Last minute arrangements erased the confusion regarding reception space which Early found imminent upon his departure from the city. A large crowd greeted the candidate at the auditorium:

The Auditorium meeting was what its sponsors, the Cook County Democratic managing committee, had hoped it would be—a huge success. Long before the doors were opened a great crowd had gathered and hundreds were unable to find seats when County Clerk Robert Sweitzer called the meeting to order.

Candidate Roosevelt was given a tremendous ovation when he was introduced by the chairman.

Ex-Senator James Hamilton Lewis, gubernatorial candidate, followed the FDR speech with an attack on "the 'senatorial syndicate,' which he charged with having framed the nomination of the republican candidates. He accused the republicans with a deliberate attempt to wreck the farm loan bank system and the federal reserve system." The latter part of the Lewis address

---

149 Chicago Herald and Examiner, August 11, 1920.
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was devoted to the League of Nations. He "waxed sensationally eloquent" and "bordered on the sensational" in delivering "a brilliant address."  

Following the Hyde Park acceptance speech on August 9, Roosevelt left for a brief meeting with Democratic officials in New York City and proceeded on to Chicago to open his first western campaign trip. After speaking at a night meeting, August 11, he remained at the Sherman Hotel and departed for Wisconsin the next morning. The strong Democratic organization in Cook County made the Illinois city an inviting springboard from which to launch a national campaign swing.

Choice of Subject and Speech Goal

Steve Early's advance telegram warned the candidate about several limitations regarding his speech subject and goal. First, it noted that the League of Nations was favored by the "intelligent" classes who were "decidedly in minority," while the rank and file were "opposed if not indifferent and also lack understanding" of the issue involved. As an added handicap, the leading newspapers were classified as "vigorously" opposed to the League. Second, the coal shortage posed a threat to farming and industry throughout Illinois. Third, there was no marked animosity toward the high cost

---

153 Ibid.; Chicago Daily Tribune; Chicago Herald and Examiner, August 12, 1920.
of living. Fourth, unemployment was not apparent in the labor forces. Fifth, general business conditions were favorable.

Finally, Harding's nomination seemed to be a "disappointment" to "Illinois and Northwestern states and has greatly increased chances Democratic victory." Early expounded on this final point in a letter to Louis Howe by observing: "The feeling in Chicago, Kenosha, Racine and Milwaukee, is that Harding is a conservative of the old school, while Cox and Roosevelt are progressive and therefore more desirable." Early's telegram was sent to the Democratic campaign headquarters in the Grand Central Palace, New York City, prior to FDR's departure. Furthermore, one newspaper noted that the candidate prepared his Chicago speech after his New York departure "while the train was speeding him toward the city." It speculated: "According to dispatches en route, Mr. Roosevelt will stress the need of making an improvement in the methods of American government, which he had proclaimed as archaic in his acceptance speech delivered Monday in Hyde Park, New York." The telegram, which included FDR's scribbled notations, undoubtedly was instrumental in suggesting many ideas.

---

154 Telegram, Early to FDR, August 9, 1920.
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However, "the methods of American government" did not represent the major theme of the Chicago address. The Vice-Presidential hopeful followed the recommendations found in the Early telegram. He sought to capitalize on the reported Republican discontent over the GOP Presidential selection. "He sprinkled salt in all of the old Republican wounds, and announced that his present tour through fifteen states in seventeen days is made for the express purpose of aligning progressives and independents behind the Democratic ticket." Taking his cue from Early, "the vice presidential candidate did anything but shove the 'league of nations' issue to the front. His league comment was strikingly brief . . . ." Possibly at the insistence of local leaders, he introduced one change in the content of the prepared manuscript when "he assaulted the republican campaign fund" with "caustic phrases."

Nevertheless, the candidate followed one of the goals already established in the acceptance address. He tried to convince neutrals and partisan Republicans that the Democratic Party represented their best interests in 1920. Therefore, his subject dealt with those aspects which were believed to be attractive to exponents of progressivism.

159 Chicago Herald and Examiner, August 12, 1920.
Premises and Methods of Proof

Roosevelt did not choose to develop the multiple number of issues that he introduced in the acceptance address. Early's analysis of the Chicago situation probably encouraged the candidate to concentrate his efforts on the progressive versus the reactionary issue. In addition, FDR grew to feel that the entire West was a hotbed of progressive strength. The "progress or reaction" question was one which received increasing emphasis as he spoke both in the West and in the East. While this progressive emphasis seemingly was a wise choice for the Chicago audience, it had questionable value on the total national electorate.

In officially opening the campaign, the nominee's premises once more suggested a hypothetical syllogism:

Major premise: If progressive reforms are to be enacted, Democrats, Republicans, and independents must support the Democratic Party.

Minor premise: Progressive reforms must be enacted.

Conclusion: Therefore, Democrats, Republicans, and independents must support the Democratic Party.

Both the antecedent and the consequent of the major premise were expressed several times. Initially, the speaker indicated that

---


the voters could not depend on the Republican nominee to follow a progressive program: Harding "and his 'sponsors', the Old Guard" are "unmindful of the marvelous progress around them" and offer "no real remedies or constructive program to meet the national and international problems we face today." On the other hand, "The Democratic Party offers ... a definite program of constructive measures ... We offer in short a continuation of progress, of prosperity along sound and not inflated or artificial lines."164

The minor premise, which emphasized a need for continued progressive reforms, was visualized as a deterrent force against "selfish men ... who had not discovered that the World was moving on ... we see them, making no attempt to interpret the progressive thought now so widespread ..."165 Cited as "great constructive legislation" were bills "like the Federal Reserve Act, the Farm Loan Act, the Eight-Hour Law, and the many other measures which the country is proud of today."166

The syllogistic conclusion was emphasized in this plea:

"Above all, let us unite, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, from

163 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Chicago, Illinois, August 11, 1920, pp. 5-6. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the Chicago address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR Chicago Speech.

164 Ibid., p. 11.

165 Ibid., pp. 5-6.

166 Ibid., p. 7.
North and South and East and West... to insist on progress and action, and to work unceasingly as individuals for the betterment of our Nation."167

As in the Hyde Park speech, Roosevelt delivered an argumentative address in an attempt to gain agreement and to win votes. He was obligated to prove the necessity for additional progressive reform measures which merited bi-partisan and independent support. Therefore, he was compelled to offer substantial logical evidence. He presented little support through the use of testimony. Early in the speech he recalled a statement made by Governor Cox: "To my delight almost the first thing he said to me was: 'We must carry the issues to the people of the whole Country with all the strength we have.'"168 However, this remark probably carried stronger ethical and emotional connotations than logical. The same conclusion can be drawn from the speaker's other direct quotation: "You remember that Lincoln once said: 'You can't fool the people - there's such an all-fired lot of them!'"169 He returned to a sounder logical basis by indirectly alluding to a statement made by the Republican nominee: "How, for instance, will Senator Harding, if elected, restore, as he suggests, the market for liberty

167 Ibid., p. 12.
168 Ibid., p. 1.
169 Ibid., p. 3.
bonds to par?" A direct quotation in this instance, together with a complete documentation of the Senator's speech, would have produced a stronger testimonial reference. This same criticism can be applied to two other general contentions:

The attempt to satisfy factions has satisfied none — only the Old Guard profess contentment, and they do this only in public and not among themselves.

... Their orators and their papers, will discuss with partisan falsehood the history of the past seven years. They will slur over the great fact, which the voters understand, that this campaign is to elect men to office for the next four years. 171

If "the Old Guard" made "public" professions, these should have been easily accessible to the speaker. Likewise, the "orators" and "papers" involved in "partisan falsehood" could have been identified more clearly if the accusations rested on firm evidence. Therefore, Roosevelt's use of testimony did not offer substantial logical support to his address.

The Vice-Presidential nominee offered a profuse supply of examples. Several of these were specific and apropos to the various arguments. He delighted in recalling the Republican-Progressive split in previous national elections:

But for eight, yes for twelve years, a conflict has been raging within that party ... From 1908 to 1912, a group of selfish men sought for their own

170 Ibid., p. 9.
171 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
purposes . . . to gain control of the Party machinery.
You know the result. It was in this very city that
was born the movement of protest.\textsuperscript{172} He further noted the vote given "to a great American leader, but it
was even more than support of Theodore Roosevelt, the man: it was
the voice of insistence that the Party control be taken out of the
hands of selfish men . . . ." Next, he reminded his auditors that
"the present Republican nominee for the Presidency" supported "the
Ancient Regime" and "hurled bitter and insulting attacks at the
Progressive Leader."\textsuperscript{173} Considered collectively and in the
progression of their development, these references shrewdly
identified Harding with dishonorable and discredited political
associations. He cautioned the listeners to note that this "small
and intensely narrow wing of their party . . . still hold the reins
of power. Chicago has seen this machinery in motion in 1912, in
1916, in 1920."\textsuperscript{174}

At this point, FDR considered the Republican Party platform.
His argument from example continued to be cogent and forceful as he
recalled the GOP condemnation for every program advocated by the
Democratic Administration. Yet, he suggested that its "framers
forgot perhaps that . . . dozens of Republican Congressmen . . .

\textsuperscript{172}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 4-5.
\textsuperscript{173}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{174}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 6.
helped the Democratic Administration to pass great constructive legislation like the Federal Reserve Act, the Farm Loan Act, the Eight-Hour Law. . . ." He offered, as additional evidence, the part played by Republicans in the war effort which amounted to support for the Administration. 175 Specifically, he focused attention on the "Republican plank in regard to our foreign relations" and showed that major differences still exist in the Party because this plank "is interpreted by Senator Johnson and by President Taft in diametrically opposite ways." 176 He wisely employed illustrative examples to identify obvious breaches in the opposition's national and international political philosophy.

On the other hand, several examples lacked the sharp, specific conciseness noted above. He pointed to "old-time, hard-shell politicians" and "a few narrowly prejudiced newspapers" who "damn everybody" without offering any identification. 177 Lack of clarity was evident also in the charge against "these platform drafters" who were "vague and evasive." 178 He cited the American "financial system" as being "sounder than that of any other nation in the whole world" and neglected to enforce the statement with

175 Ibid., p. 7.
176 Ibid., p. 8.
177 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
178 Ibid., p. 7.
comparative examples. He used only generalizations to show that the Democratic platform "pledges a definite program of constructive measures." Although some shortcomings were noted, many examples found in the Chicago address were presented in greater detail than those used two days earlier in the acceptance speech.

Statistical references also contained more substance than those mentioned in the initial address. He recalled that the Progressive Party "received the majority of the votes of the old Republican Party" in the 1912 elections. Later, he paid tribute to "the hundreds and thousands of patriotic Republicans" who participated in government service during the war. The statistics were more precise in questioning how Senator Harding intended to restore the market for liberty bonds to par:

He can do it in two ways; either by refunding all the billions outstanding at a higher rate of interest -- six percent or higher, instead of 4½% -- and the taxpayers will pay the difference [sic] in interest, a little matter of about half a billion extra every year on your shoulders and mine; or he can pay them off over the counter, anticipating their dates of maturity and raise our taxes even higher to get the necessary cash.

---
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These remarks contained the major premise of an invalid disjunctive syllogism which failed to exhaust all possible recourses. Either course of action produced a dilemma for the opposition, however, if they were accepted by the listeners as the only available solutions.

Two statistical quotations carried in press reports of the speech were not contained in the manuscript. One offered to lower governmental expenditures, "to-day running at $6,000,000,000 a year," to "$4,000,000,000 a year—just two-thirds of what they are now." The expenditure of "$2,000,000,000 more than is necessary for the proper administration of the government" was bitterly attacked by Iowa Congressman James W. Good. If the Roosevelt quotation was an accurate one, the Congressman's refutation appeared to be valid. On another occasion, FDR assaulted the GOP campaign fund, "saying that on the basis of $700,000 for Chicago for its population, the national fund would be in excess of $30,000,000." The Republican Daily News admitted the $700,000 objective for Chicago, but the nominee merely assumed that equal goals existed throughout the country and that these goals would be totally

---

184 As quoted in Chicago Daily News, August 12, 1920.
185 Ibid.
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realized. Thus, the statistical evidence reflected argumentative strengths and weaknesses.

Augmenting the logical content was an extensive array of ethical references. These were distributed throughout the speech as the candidate labored zealously to impress normally independent and Republican voters. Primarily, the speaker focused attention upon the probity of his character by associating "either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated," by bestowing "tempered praise upon himself, his client, and his cause," and by linking "the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous." He elevated his role in the campaign as follows:

First of all Governor Cox and I believe that it is the simple duty of the candidates to give as many citizens as possible, in as many States as possible, an opportunity to see, and hear and form their own impressions of the men they are to vote for . . . . All that any right-minded candidate can ask is that the votes be cast intelligently; all that he can do is to present the issues honestly and honorably as he sees them . . . . Join with us in a sincere effort to help our beloved land . . . . let us unite . . . to work unceasingly as individuals for the betterment of our Nation.188

Additionally, he praised his own cause and linked the opposition with a dishonorable mission. This method was duplicated frequently throughout the address. He extolled America's wartime financing as

188 FDR Chicago Speech, pp. 1, 3, 12.
the "cleverest," "soundest," and "most just method ever devised"; and pledged a future policy "of prosperity along sound and not inflated or artificial lines."\textsuperscript{189}

Conversely, Harding was depicted as a member of "the Ancient Regime, who hurled bitter and insulting attacks" at President Theodore Roosevelt; as one of "the Republican oligarchs" who "propose to keep the business of this nation waiting for another year or two while they take up some new crack-brained scheme"; and a spokesman "of this little group of misrepresentative men."\textsuperscript{190} The GOP leadership was condemned for negotiating "deals" in a spirit of "treachery," and adopting a platform "in dark chambers amidst all secrecy" that "was merely a vote-catcher for the unthinking" by featuring "two meanings . . . on almost every important subject."\textsuperscript{191}

In the following concise series of remarks, the virtuous Democratic philosophy was compared with the destructive Republican goals:

The Democratic Party . . . platform pledges a definite program of constructive measures, not a hodge podge of vague compromises; a definite foreign policy for immediate and permanent peace, not an undefined suggestion of new new [sic] and unworkable schemes; a pledge that the safeguards of workingmen and women already accomplished under

\textsuperscript{189}Ibid., pp. 9, 11.

\textsuperscript{190}Ibid., pp. 5, 10, 12.

\textsuperscript{191}Ibid., pp. 6, 9, 7; Chicago \textit{Herald and Examiner}, August 12, 1920.
Democratic leadership shall remain; not the fear that 'a' Republican change will restore to power the influential few.  

Sagacity, or intelligence, as an element of ethical appeal, was given less consideration than the aspects of character. Roosevelt tactfully avoided ridicule in establishing the following points:

... this land of ours is of such physical magnitude, has so many different kinds of problems in different kinds of places, that those who may be called on to exercise national powers of governing owe it to themselves to study, and to study insofar as possible at first hand, the questions before them ... .

I do not forget that the Government of the United States is intended for every citizen and not only for those of one party faith . . . .

... I ask you ... to make up your own minds. I will abide willingly by the result.

Finally, FDR's good will was revealed by "his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth," and by his praise for the audience:

After the San Francisco Convention, I journeyed eastward to pay my respects at once to our great leader, the Governor of Ohio.

... on this journey to the very waters of the Pacific Ocean, and in all my subsequent

192 FDR Chicago Speech, p. 11.
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194 See Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 387.
travels, I shall have the opportunity to talk, not only to Democrats, but also to those who are normally affiliated with other parties, and with men and women without party affiliations - the 'Independents'.

... Thank Heaven that this electorate of ours has brains and knows how to use them!

... I willingly acknowledge and praise the fine citizenship which goes to make up the rank and file of the Republican Party. Many millions of voters of the Republican ticket are splendid Americans...

The candidate did an outstanding job in establishing his ethos through the multiple references to high character, sagacity, and good will.

Many preceding excerpts from the Chicago address employed the "abundance of adjectives, the pictorial effect, and the appeal to imagery" which carried emotional impact. Appearing before a large, enthusiastic gathering, the nominee recognized the value of such remarks. He chose illustrations which connoted action and displayed a defiance of the opposition. His initial sentence established the tone and temper for the speech: "Tonight we are firing the opening gun of a battle of far-reaching importance, and once again the shots are going to be heard around the World - for the action of the American Nation this year will be watched with

---
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anxious eyes by all civilization." He described Republican leaders during "the first eight years of this century" as "men who marched with the times, men who tried to interpret the thought of the body of the party for the better governing of the Country." Yet, he also relied on "loaded words" which carried strong logical and emotional connotations in declaring: "We are opposed to the attitude of placing ourselves in some self-appointed shrine and then asking America to come and worship at our feet." He continued to treat the contemporary GOP leaders with derision by identifying them as "the Old Guard . . . with their eyes on the ground, unmindful of the marvelous progress around them, wrapped in their selfishness, fault finding and bitterly criticizing," offering to make "a few little clever changes of language" in order to "sell out the whole Federal Reserve System" to an exclusive "clique of individuals." He concluded with gusto by praising once more the former Republican leadership and by castigating those political "Generals who vacillate between inaction and retreat." He pleaded for "a restoration of the Republicanism of Lincoln and Roosevelt by
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striving to defeat those who were responsible for the acts of this Chicago convention." 202

Roosevelt's methods of proof showed a marked improvement in the Chicago address. His ethical and emotional appeals maintained a high level of effectiveness, and his logical references at times were more specific than those employed at Hyde Park. In the latter instance, the opposition writers and speakers mainly took issue with statistical material which was not included in the original manuscript.

Speech Structure

Roosevelt stated his central theme, with varying degrees of emphasis, three times in the Chicago speech. In the introduction, he maintained: "I do not forget that the Government of the United States is intended for every citizen and not only for those of one party faith." 203 In the conclusion, he made a more definite appeal with the following statements:

Join with us in a sincere effort to help our beloved land in this year of years . . .

Above all, let us unite, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, from North and South and East and West, to explode the shams of partisan narrowness, to grasp our true issues, our true problems with broad vision;

202 Ibid., p. 12.
203 Ibid., p. 3.
to insist on progress and action, and to work unceasingly as individuals for the betterment of our Nation.\textsuperscript{204}

For the sake of brevity, the central thought can be condensed as follows: Democrats, Republicans, and Independents should unite to support the Democratic Party. Although the theme did not emerge a half dozen times, as it did in the acceptance speech, it was sufficiently clear to avoid misunderstanding.

Once more, the speech followed a logical order of arrangement. The introduction, in addition to citing the central idea, presented the following points: "First of all Governor Cox and I believe that it is the simple duty of the candidates" to speak "to as many citizens as possible . . . . In the second place . . . those who may be called on to exercise national powers of governing" should become familiar with the problems of the entire country.\textsuperscript{205} However, these two ideas did not constitute the two major points developed within the body of the speech. These two major ideas were not previewed before the development of each one.

Roosevelt's major contentions can be briefed as follows:

I. Democratic leaders advocate progress and action, for

A. They are opposed to a few prejudiced politicians and newspapers controlling the country.

\textsuperscript{204}Ibid., p. 12.

\textsuperscript{205}Ibid., pp. 1-2.
B. They are in sympathy with the goals of the Progressive Party, for

1. The Progressive Party was founded by honest men.

2. The Progressive Party stood for good government, for

   a. The Progressives opposed selfish men.
   
   b. The Progressives opposed reactionary ideas.

C. They oppose the "clique" which includes the 1920 Republican nominee and his "sponsors."

II. The Democratic platform advocates progress and action, for

A. It pledges a constructive national program, for

   1. It supports the Federal Reserve Act.
   
   2. It supports the Farm Loan Act.
   
   3. It supports the Eight-Hour Law.
   
   4. It supports governmental reorganization "along sound economic and humanitarian lines."
   
   5. It does not attempt to satisfy factions.

B. It pledges a constructive international program, for

   1. It supports America's participation in the League of Nations.
2. It does not endorse "some new crack-brained scheme of some new undefined Association of Nations."

3. It supports a desire "for immediate and permanent peace."

Whereas the Hyde Park speech concentrated on national and international problems, the Chicago address confined these issues to the second point. The first point attempted to appeal directly to Republicans and Progressives. The speech revealed a clear division of introduction, body, and conclusion. Yet, the information in the body was not separated as carefully as the brief seems to indicate. Without previewing, summarizing, or employing "signposts," the material did not fall into individual compartments. The speech structure was adequate, although it failed to meet the standard established in the acceptance address.

Use of Language

FDR's style continued to reflect characteristics of clarity, vividness, and impressiveness. The mean sentence-length for the Chicago address was 26.3 words. This figure indicated only a slight increase over the Hyde Park average. The introduction continued to use the longest sentences, while the shortest statements were uttered in the conclusion. The development of the two major

---

206 The mean sentence-length for the introduction was 32.0 words. The conclusion showed a mean sentence-length of 21.9 words.
points in the body revealed means of 23.8 and 26.6, respectively.
The speaker varied the length of his sentences from four to seventy-seven words. Therefore, the numerical structure of the Chicago utterances compared favorably with those in the acceptance address.

Homely expressions were found in quantity. FDR made references to "any right-minded candidate"; platform planks which became "a rehash of generalities and high-sounding words"; opponents who attempted to "slur over the great fact" in an effort to put forward "some new crack-brained scheme" that resulted in "a hodgepodge of vague compromises." The homely remarks, often carrying a tinge of sarcasm, were utilized effectively in an effort to discredit the GOP leadership.

Several terms were applied synonymously in an attempt to add clarity. He scornfully mentioned "old-time, hard-shell politicians . . . a small and intensely narrow wing of their party . . . their skill in manipulation, their playing off of one section against the other," and the "plank about labor is so unsatisfactory, so weak . . . ." He failed to develop a lengthy series of synonyms, as he had done previously, and tended to ignore this technique as an effective stylistic device. He did apply some repetition in stating:

---
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The Republican Party is one of great traditions, of great patriotism, of great accomplishments.

... a conflict has been raging within that party - raging not so much among the privates ...

Their thought, their control, their interest ...
Chicago has seen ... Chicago can bear witness ...
...
...
they offer no definite policy; they do not make clear what constructive measures they advocate, nor do they make clear what action they will take ...

Parallel sentence structure continued to be a primary method of clarification. Many examples were evident in the Chicago speech.

A few of these included:

It was in this very city that these men succeeded in their purpose. It was in this very city that was born the movement of protest ... it was even more than the support of Theodore Roosevelt, the man: it was the voice of insistence ...

Once again, we see them, with their eyes to the ground ... Once again, we see them, making no attempt to interpret the progressive thought ...

I need not go into the details of the convention here this year. I need not recite to you the remarkable document which finally emerged labelled 'The Republican Platform'. I need not refer to the planks so mysteriously mislaid.

Its framers forgot perhaps that ... they were including ... dozens of Republican Congressmen ... They forgot perhaps that they were condemning, too, the hundreds and thousands of patriotic Republicans ... They forgot that

\[209\text{Ibid., pp. 4, 6, 9.}\]
the great struggle was conducted and won as a National War . . . .

The vividness and impressiveness of Roosevelt's language was enhanced by metaphoric expressions. Obviously intended to instill fire, enthusiasm, and youthful exuberance into this opening campaign speech, the candidate developed the following battlefield metaphors:

Tonight we are firing the opening gun of a battle of far-reaching importance, and once again the shots are going to be heard around the World . . . .

. . . . a conflict has been raging within that party - raging not so much among the privates in the ranks as among those in high command . . . .
men who marched with the times . . . .

. . . . with their eyes on the ground . . . .
'marking time' with an energy worthy of a better cause, instead of marching forward . . . .

. . . . misrepresentative generals at the head of the Republican troops.

Purge your own army of those generals who vacillate between inaction and retreat.

His metaphors were not limited to those concerned with the military, as shown by these examples:

That vote . . . was the voice of insistence . . .
that the World was moving on. Among those . . .
who hurled bitter and insulting attacks . . . .

. . . . they still hold the reins of power.
Chicago has seen this machinery in motion . . . .

\[210\] Ibid., pp. 5, 6, 7.
\[211\] Ibid., pp. 1, 4, 5, 6, 12.
Contending factions had to be satisfied, and the cleverest chemists were summoned to mix the ingredients. The result was a new substance, which has lost the good qualities of its basic parts, and as a new composition has no known use. 212

Short, pungent, striking phrases captured additional feelings of action. The Democratic nominees were opposed to "placing ourselves in some self-appointed shrine." The Vice-Presidential nominee was embarking on a "journey to the very waters of the Pacific Ocean" in order to expose the GOP platform as "merely a vote-catcher for the unthinking." He quoted Lincoln as a source for one striking phrase: "'You can't fool the people - there's such an all-fired lot of them!'" 213 The Chicago Herald and Examiner detected two remarks of notable impression:

And then the vice presidential candidate offered a new slogan for the Democratic campaign:

'The Democratic party offers not "a" change, but "the" change.'

'Join with us,' he urged, 'in a sincere effort to help our beloved land in this year of years. This is truly a fork in the road.' 214

The Chicago Daily Tribune called attention to the candidate's impromptu condemnation of the Republican "attempt to 'Newberryize' this country" with their huge campaign fund. 215
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Bombast, ridicule, and sarcasm flowed freely in Roosevelt's vigorous attack on the opposition. GOP leaders were depicted as "the Ancient Regime," the "sponsors" of Harding, the "Old Guard," "the clique of individuals," "the Republican oligarchs," "the influential few," "hungry office-holders," "this little group of misrepresentative men." Their "vague and evasive" platform drafters produced a document which reflected "vague compromises," "unworkable schemes," and "shams of partisan narrowness." Their "narrowly prejudiced newspapers" treated history "with partisan falsehood." FDR struck from the manuscript additional bombastic comments. However, he persisted in carefully praising the "rank and file" Republican voter and separated them from the undesirable party leadership.

In eighty-seven sentences, the first person was used only forty-nine times. The third person was employed eighty-six times, or almost twice as often. Therefore, a notable change in pronominal usage occurred in the Chicago address. This factor, especially apparent in the body of the speech, can be explained by the many

216 FDR Chicago Speech, pp. 5, 10, 11, 12.
217 Ibid., pp. 7, 11, 12.
218 Ibid., pp. 3, 8.
219 Ibid., pp. 2, 5.
220 Ibid., pp. 4, 8, 12.
references to the opposition and its program in terms of "he," "it," "they," "them," and "their." However, the first person was predominant in the introduction, the central idea, and the conclusion.

Roosevelt "made little use of interrogation, either direct or rhetorical," in his Presidential speeches. Yet, he asked six questions in the opening 1920 campaign address. He inquired, "How, for instance, will Senator Harding, if elected, restore, as he suggests, the market for liberty bonds to par?" Next, he suggested two alternative answers to the question, neither being a feasible course to follow. He interjected a series of rhetorical questions in an attack on two other topics:

What kind of a change would Senator Harding make in our Federal Reserve System? Does he not know that under it for the first time in our history the control of our national finances is in the hands of the nation and not in the clutch of a handful of private bankers? Would he go back to the plan of the Aldrich Bill, sponsored back in 1911 by these same Penroses and Lodges and Smoots?

What do the Republican oligarchs mean by 'a change'? Do they propose to keep the business of this nation waiting for another year or two while they take up some new undefined Association of Nations with the twenty-nine nations which are already members of the League of Nations?

---


222 FDR Chicago Speech, p. 9.

223 Ibid., p. 10.
He asked "loaded," rhetorical questions\(^{224}\) to amplify his own approach to specific issues and to discredit opposition remedies.

The appeal for Progressive and independent votes encouraged a close identity with former President Theodore Roosevelt. The "Roosevelt name" possibly helped the candidate gain the Vice-Presidential nomination and political strategists planned to capitalize on it. The deceased President's ethical appeal was of sufficient national attraction to cause "Jergen's Violet Soap" to feature his 1912 campaign exploits in its 1920 advertisements.\(^{225}\) A major highway was named in his honor in the State of Washington.\(^{226}\) Leland D. Baldwin noted:

TR's significance lay in two things: his popularization and redirection of progressive issues, and the start that he gave to the conservation of natural resources. That he actually accomplished little may be attributed in part to his own doubt and hesitancy, but perhaps even more to the political situation: he had to keep East and West together . . . .\(^{227}\)

Attempting to follow in "TR's" footsteps, FDR probably sensed the importance of politically welding the East and the West. He praised his distant relative lavishly as "a great American leader;"

\(^{224}\) See Gray and Braden, Public Speaking, p. 305.

\(^{225}\) For example, see New York Times, June 20, 1920.

\(^{226}\) Editorial, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 22, 1920.

and imitated his style by using such terms as "delight," "delightful," and "splendid."\^228\^ Steve Early sent instructions to continue exploiting the great Progressive's image throughout the West.\^229\^ The nominee apparently followed these instructions effectively,\^230\^ which caused alarm in the Republican press.\^231\^ One GOP west coast editorial haughtily disclosed "the remoteness of his [FDR's] resemblance of and kinship to Theodore Roosevelt."\^232\^ Finally, Roosevelt interspersed ad libitum in the Chicago speech. He departed from the prepared text to criticize the GOP platform, to lambast the Republican campaign fund, and to advocate methods of governmental economy.\^233\^ Each interjection was short and pertinent to the subject under consideration. For example, he contended: "The people of this country . . . know that their Government will repay them dollar for dollar when the time of the loan is up. They know that today the Treasury of the United States

\^228\^FDR Chicago Speech, pp. 5, 1, 3, 4.

\^229\^For examples, see Telegrams, Early to FDR, August 14; 15; 16, 1920.

\^230\^See Milwaukee \textit{Journal}, August 13; Seattle \textit{Post-Intelligencer}, August 20; Seattle \textit{Star}, August 21, 1920.


is running ahead and not behind."234 Apparently feeling that the final statement needed expansion, he changed the pronoun and introduced the following additions:

> We know to-day that the treasury of the United States is running ahead and not behind, and you know, too, the pledge given by my chief and yours that if the democratic party is returned to power, that the expenditures of the government to-day running at $6,000,000,000 a year will be cut to $4,000,000,000 a year — just two-thirds of what they are now.235

Caution must be exercised in accepting the verbatim newspaper reports because small differences existed in the terminology. Nevertheless, all reports indicated minor departures from the prepared text. After investigating five Presidential addresses, Laura Crowell found that Roosevelt's "campaign speeches seemed to allow him greater freedom in ad-libbing than did the other occasions . . . these ad-libs . . . allowed Roosevelt to relate his ideas and himself to his listeners in more vibrant, compelling terms."236 In the Chicago speech, he used *ad libitum* in attempting to clarify and to expand a general contention.

Except for some notable changes in emphasis, Roosevelt employed those distinctive stylistic traits which were noted in the

---

234 FDR Chicago Speech, pp. 9-10.

235 As quoted by Iowa's GOP Congressman, James W. Good, in the Chicago *Daily News*, August 12, 1920.

acceptance speech. Many of his metaphoric expressions used military terminology; he used third person pronouns almost twice as often as first person; he used six rhetorical questions; he infrequently imitated President Theodore Roosevelt's speaking style; and he interjected at least three unprepared comments. For the most part, his language continued to be clear, vivid, and impressive.

Delivery

Few extant, contemporary reports of the Chicago address include extensive references concerning the speaker's delivery. They tend to agree that he employed a "caustic attack," delivered a "bitter arraignment of the Republican party," and "was vitriolic in his characterization" of the opposition. These accounts further disclosed frequent applauding, cheering, booing, and demonstrating by the audience. The critic only can surmise that, on the basis of extremely fragmentary evidence, his appearance, physical manifestations, and vocal skill satisfactorily met the demands imposed by the speech, the audience, and the occasion.

Final Evaluation

Roosevelt received the usual congratulatory messages from his partisan friends following the Chicago meeting. His New York campaign headquarters manager received many of these messages and

237Chicago Daily Tribune; Chicago Herald and Examiner; Chicago Daily News, August 12, 1920.
wired: "The criticisms of your Chicago and Wisconsin speeches have been highly favorable by both Democrats and Republicans. Your Chicago speech [made] a big appeal to your friends of independent thought. This is great stuff and keep it up." George Foster Peabody added the praises of Harvard President Emeritus Charles Elliott in stating: "Congratulations on your fine opening of the campaign. It may interest you to know that in a letter from President Elliott he compliments your opening speech very highly. All success to you." After returning from the West, however, FDR was bitter over the fact that no Democratic "lesser lights" answered the charges made by Congressman Good on "the question of appropriations in his Chicago speech." After returning from the West, however, FDR was bitter over the fact that no Democratic "lesser lights" answered the charges made by Congressman Good on "the question of appropriations in his Chicago speech."

Franklin D. Roosevelt opened his national campaign tour in Chicago before an overflow crowd of five thousand noisy, enthusiastic men and women in the auditorium. He chose to disregard local problems and to minimize the League of Nations issue in favor of developing the appeal to progressive sentiment. In so doing, he attempted to convince independent and opposition voters that the Democratic Party represented "progress" in 1920.

The premises pointed to a need for progressive reform and indicated that both the Democratic platform and the Democratic

---

238 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, August 13, 1920.

239 Telegram, Peabody to FDR, August 14, 1920.

240 Unsigned Memorandum to Harrison, September 3, 1920.
leaders recognized this need. His methods for proving these premises were better than those used in the acceptance speech. His ethical and emotional proofs continued to be effective, and his logical proofs were more specific.

The speech structure did not meet the standard established at Hyde Park. The central theme was stated clearly, but the major points were more difficult to detect. Lack of preview, summarization, or "signposts" contributed to the structural difficulties.

His speaking style remained highly effective. He departed somewhat from those stylistic devices which characterized the acceptance speech, but the changes did not alter adversely the clear, vivid, and impressive qualities of his language.

Finally, on the basis of little evidence, his delivery apparently did not distract from the content of his message.

Seattle

Audience, Occasion, and Setting

Following the Chicago speech, Roosevelt's campaign trail progressed rapidly through Wisconsin, Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and Washington. The Rocky Mountain regions gave him "a tremendously enthusiastic reception" wherever he appeared.241

---

However, Steve Early, from his forward position, detected several forthcoming problems in the extreme Northwest. From Spokane, he wrote:

Washington State is DRY. Interest centers on reclamation of lands and destruction of Non-Partisan League . . . There is apparently little interest among the rank and file on the League of Nations. Less than ten percent of the people are familiar with the issue. Impression here is that President Wilson failed to stimulate interest.  

He explained some of the difficulties more specifically after reaching Seattle:

The struggle for Democracy in Washington State will be more up-hill and difficult in the coming election than it was in 1916. The reasons are:

This is a Bryan Democracy. Bryan has imbittered the people against Wilson, whether intentionally or not. The facts are that he has.

There is an evident belief among the people also that Wilson controls Cox and that Cox has subordinated himself to the White House and has not acted as he would have had he been more independent. If the President would hand over the reins and let Cox steer his own course, they say things would be different. Something really should be done to off set this impression. It not only prevails here but in the other states through which I have passed . . .

The interest in the League of Nations is waning. The Republican propaganda has been most effective. The Bryanites too are dissatisfied on the League question . . .

Still, the Democrats here are working hard and optimistically. The women are turning things over with a vengance. They are celebrating the suffrage victory

---

242 Letter, Early to McIntyre, August 17, 1920.
tonight. The act of the Tennessee legislature will do a lot for the Democratic cause. The women all want and believe in a League of Nations. They will vote for it.

Upon arriving in San Francisco, Early reflected on still another western problem:

In both Seattle and Portland the Republicans are well organized and carrying the campaign forward in a much more effective way than are the dis-organized Democrats. The Republicans have already distributed a vast amount of campaign literature and lithographs to their candidates. The Democrats are struggling individually and bemoaning the fact that they have no literature nor lithographs.

To aggravate all of these shortcomings, the Democrats were not favored by any of the three Seattle newspapers:

The Times has heretofore been known as an independent newspaper. It was in 1916. Now, it won't even print the acceptance speech of Cox until it is compelled to by the demands made upon it by its subscribers.

The Post-Intelligencer is and always has been a republican paper of the staunchest sort. As a matter of fact if the Democrats get their issues before the people here they will have to get themselves a newspaper... The Star is the other paper here. It is Scripps and caters to the working classes, murders, sobbs and sensations. It doesn't touch politics.

... The only advertising the [Seattle] meeting has been given was by paid advertisements in the papers... And, the Times charges $5.40 and [sic] inch for political advertising. It doesn't want any from the Dems. Of course, none is necessary for the Republicans. They get theirs in the news columns.

243 Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.
244 Letter, Early to Howe, August 22, 1920.
245 Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.
Making no attempt to hide their animosity, some west coast newspapers referred to the Democrats as "Bourbons." The historian, W. R. Thayer, defines the term as follows:

There comes a time in every sect, party, or institution when it stops growing, its arteries harden, its young men see no visions, its old men dream no dreams; it lives on the past and desperately tries to perpetuate the past. In politics when this process of petrification is reached, we call it Bourbonism... 247

The Seattle newspapers did not keep their readers adequately informed about FDR's western tour. Steve Early complained that the final afternoon editions, on August 18, did not carry "a word of his big speech at Butte at ten o'clock this morning." For this Montana address, lack of news coverage was a distinct Democratic advantage. Roosevelt invited political turmoil by declaring:

As a matter of fact the United States has about 12 votes in the Assembly. Until last week I had two of them myself, and now Secretary Daniels has them. You know I have had something to do with the running of a couple of little republics. Facts are that I wrote Haiti's constitution myself, and if I do say it, I think it is a pretty good constitution. Haiti and San Domingo, Panama, Cuba and Central American countries, who have at least 12 votes in the League Assembly, all regard Uncle Sam as a guardian and big

246 For examples, see Seattle Daily Times, August 18-21; San Francisco Chronicle, August 24, 1920.


248 Letter, Early to Howe, August 18, 1920.
brother, and this country practically will have their votes in the League.\textsuperscript{249}

He was rebuffed by the State Department; he angered South American diplomats; he was attacked verbally in a speech by Senator Harding; he profusely denied making the statements; and his denial enraged the Montana audience.\textsuperscript{250} The topic continued to occupy a prominent place in news reports throughout the campaign.\textsuperscript{251} After departing from Washington State, the harassed nominee persisted in trying to explain his Butte comments in Portland, Oregon, by contending that "the partisan Republican Press . . . sent some one to the State Department the other day and misrepresented me."\textsuperscript{252} Yet, two days later he bragged to a San Francisco audience: "Why, I have been running Haiti and San Domingo for the past seven years."\textsuperscript{253}

\textsuperscript{249}As quoted in Boston Transcript, August 19, 1920.

\textsuperscript{250}Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21-26; Boston Transcript, August 25-29; New York Times, August 29; Letter, FDR to Abbott, September 4; Telegram, McCarthy to St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 28, 1920.

\textsuperscript{251}For a few examples, see editorial, Chicago Herald and Examiner, August 30, 1920; "How Big Is Cox?" and "Uncle Sam's Twelve Votes," The Independent, CIII (September 4, 1920), 270, 280-281; New York Herald, October 18, 1920.

\textsuperscript{252}Carbon typescript (extracts), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Portland, Oregon, August 21, 1920, pp. 5-6.

\textsuperscript{253}Carbon typescript (complete), in Ibid., San Francisco, California, August 23, 1920, p. 10. For an account of the Butte, Montana, incident, see Freidel, Franklin D. Roosevelt: The Ordeal, pp. 80-83.
It remains significant that no Seattle newspaper reported the repercussions until the day Roosevelt moved out of the state and into Oregon. Therefore, his Washington audiences likely knew little, or nothing, about the Montana incident. Although haunted by this unfortunate speech in other areas, his general effectiveness in the West was admitted even by GOP publications. A typical and truthful reaction to his Washington State campaign noted:

Washington voters last week extended a cordial welcome to Franklin D. Roosevelt, democratic candidate for vice-president. They were favorably impressed with his genial personality. They listened intently to his frank and vigorous handling of national issues. They like the former assistant secretary of the navy, but most of them will vote for Harding.254

The "dis-organized Democrats" of the "Washington delegation provided the Boss with a special train of five cars and arranged their itinerary without regard to that originally planned by the New York Headquarters . . . ."255 He was joined in Spokane "by National Committeeman A. R. Titlow, State Chairman George F. Christensen, four Democratic candidates for governor and a number of other party leaders . . . and at times during the cross-state journey the gubernatorial candidates had opportunity to be seen with the vice presidential candidate."256

255 Letter, Early to Howe, August 22, 1920.
256 Seattle Daily Times, August 20, 1920.
Up to the time of his arrival in Seattle, Roosevelt made ten speeches on August 20, beginning at Pasco at seven o'clock in the morning and progressing through Kennewick, Prosser, Mabton, Toppenish, Yakima, Ellensburg, Cle Elum, Auburn, and Kent. All of the speeches, except for those at Pasco, Yakima, and Ellensburg, were presented from the rear platform of the private car. 257

The nominee was eating dinner when the train pulled into the Seattle yards a few minutes after 7:00 p.m. He did not keep the delegation of welcoming Democrats waiting long before he alighted, posed for a series of photographs, and was introduced to the crowd. A parade, led by Wagner's band, proceeded by automobile directly to the Arena. Five hundred reserved seats were sold at one dollar each in order to defray the expenses of the meeting. Other seats in the hall were available free to the general public. The mixed audience, which totaled about 2800 persons, did not entirely fill the Arena. 258 One Republican publication observed: "There were as many empty seats as seats that were occupied in the hall, and the Arena only half filled is a cheerless place in which to speak. The fact that hundreds of tickets were sold at $1 each may have had something to do with dampening of Democratic ardor." 259 The crowd participated in community singing while

257 Ibid., August 21, 1920.
258 Ibid.; Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 19; 21, 1920.
259 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 22, 1920.
awaiting the arrival of the escort parade and then gave Roosevelt an enthusiastic reception. After the nominee was ushered to the platform, the audience stood and sang "The Star Spangled Banner." Democratic women campaign workers and principal party candidates for state offices were given prominent positions on the dais, "and no opportunity to capitalize the occasion in the interest of the candidates was overlooked."260

Hugh C. Todd, Democratic candidate for Congress, was master of ceremonies. He "wasted no time in speechmaking," but promptly introduced a member of the Roosevelt party, Judge Robert Marx of Ohio. The judge told the people "what Cox had done for Ohio," and then the Vice-Presidential nominee was introduced. FDR was no stranger to Seattle. As Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he was a guest of the Press Club in 1914.

Following the Arena address, he held an informal reception, "shaking hands with several hundred Democrats, many of whom exchanged comments with him. Through it all, Mr. Roosevelt smiled good naturedly and gossiped cheerfully with the crowd." After departing from the Arena, he entrained immediately for Grays Harbor where he began another strenuous day on August 21, with an early morning speech at Hoquiam.261

260 Ibid., August 21, 1920.
Choice of Subject and Speech Goal

Roosevelt did not alter the Chicago strategy in selecting his speech subject and goal. He was warned by Early's message concerning support for prohibition, opposition to the League of Nations, bitterness toward President Wilson, and local interest in land reclamation. Following news developments closely, he was aware of the Tennessee suffrage action. He chose to continue dealing with the subject of progressivism in appealing for independent and GOP support. Furthermore, he alluded to his naval experiences in a state which depended greatly upon shipping interests.

One newspaper summarized his effort as follows:

He discussed quite fully the question of national defense, making his first utterances on that subject last night, and this of course enabled him to speak of the future of the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton. At Spokane he had touched on the problem of reclamation and irrigation, which is close to the heart of the Inland Empire, and as at Spokane so in Seattle last night, he promised quick action in the matter of extensions and other improvements, and modestly claimed that as it was a Democratic administration that first recognized the needs of the Pacific in the matter of navy yard facilities, it will be a Democratic administration which will carry on the work.

An earlier edition of the same publication proclaimed:

It is this Progressive Republican-Independent vote that Roosevelt was instructed to appeal to on his present speaking tour through fifteen states between Chicago and the Pacific. In all of his speeches he

---

262 Letter, Early to McIntyre, August 17, 1920.
draws liberally on the record of the late Col. Roosevelt in his attempt to show that the Republican party of today is not in tune with the Republican party of his day, and by comparison, to demonstrate that the platform adopted by the Republicans at Chicago is not a forward-looking instrument. 263

Premises and Methods of Proof

Facing not only a mixed audience, but one made up of diverse political affiliations, Roosevelt chose to continue appealing for progressive votes. His premises formed a hypothetical syllogism once more:

Major premise: If national and international progressive reforms are to be completed, a Democratic Administration must be elected.

Minor premise: National and international progressive reforms must be completed.

Conclusion: Therefore, a Democratic Administration must be elected.

The exact terminology, as stated in the preceding syllogism, was not employed by the speaker. However, his premises were all encompassed in the following remarks:

We want it to be a prosperity that will give to those who now lack it a bigger share in the opportunities of American life . . .

... without us the League of Nations can take no steps in that very important part of its functions,

263 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21, 1920.
that is to say the limitation of armaments by mutual consent among Nations . . .

It has been a Democratic Administration which has recognized your needs and the national needs on the Pacific. It will be another Democratic Administration which will carry out the splendid work already begun. A sarcastic Republican report contended: "The peculiar logic of Franklin D. Roosevelt voices an appeal to the old Roosevelt followers to join with the Democrats in this campaign for the purpose of making possible in the future 'a restoration of the Republicanism of Lincoln and Roosevelt.'"265

Similar to the Chicago address, FDR was compelled to show why progressive reforms were needed and how his party was superior to the opposition in executing them. He placed little emphasis on testimony as a form of support. His ten-page manuscript included only one quotation: "The Democratic Party does not adopt the 'full dinner pail' as its slogan, because, as Governor Cox has so well said, 'We are not satisfied with only the "full dinner pail."'"266 The emotive value of such a fragmentary quotation far exceeded its referential importance.

---

264 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Seattle, Washington, August 20, 1920, pp. D, 2, 5. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the Seattle address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR Seattle Speech.

265 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21, 1920.

266 FDR Seattle Speech, p. C.
The speaker's logical evidence improved slightly in his citation of examples. It was particularly strong in adapting historical facts to the argument under consideration, as shown in the following excerpt:

Up to 1914 the world as a whole was on the basis of competitive armament. Just as fast as Germany added another Division to her army, France had to do likewise. The same thing was true of even the smaller states of the world. When Germany began feverishly to build up her navy, Great Britain had to answer with an even greater number of battle ships. In this race the United States was compelled to keep pace or run the danger of having an inadequate defense. The result was an enormous increase in our Army and especially in our Navy before the war.267

He relied on general contentions, which probably were well known to segments of his audience in declaring: "To-day we could not base the whole American fleet on the Pacific Coast. We have not enough docks . . . repair facilities . . . storehouses . . . water in the channel to get to one of the principal Navy Yards."268 For this point, he utilized experience and knowledge which resulted from his tenure in the Navy Department. Personal experiences were used for logical and ethical appeal in the following statements:

I have been West many times before. I have been to Seattle in the past, as most of you know . . . . I can remember the days when bread lines existed in many parts of the land . . . the days of financial

267Ibid., pp. 1-2.
268Ibid., p. 5.
panic . . . the days when bank savings in this great land were but a dream for the average citizen. However, he weakly concluded: "Today this is not the case."

Similar statements on the same subject also lacked support, such as: "The Democratic party might have the right to use that slogan of 'Let well enough alone' this year because of the unprecedented prosperity of the Nation . . . . It is true that we are prosperous." Early's message informed the nominee that "Lumber is the big industry" in Washington. Yet, the day before the Arena speech, a local paper reported that "Lumbermen of the Pacific Northwest see ruin facing them" under proposed railroad freight rate advances. The West Coast Lumbermen's Association defiantly protested: "The old spirit of 'the public be damned' is strongly in evidence."

Roosevelt should have been aware of these circumstances which demanded substantial support for his "unprecedented prosperity" observation. He was excessive in his praise for contemporary financial conditions. This optimism undermined his attempt to show the necessity for additional reform measures. Therefore, regarding national problems, there was a need for statistical modes of proof.

---

269 Ibid., p. B.
270 Ibid., pp. B, D.
271 Letter, Early to McIntyre, August 17; Seattle Daily Times, August 19, 1920.
Numerous statistics were offered on international arguments. Military preparations for the war "ran up into the hundred of millions, and this money came directly from the pockets of the tax-payers." Currently, "the Army and Navy are costing the people of this Country, and in this I do not include any of the war expenses, just about $1,000,000,000." Even with this expenditure, the Navy "is at the present time in second place." He warned that if the world returns "to the old pre-war condition of competitive building" it will mean "without question, an increase in the already enormous cost which we are sustaining. Battle-ships that formerly cost Six or Eight Million Dollars, now cost Twenty-five or Thirty Million." This arms race will mean "that we shall have to spend in the near future far more than the present Billion Dollars a year." However, by working through the League of Nations "the size of all navies" would be "materially reduced." Consequently, "Instead of fifty battle-ships we would have twenty-five or even fifteen. Instead of paying out a Billion Dollars every year for armament, we could cut the cost more than in half."272 FDR's statistical references gave force to his international arguments. Thus, he was quite effective in showing the advantages of League participation by precisely pointing to tax savings. His Navy experience undoubtedly afforded ample data on past, present, and future armament costs.

272 FDR Seattle Speech, pp. 2-4.
Ethical appeal played a prominent role in the Seattle address, especially regarding national issues. The nominee inserted remarks which reflected on his integrity and character by proclaiming:

... we want it to be a prosperity of better homes, of better living conditions - a prosperity which eliminates the sweat-shop and the overworking of our mothers and our children.

These are some of the reasons why Governor Cox and I are carrying our case to the people.

I am not a militarist. 273

Conversely, he attacked the character of his opponents:

Human beings, in the march of civilization must have more than animals. To stop short at satisfying their stomachs is an insult which apparently the present leaders of the Republican Party do not realize.

It is not merely in the matter of our foreign policy and how we shall restore peace that the Republican platform faces both ways at the same time. It is true of the whole campaign which they are staging ... by dragging in dead issues as they have attempted to do with the tariff ... 274

He combined character and sagacity appeals by stating: "You and I know that taking it by and large the Country is prosperous, - not the mere prosperity of a handful of men controlled by privilege, but the prosperity that extends pretty deeply throughout the communities." 275

273 Ibid., pp. D, E, 1.
274 Ibid., pp. C-D.
275 Ibid., p. B.
Sagacity, or expressions which show a familiarity with the
issues, was implied throughout the presentation. This form of
ethos was incorporated in the following remarks:

In the past ten days I have come from salt water
to salt water again . . . we have visited and held
meetings in all of the great States of the Northwest
. . .

. . . the United States shall maintain at all times an
Army and a Navy wholly adequate for national defense.

We believe whole-heartedly in adequate defense.

I have no doubt that if the great powers meet around
the table, and it is obvious that they all must sit
at that table, they will be able to reach an
agreement . . .

With the existing size of our fleet, we know from the
experience of having half of our fleet in the Pacific
at this time that our shore facilities at Puget Sound,
at San Francisco Bay, and in Southern California, are
wholly inadequate. This is a simple matter of common
sense.276

Expressions of good will were distributed moderately in
the introduction and in the transition between the major points.
Early in the speech, Roosevelt said, "There is, after all, very
little difference between us Americans, no matter from what State
we come . . . . we have not merely a common language . . . we have
also the same general standards of life and the same ideals of
thought." He praised "the extraordinary and rich valleys of your
own State, reclaimed from a wilderness by the initiative of man."
He saluted the seaport city and entered the second phase of his

276Ibid., pp. A, 1, 3, 5.
speech in declaring: "Seattle is a Navy town. It knows what the Navy is for, and it is, therefore, in this city that I want first to take up the great vital question of our Army and Navy of the future."277 As shown by these examples, the campaigner spent considerable effort in establishing his ethical proofs. Those dealing with good will were expressed quite well. However, even the opposition held him in high esteem, as a local GOP newspaper emphasized: "He is no stranger here, and is well liked for his personality by those who differ from him politically."278 On this basis, the extensive references to ethos probably were unnecessary.

Finally, the speaker used emotional support, especially in treating national topics. His pathetic appeals pictorially solicited a unification of moral forces:

Coming down the slopes to the sea this afternoon, I have been thinking of some of the outstanding features of these journeyings. First of all, of course, is the thought which comes to every one as they cross this great Republic of ours, the thought of its magnitude, charm and physical riches; and next perhaps I have thought of the splendid unity of our people who inhabit it.

In all these parts we find the same type of rugged, forward-looking Americans, determined to make good and to make their Country a better place to live in.

... we Americans have heads and know how to use them... we must feed both the head and the heart even more truly than the appetites of the flesh.

277 Ibid., pp. A, B, 1.

278 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21, 1920.
Is it worth while for America to take part in something which will not merely serve to lift the burden of maintaining armaments from the shoulders of humanity, but which will also immediately reduce the danger of war by reducing the weapons for waging wars in the hands of Nations which might be possible aggressors?279

These moral forces were directed against the Republican leaders who "are not using their . . . slogan of 'Let well enough alone', but they would be if they happened to be in power at the present moment." He used implication and suggestion in further condemnations: "We worship at the shrine not of the 'God of things as they are', but at the shrine of the 'God of things as they should be' . . . . We believe that national candidates should be 'Nationally-minded' not 'Marion-minded'."280

Roosevelt depended mainly upon ethical and emotional proofs in developing the introduction, the conclusion, and the first major point. He used strong logical elements to supplement ethos and pathos in explaining his position on international affairs. Logos was practically nonexistent in the treatment of national questions, therefore, this important method of support radically improved in quality and effectiveness when the second half of the speech unfolded. This abrupt variance in the quality of factual material was not detected in the Hyde Park and the Chicago addresses. There were no major discrepancies apparent in ethical


280 Ibid., pp. D, E.
or emotional appeals aside from the fact that they were substituted, at times, for much needed logical proofs.

Speech Structure

Roosevelt withheld a clear statement of his central theme until the conclusion: "It has been a Democratic Administration which has recognized your needs and the national needs on the Pacific. It will be another Democratic Administration which will carry out the splendid work already begun."281 Whereas he stated his central idea six times at Hyde Park and three times at Chicago, he submitted it only once at Seattle. On the basis of Early's advance warning, perhaps he contemplated a predominantly Republican gathering and chose to conclude with his major purpose. Apparently the theme was understood. Referring to the speeches of FDR and Judge Marx, one local newspaper observed:

The thesis of both speakers seemed to be that the leaders of the Republican party today are not representative of true Republicanism, and that the Democrats are; therefore the only true interpretation of the progressive thought of the nation is found in the Democratic platform . . . .282

The FDR address proceeded through a logical order of arrangement. However, the introduction previewed neither the central thought nor the major points. It simply established a friendly and intelligent hearing by using ethical and emotional

281Ibid., p. 5.

282Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21, 1920.
appeals. The speaker exerted a greater effort to establish rapport in Seattle than he had done previously at Hyde Park or Chicago.

The following constitutes a brief of the candidate's major contentions:

I. National interests depend upon progressivism, for
   A. The country has prospered, for
      1. There are no bread lines.
      2. There is no financial panic.
      3. Individual bank savings have increased.
   B. The Republicans can discover no true issues, for
      1. They are "dragging in" the old tariff question.
      2. They are advocating the status quo.
   C. The Democrats advocate even greater prosperity, for
      1. We stand for better homes.
      2. We stand for better living conditions.
      3. We stand for better working conditions.

II. International interests depend upon progressivism, for
   A. The Democrats support an adequate defense force, for
      1. Naval facilities on the Pacific Coast will be improved, for
a. We will build more docks.
b. We will establish more repair facilities.
c. We will construct more storehouses.

2. Half of our fleet will remain on the Pacific Coast.

B. The Democrats advocate joining the League of Nations, for

1. The League will limit armaments.
2. The League will oppose an international arms race.
3. The League will "reduce the danger of war."

C. The Democrats have experience in solving previous problems.

There was an inconsistency in the first point. After stating that the GOP wanted to change the tariff, the anxious nominee added that "Let well enough alone" was the "kind of slogan" which "is typical of their present leadership." If the Republicans were contented with the status quo, it was implausible to include their objection to the current tariff laws. The second point merely was suggested and never as clearly stated as the brief implies.

\[^{283}\text{FDR Seattle Speech, pp. C-D.}\]
The Seattle address was not well constructed. Pages "one" through "five" seemingly were written prior to the "A" through "E" additions. The lack of effective transitions was apparent. In fact, both pages "one" and "A" included introductory comments which appeared to be intended originally as opening statements. Also, pages "five" and "E" possessed concluding remarks. Under the pressure of a crowded schedule, the campaigner possibly had little time to devote to speech preparation and, consequently, his organization suffered. This address was doubled in length by using inserts, and its structural quality was far below the standard set by the well-prepared acceptance oration.

Use of Language

Roosevelt did not use the preponderance of stylistic variety noted at Hyde Park and at Chicago. For one thing, the Seattle address was shorter in length. His statements continued to be brief with the mean sentence-length totaling 20.9 words. Like the two previous speeches, the introductory sentences averaged almost ten words longer than those in the remainder of the address. The conclusion utilized concise utterances, as reflected by the 16.5 mean sentence-length. Several statements in the body totaled only four or five words and the longest sentence consisted of sixty-one words. Overall, numerical
evaluations revealed the prevalence of terse, succinct, compressed expressions.

Homely remarks which added to simplicity were liberally applied to his contentions. At various times, he focused attention on "the 'full dinner pail'" and "their old-fasioned [sic] slogan of 'Let well enough alone'." Financially, he spoke "in terms of dollars and cents . . . the pockets of the tax-payers . . . . the tax-payers' pockets . . . . we could cut the cost more than in half." Concerning international negotiations, he declared: "Let us examine the future . . . . if the great powers meet around a table . . . . a fair ratio of the different armies and navies . . . . can be worked out." Also, he spoke about "the sweat-shop" and "a simple matter of common sense." Homely expressions were uttered usually as clarification devices.

Fewer synonyms were noted in the Seattle address. The speaker did refer to his trip "from salt water to salt water again - from one ocean to the other," and he identified "the great States of the Northwest, beginning with Wisconsin and working through Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Idaho and Washington." Later, he recalled "rugged, forward-looking Americans," and "the size of those navies - the size of all

284 Ibid., pp. C-D, 2-5.
A few uses of repetition were represented in the following remarks:

We want that prosperity to be of more than mere money - we want it to be a prosperity of better homes, of better living conditions - a prosperity which eliminates the sweat-shop and the overworking of our mothers and our children.

... national defense, inadequate defense, adequate defense.

Synonyms and repetitious phrasings were used less frequently in the Washington speech.

Parallel sentence structure continued to be a favorite FDR language characteristic. He distributed parallelisms equally in developing both of his major points:

I can remember the days when bread lines existed in many parts of the land. I can remember the days of financial panic. I can remember the days when bank savings in this great land were but a dream for the average citizen.

It is insufficient for a political party ... to hand out a mass of words ... It is insufficient for a political party to try to catch votes ... It is not merely in the matter of our foreign policy ... It is true of the whole campaign ...

Instead of fifty battle-ships ... Instead of paying out a Billion Dollars ...

We have not enough docks. We have not enough repair facilities. We have not enough storehouses. We have not enough water in the channel ...

---

Roosevelt copiously supplied metaphoric expressions. He combined metaphor and repetition in uncovering "not the mere prosperity of a handful of men . . . but the prosperity that extends pretty deeply . . . ." He combined metaphor with bombast in disclosing GOP efforts "to throw an old-fashioned Puget Sound fog around the true issues by dragging in dead issues . . . ." Then, he used numerous metaphors which were stated concisely in the following terms:

... we must feed both the head and the heart . . . .
... the whole campaign which they are staging.
... carrying our case to the people.
... turn our eyes outside of our own boundaries
... .
... Great Britain had to answer with an even greater number of battle ships.
... the League of Nations can take no steps . . . .
... to lift the burden . . . from the shoulders of humanity . . . in the hands of Nations . . . .

The striking phrase was not widely used at Seattle. The candidate combined metaphor, bombast, repetition and striking terminology in noting: "We worship at the shrine not of the 'God of things as they are', but at the shrine of the 'God of things as they should be'." His brevity was apparent in the blunt

288 Ibid., pp. B, C, E, 1, 2, 4.
announcement: "I am not a militarist." While he used many short statements, this speech did not possess an array of pungent phrases which stood apart from the remainder of the material.

Bombast, ridicule, and sarcasm were held to a minimum. The Republican platform was condemned for being "a mass of words," and opposition leadership was censored for insulting the electorate and for forcing a "kind of slogan" into past campaigns. His healthiest cudgel was reserved for Harding's "front porch campaign" with the words: "We believe that national candidates should be 'Nationally-minded' not 'Marion-minded'". However, his language was mild in comparison with previous efforts. After interviewing the Vice-Presidential aspirant, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Jr., explained, "The secret of making an audience in the West 'Cox sure,' said Roosevelt, 'is simply telling them that "Harding is a very nice gentleman." There is nothing a Westerner detests more than a very nice gentleman." FDR reserved this technique for his San Francisco audience three days later.

Several letters were received from publishing companies and individual citizens which objected to his use of "crooks,"

---

289 Ibid., pp. D, 1.
290 Ibid., pp. C, D, E.
292 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," San Francisco, California, August 23, 1920, p. 3.
"liars," "political crooks," and his "cheap and ill-advised political attacks" on the GOP while speaking in the West. FDR's manuscripts through the Portland, Oregon, address do not include these terms, although he did refer to "lies," "cowardly" people, and "a palpable lie" at the Hotel St. Francis luncheon in San Francisco. Bombast was utilized infrequently at Seattle.

First person pronouns returned to a place of prominence. In eighty-eight sentences, the first person appeared eighty times, with the third person used on fifty-four occasions. In placing little emphasis on ridicule, the speaker found the third person to be less applicable.

The nominee asked four rhetorical questions in the Washington address. He stated two short interrogatives and followed each one with a lengthy answer. In approaching the conclusion he offered an extensive explanation, then proceeded to insert the following queries in parallel form: "Is it worth while? Is it worth while for America to . . . reduce the danger of war by reducing the

---

293 Letters, Gay to FDR, August 20; Ously to FDR, August 16; Smith to FDR, September 28, 1920.

294 Flushing Times, August 28, 1920.


296 FDR Seattle Speech, pp. 1, 2.
weapons for waging wars in the hands of Nations which will be possible aggressors?" Rather than devise inquiries which discredited the opposition, he asked questions in order to amplify his own position on pertinent international issues.

Even though he continued to appeal for Progressive support, the Theodore Roosevelt style was not emphasized. Their kinship was described in most publicity releases at the time and FDR declared in a Yakima, Washington, interview: "Oh, T. R. and I were the best of friends." Furthermore, he discussed reclamation and conservation throughout the Evergreen State tour. In Milwaukee, St. Paul, Sioux Falls, Helena, and Butte, he sprinkled his utterances liberally with "splendid," "delight," "square deal," and "splendidly." The San Francisco Chronicle reported:

Members of the Roosevelt party confirm the stories that the Democratic nominee is being confused to a considerable extent with the late Colonel Roosevelt. By mail and in person either the candidate or members of his party are asked if he is not a son of the Colonel 'carrying on the work.' The present Roosevelt is said to have many characteristics of his famous namesake, who was but distantly related. The ban, though, is on the use of the word 'delighted.' Roosevelt will say 'bully,' though, and he frequently says 'fine' in enthusiastic tones.

---

297 Ibid., p. 4.
298 As quoted in Seattle Star, August 21, 1920.
299 Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21, 1920.
300 August 24, 1920.
Even though he used "splendid" only once in the Seattle manuscript, one Washington follower of President Roosevelt exclaimed, "'May I not' express the 'deelight' experienced in listening to you . . . ."\textsuperscript{301} Doubtlessly, his kinship with the former Progressive was exploited during the initial swing through the West.

There was some hint that ad libitum was interjected into the Seattle speaking experience. A local newspaper recalled: "The suffrage victory in Tennessee was not overlooked by Mr. Roosevelt. He found inspiration in the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, and left the thought that the Democrats had had something to do with the ultimate victory."\textsuperscript{302} These utterances could have emanated from the press conference which followed the meeting; however, with many women in the audience, it is likely that such statements were presented during the formal address.

Roosevelt continued to utilize those familiar stylistic devices which were noted in his earlier addresses.

His sentences were brief and included many homely remarks. There were fewer synonyms and repetitious phrasings, although parallel sentence structure was observed at four different points. There were frequent metaphoric expressions, but there was a

\textsuperscript{301}Letter, Selby to FDR, August 21, 1920.

\textsuperscript{302}Seattle Post-Intelligencer, August 21, 1920.
notable lack of striking phrases and biting sarcasm. First person pronouns were in preponderance, along with rhetorical questions, and the exploitation of President Theodore Roosevelt's ethos. There remains the possibility that he interjected a few unprepared comments into the speech.

**Delivery**

Once again only fragmentary reports are available concerning Roosevelt's delivery before the Seattle audience. A Republican newspaper described him as "the handsome young candidate" and added that the "smiling personality of the candidate did much to put him on good terms with a mixed audience." He wore "a blue serge suit, double-breasted, a black tie and a brown fedora hat."\(^303\) A telegram from Governor Thomas Riggs of Alaska urged Roosevelt: "Bring out in Seattle speech that conservationists still want to bottle up Alaska and you will influence Alaskans now residing in Washington . . . ."\(^304\) This message was relayed to Butte, Montana, four days before the scheduled speech in Seattle. Riggs was in the Washington audience and approached the candidate following his presentation. "Mr. Roosevelt . . . spied Governor Riggs and called to the Alaskan: 'I didn't intend to do it, but I forgot

\(^{303}\)Ibid.

\(^{304}\)Telegram, Riggs to FDR, August 16, 1920.
all about Alaska. I wanted to call attention to plans for the development of the territory and to show what had been done, but I forgot." If this declaration was uttered in earnest, the candidate intended to depart from his prepared text, because it contained nothing about Alaska. Apparently the manuscript type of presentation was used because newspapers printed practically the entire speech in its extant form.

FDR's overall effectiveness was analyzed by Vanderbilt in the interview on the day following the Seattle appearance as follows: "Roosevelt is making votes in the West. He has a personality and a frankness that the people out here like."  

Final Evaluation

Franklin D. Roosevelt delivered an important far western speech at the half-filled Arena in Seattle, Washington, on August 20, 1920, before a mixed audience of 2800. He promised improvement in local port facilities, barely mentioned the League of Nations, and concentrated on soliciting progressive support from his GOP and independent auditors.

The premises emphasized both national and international reform along progressive lines. He employed far more effective logical support in dealing with international issues, and relied

---

305 Seattle Daily Times, August 21, 1920.
excessively on ethical and emotional appeals in treating national topics. Statistical references composed the strongest element of logical material.

The speech structure was poor. With no preview, summarization, or "signposts," the major points became obscure. Apparently doubling the size of the manuscript, the inserts did not fit smoothly into the original text and a lack of clear transitions added to organizational difficulties.

His speaking lacked some of the stylistic devices which were noted in earlier addresses, although the use of language was satisfactorily handled.

With few comments available, his delivery seemingly met the requirements imposed by the audience, the speech, and the occasion.

Local opposition newspapers were outspoken in their criticism. The Seattle Post-Intelligencer noted discontent because Roosevelt at no time mentioned the name of President Wilson in his Arena speech, or in fact, in any of his personal addresses in this state . . . The Wilson following in Seattle is inclined to be sensitive, and the omission of his name in the speech of the vice presidential candidate, who has long been a member of the president's official family, caused considerable grief.

Then, again, the fact that he practically ignored the Democratic platform in his speech was commented upon yesterday in the groups that gathered at the close of the meeting of the King
County Democratic Club. His League of Nations discussion did not fully satisfy the Wilson followers. The Seattle Daily Times attempted to refute "Roosevelt's eloquent plea for the League covenant" although he made few remarks on the subject. According to Early's persistent telegrams, Wilson was not popular in the West. Therefore, these press criticisms did not seem to be valid under the circumstances.

The poorer quality of the Seattle address, in comparison with the Hyde Park and the Chicago utterances, can be explained partially by the lack of time for sufficient preparation and the physical fatigue caused by continuous campaigning.

Conclusion

From Seattle, Roosevelt continued his first campaign tour through Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and concluded his initial western excursion by meeting Governor Cox at the Ohio State Fair in Columbus, Ohio, August 31. The Republican press, probably concerned over his enthusiastic reception, offered a cryptic analysis of the New Yorker's introduction to national electioneering:

He talked non-partisan league in the Dakotas and on to the Pacific where he thought it would be popular.

---

308 Editorial, August 21, 1920.
He told California that Cox is the Hiram Johnson of the East. He told the trans-Mississippi Germans that the Cox-Roosevelt administration would consider it 'America's high duty to aid the Germans,' etc., etc., etc.

'At San Francisco it was a fight in the open,' he told an audience at Grand Island, Nebraska, Saturday. Yes, yes, a fight in the open with Charley Murphy and Tom Taggart and their snow-white plumes leading the much-vaunted 'progressive elements' which Cousin Franklin has had so much to say about all over the West.310

After returning to the East, Roosevelt reflected on the opening tour as follows: "The Western trip has been a real success - for big audiences, keen interest, especially on the part of the women."311 In his autobiography, Cox recalled: "On a speaking tour through the Far West, Mr. Roosevelt made an excellent impression. When I went to the coast afterwards, I had the most enthusiastic reports about his personality and the intelligence and forthrightness of his public addresses."312 One partisan, inspired, Sandpoint, Idaho, poet emotionally penned the following strains:

Not one among us but has felt,
In use of that name Roosevelt,
There's magic sometimes in a name
That's been inscribed on scroll of fame . . .


311 Letter, FDR to Battle, September 5, 1920.

For after all no higher praise
Can groups of men or nations raise
For any man than that he stood
For peace and universal good . . .

In meeting thee we all have felt
We can depend on Roosevelt.313

Roosevelt breathed periodic bursts of emotional fervor into
an otherwise dull, dormant campaign as his private railway car
sped through the West. In view of the contemporary anti-Democratic
sentiment among the electorate, he developed satisfactory speech
subjects and premises. Unquestionably, the trip added luster to
his ethos, although his logical appeals often lacked effective
support. He faced monumental tasks in attempting to check the
swing of national feelings toward the GOP. However, his performance
caused sufficient concern in the opposition camp—that Colonel Teddy
Roosevelt, Jr., was placed immediately on his campaign trail.
FDR's success likely contributed to Senator Harding's decision to
make a few additional speaking jaunts into various portions of the
country.

The nominee's style and delivery enhanced his cause even
though the ambitious schedule possibly led to a degeneration of
his speech structure. Due to the pressures of constant traveling
and speaking, the oratorical standards achieved in the Hyde Park

313 Poem, "To Franklin D. Roosevelt," Goss to FDR, August 19,
1920.
and the Chicago addresses were never matched in the succeeding
western performances.
CHAPTER V

THE SECOND CAMPAIGN TOUR, SEPTEMBER 1 - OCTOBER 3

Introduction

Following the Cox-Roosevelt meeting at Columbus, Ohio, the Vice-Presidential nominee departed immediately for the East. Because of population density, he was able to deliver more speeches during the second tour. Contemporary newspapers reported the presentation of 131 addresses from September 1 through October 3. Many additional rear platform appearances possibly were unreported. Unfortunately, a total of only six complete speeches and twenty-eight excerpts of speeches from this period are extant in the Roosevelt Library.

The candidate began the eastern swing with the State of Maine, prior to its traditionally early congressional elections. He spent Labor Day delivering speeches in New York City and then enjoyed a brief vacation at Campobello Island. He returned to the campaign trail with extensive schedules in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey before turning South to West Virginia and Kentucky.

Although the Democrats experienced a political setback in the Maine elections, Roosevelt attempted to maintain outwardly his confidence in the ultimate Democratic victory in November. He contended:
In view of the fact that it was a State election, and in view of the fact that it was the State of Maine, I regard the election there yesterday as without significance in its bearing on what will happen at the election next November.

It will, of course, be remembered that in 1916 Maine also went heavily Republican in the State election.1

The Republican press immediately assaulted this optimistic view, as reflected in the following editorial:

Speaking at Pittsfield, Mass., Franklin D. Roosevelt electrified his hearers by remarking that he saw some hopeful democratic signs in the Maine election. His eyes are sharper than those of his brother democrats who have as yet been unable to see how a plurality for the republican candidate of nearly 70,000, the greatest in the history of the state, can give any food for hope and comfort.2

The candidate proceeded into New Jersey, called Senator Harding "a weakling" and challenged him to take a definite stand on the League of Nations.3 Nearing the end of the second campaign tour, he delivered key speeches at Wheeling and at Louisville. These two speeches fall under close scrutiny in this chapter.

1FDR press release, September 14, 1920. All letters, memoranda, speeches, itineraries, telegrams, and press releases referred to herein are located in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.

2Hartford Courant, September 17, 1920.

Wheeling

Audience, Occasion, and Setting

The nominee's campaign party was increased by two. His wife, Eleanor Roosevelt, gained her initial experience in national electioneering on this second tour and was impressed favorably with the activity of new women voters. His loyal secretary, Louis Howe, also joined the group late in September and continued with the candidate until the end of the third tour. 4

The three-day West Virginia campaign was opened on September 28, with speeches at Martinsburg, Grafton, and Clarksburg. The second day was devoted to Morgantown, Fairmont, Mannington, Glovergap, Cameron, and Moundsville, before pulling into Wheeling. The Vice-Presidential aspirant was accompanied by a host of party officials, which included Arthur B. Koontz, gubernatorial candidate; Robert F. Kidd, congressional nominee; and Mrs. Izetta Jewell Brown, the former actress and widow of Congressman W. G. Brown. All of these speakers received an enthusiastic response at every stop, especially from the women in the audience. 5

4Eleanor Roosevelt has described her experiences at this time in This Is My Story (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), pp. 310-321.

5Clarksburg [West Virginia] Telegram, September 28; Wheeling Register, September 29-30; Baltimore Sun, September 29; Pittsburgh Dispatch, September 30, 1920.
As Roosevelt approached Wheeling, he was given credit for campaigning in twenty-nine states, traveling more than 17,000 miles, and addressing more than 250,000 persons.\(^6\) West Virginia seemed to be a primary political target:

During the present campaign Wheeling has occupied a most important place on the political map of the nation and few cities have been given like attention by the tops of the two tickets. Governor Cox opened his speaking itinerary here and may return. Messrs. Harding and Roosevelt come this week. Never before has the city been honored by a visit from three of the four leading candidates of the country. In years gone by, Bryan, Roosevelt, Taft, President Wilson and one or two vice presidential candidates spoke here, but we fail to recall the time when so many top-notchers came Wheeling's way.\(^7\)

FDR's train entered the city nearly an hour late and was greeted by shrieking locomotive whistles. The Wheeling meeting, originally scheduled for 5:30 p.m., was changed to 8 p.m. because of his busy itinerary. There were "thousands" of people on hand to extend a spontaneous reception. Predominant among those who greeted the nominee was a large delegation of women and "it was momentarily forgotten Mrs. Roosevelt was accompanying her illustrious husband."

A parade was assembled when Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Koontz lined up at the head of the procession which formed at the depot and progressed toward the Windsor Hotel. These two men were followed by

\(^6\)Wheeling Register, September 29, 1920.

\(^7\)Editorial, Ibid., September 27, 1920.
a large body of Democrats in decorated automobiles. The "vice presidential nominee looked every inch a military man as he.treaded with firm step in perfect rythm [sic] with the inspiring music turned out by the Warwood Band." An informal reception, which constituted a half-hour, hand-shaking, chatting session, was held at the hotel. Then FDR retired to his room, took a bath, and went to the dining room for a hearty meal.8

With Senator Harding appearing in the city on the preceding evening, there was a tendency to compare the Roosevelt reception with the one received by the Republican. Reporting the second parade of the night, from the hotel to the auditorium, a Democratic paper announced:

A smashing parade was pulled in the evening prior to the meeting at the Auditorium in which a large marching delegation participated with a splendid train of automobiles. Red fire was used with discrimination and not scattered with the reckless abandon that characterized the extravaganza of the previous night.9

The local GOP organ declared that Roosevelt's reception was "tame" when compared with the "Harding oration":

Cheering thousands thronged the B & O station when Senator Harding reached the city while last evening scarcely more than 200 met Mr. Roosevelt.

---

8 Ibid., September 30, 1920.
9 Ibid.
Headed by a band, a small corps of Democratic voters escorted the Democratic candidate for the vice presidency to the Windsor hotel. The multitude of people that crowded the sidewalks when Senator Harding drove from the station to his hotel were missing last night. Instead a small number of pedestrians gave an occasional cheer...10

A boisterous crowd of more than 3000 people jammed the Market Auditorium. All seats were occupied, the aisles swarmed with humanity, the rear portions of the building provided limited standing room space, and outside many more prospective listeners awaited an opportunity to catch a fleeting glimpse of the young New Yorker. A tumultuous demonstration shook the auditorium as the group of dignitaries treded their way to the platform.11

Mr. John J. Coniff, the chairman, introduced Arthur Koontz who gave a brief speech concerning the gubernatorial race. Next, he presented Mrs. Izetta Jewell Brown and she made a few remarks which highlighted the League issue. Finally, he recognized Roosevelt as the key speaker of the meeting.12

Following the Wheeling rally, the FDR party spent the night in their railway car. They departed at 6:45 a.m. the next day for New Martinsville, Sistersville, Friendly, St. Marys, and

10 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 30, 1920.
12 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 30, 1920.
Williamstown. At this point, they crossed the Ohio River for a quick stop in Marietta, Ohio, before returning to West Virginia and continuing the campaign through Parkersburg, Ravenswood, Mason City, Point Pleasant, and Charleston.¹³

**Choice of Subject and Speech Goal**

Somewhat different from the speeches analyzed in the previous chapter, Roosevelt chose to build an address around the subject of Harding's desire for a "syndicated Presidency."¹⁴ He attempted to answer the Senator's speech of the preceding night in the same auditorium. In offering direct refutation to the Republican's tariff remarks, he placed less emphasis on the drive for independent and Progressive votes. Unlike the Seattle audience, possibly the listeners at Wheeling were predominantly partisan Democrats. The speech content and emphasis left this impression.

Steve Early listened to the Harding address, took notes, and forwarded a telegram to FDR at Fairmont, West Virginia, which outlined the "chief points." He pointed out the opponent's major objections to the contemporary tariff conditions as follows:


¹⁴Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Wheeling, West Virginia, September 29, 1920, p. 13. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the Wheeling address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR Wheeling Speech. This speech was published also in the Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.
1. The "present era of reconstruction and international competition in trade would permit American markets" to be "flooded" with Europe's "cheap product."

2. A "high protective tariff" was necessary for the "salvation" of "American industries and continued prosperity."

3. Steel, iron, oil, and agricultural "resources" in West Virginia would be injured.

Regarding national affairs, the GOP spokesman accused the Administration of:

1. Needless expenditure of "millions" in wartime.

2. Retaining "thousands of war workers on Federal pay roll without need."

3. Being "unprepared for peace."

4. Vetoing the budget.

Concerning the League of Nations, Harding charged:

1. European countries would dictate American labor standards.

2. Executive "usurpation" of authority by a "President who ignored Congress."

3. Wilson "imposed dictatorial powers on people by speaking as one man for them."

For a solution to these multiple problems, Harding pledged:

1. A "meeting of minds."
2. Fair representation of the people in the nation's "domestic and international affairs."\textsuperscript{15}

Roosevelt undoubtedly used this telegram in developing his major points around the tariff, national affairs, and the League of Nations.

The speaker was guided by several other contemporary conditions. In another telegram, Early informed him that Wheeling was an "industrial center" where "machinists" constituted the "greater labor element." He recommended a treatment of labor, the League, and "war expenditures."\textsuperscript{16} His emphasis on labor difficulties was indicated further by the threat of a strike involving 126,000 members of the West Virginia State Federation of Labor. This action was to be taken in the event that Federal troops were used "as a strike breaking agency."\textsuperscript{17}

Harding presented no new arguments. All of his contentions had appeared in several other speeches. Undoubtedly Early carefully reconstructed the main tenets of the Senator's speech in order to afford FDR an opportunity to refute each idea directly, point by point. Therefore, Roosevelt's choice of subject and speech goal was influenced by the "advance man's" analysis. Early's telegram

\textsuperscript{15}Telegram, Early to FDR, September 28, 1920.
\textsuperscript{16}Telegram, Early to FDR, September 28, 1920.
\textsuperscript{17}Wheeling \textit{Intelligencer}, September 25, 1920.
represented one of the many outstanding examples of teamwork executed during this campaign. It gave the nominee an opportunity to travel freely in other geographical locales while receiving the ex-correspondent's expert resume of his opponent's utterances in an important address.

Premises and Methods of Proof

In attempting to refute the Wheeling speech presented by Harding, Roosevelt interpreted the GOP position on various points and contrasted these with the Democratic program. His West Virginia rebuttal formed the following disjunctive syllogism:

Major premise: Either a weak, "syndicated," reactionary Republican President or a strong, ethical, progressive Democratic President will be elected.

Minor premise: A weak, "syndicated," reactionary Republican President must not be elected.

Conclusion: Therefore, a strong, ethical, progressive Democratic President must be elected.

Once again, these exact terms were not used, but the syllogism was implied strongly in the concluding remarks:

What Senator Harding is trying to do is this, to prove to this country that Woodrow Wilson is an autocrat . . .

Harding wants a syndicated Presidency . . .
Thank God America's President is an autocrat. I am for that kind of a President. The weak Presidents of America have been those who have called on the Senate and Congress for assistance. Governor Cox will go down in history as one of the great Presidents from the time of Washington to that of Wilson.¹⁸

In challenging the validity of Harding's contentions in the speech of the preceding night, testimony became a primary facet in FDR's logical appeal. A local GOP newspaper, the Wheeling Intelligencer, was used early in quoting the Republican nominee. Roosevelt began "with the first column story of this paper" in attacking both the speaker and the published report. He paraphrased the Senator's claim "that if the United States did not . . . go back to the high protective tariff that took care of the special interests of this Country . . . that this nation would go on the rocks in the next four years." He charged that his adversary "was painting some old picture of closed shops, abandoned mines, bank failures, closed factories[,] bread lines, in case of a Democratic victory." He reminded the audience that this same faulty causal reasoning was used by the Republicans in 1912 and again in 1916. If there was any doubt, he asked the listeners to "get out the files of the papers . . . of 1912 and 1916 and see the same old shop-worn argument about the tariff . . ." Furthermore, he said that Harding was trying to offer "a high protective tariff" as the

only thing "to keep us" from the competition "of cheap foreign labor."

Continuing to use the Intelligencer, he noted that the man from Marion "was quoted as saying somewhere in this paper that the proposed international congress of labor would hurt the American workingman." Near the end of the speech, he emphasized the use of testimony, as follows:

\[ \ldots \ldots \text{I am going to quote from last night, word for word. Senator Harding said, according to Press reports: 'Congress never meant that we should go to war to make the world safe for democracy - nor even [sic] for Humanity's sake, but to protect the honor of America and American rights and citizens on land and sea'.}^{19} \]

Harding was not the only source of testimony. The nominee referred to the speeches of William Howard Taft in 1912, Charles Evans Hughes in 1916, and Woodrow Wilson in 1917.\(^{20}\) He used less specific designations in citing: "A man came up to me in California and said - 'Isn't Senator Harding coming out here[?]'. . . . Some people say, 'Give us a change'. . . . Now some say we cannot operate and make a profit . . . .'\(^{21}\) Nevertheless, the use of testimony in Wheeling was considerably improved over those addresses which were analyzed in the initial tour. He often followed a direct

\[ ^{19}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12.} \]

\[ ^{20}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 4, 5, 12.} \]

\[ ^{21}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 4, 6, 9.} \]
quotation with counter-arguments, or employed the testimony as logical material to enforce his contention.

Roosevelt's examples were derived mainly from historical facts. He began tracing the tariff controversy back to the legislation of 1913, when "the progressive element" of "both parties . . . got together" and turned the problem over to "the Tariff Commission." He digressed "as far back as 1912" when the Republicans were issuing false warnings about "the high protective tariff and what a victory for the Democrats would mean." It was "about 1912 . . . that people in this country began to discuss a thing called a League to Enforce Peace." This League had the support of such "big men in the country" as "Ex-President Taft, Ex-President Roosevelt, President Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge and the other leaders of both parties." Next, the nominee referred chronologically to the Monroe Doctrine, the 1830 conflict with Spain "over her colonies in South America," the 1866 dispute with France over Mexico, the "1844 or 1845" disagreement with England in the Venezuelan boundary difficulty, the 1905 brush between Teddy Roosevelt and Germany, and the disturbances from 1914 to 1917 which led up to American entry into the World War. He displayed a knowledge of historical detail which was applied adeptly to his arguments.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\text{Ibid.}, pp. 2, 3-4, 10-12.\]
Contemporary examples were used effectively. The international labor council was described as a body dedicated to the improvement of "the rights and living conditions of the working men and women" in all nations of the world. FDR pointed to the difficulties in passing "the so-called La Follette Seamen's Law" to show "the opposition of the reactionary element of the Republican Party" in progressive labor legislation. This bill provided "that . . . any sailors on American ships should have proper conditions under which to work and live . . . that each should have a bunk of his own . . . that they should have . . . at least one square meal a day . . . ." The historical and contemporary examples were detailed sufficiently, apropos to the argument, and skillfully distributed under each of the three major points.

Testimony and examples were employed more extensively than statistics as products of logical appeal. Nevertheless, the speaker did maintain: "97 or 98 men and women out of every hundred in all the world belong to the ranks of labor"; "foreign nations" pay their seamen "$10.00 or $12.00 per month and can feed them for $7.00 or $8.00 a month"; and "instead of having one ship as we had in 1912 we have twenty for every one then." He needed to add

---

23 Ibid., p. 8.
24 Ibid., pp. 8, 9.
statistical enforcement to the assertion: "We have better prosp-
erness today . . . than we have ever had before in our life-time
and it comes under Democracy." Yet, the Wheeling speech presented
exceptionally strong supporting material. Roosevelt seemed to
marshall his evidence much better when answering the declarations of
the opposition.

During the first campaign tour, FDR's ethical appeal held
a prominent place in all of his speeches. Ethos at Wheeling assumed
better balance in relation to other proofs. References to high
character were emphasized in the treatment of the labor and League
topics as follows:

We want to bring them [foreign factory conditions]
up, if we can, to some where near our standard . . .
Do not forget that millions of our fellow workmen
are far worse off than we are, and we believe by
joining around the table with the representatives of
labor from other parts of the world we will be able
to help humanity . . . . I call it not merely
sound economics but I call it also an extension of
that great principle of that great unselfish moral
purpose . . . .

Conversely, he levied an attack on the character of his
opponent in these terms:

Senator Harding did not think that then, and he
would not have said it then. I have too much
respect for his Americanism, and I have a mighty
poor respect for his memory.

25 Ibid., p. 7.
26 Ibid., pp. 8, 9.
He wants to draw around him that little clique of Senators that have always run him and make the Presidency a messenger boy's position.27

Experience and knowledge in dealing with contemporary issues, or sagacity, was recalled in brief comments which were inserted at crucial points:

I have not prepared anything - I never need to prepare anything . . . .

I was over there when a delegation representing American labor turned up in Paris . . . . I have seen the conditions in the merchant marine of our own country in the old days, and conditions which exist in the merchant marine of other countries . . . . But there is a difference - anybody can see it who can understand economics . . . .

We were not thinking in terms only of the lines of the armies . . . we were not only thinking in the terms of the ships that were going down . . . .28

Roosevelt distributed statements of good will throughout the speech. He opened by stating: "I am glad to get to Wheeling. I am glad to be here tonight . . . ." Later, he praised both his colleague and his opponent in recognizing: "Senator Harding and Governor Cox are both good Americans." He called the auditors "My friends" on three occasions and more specifically identified them as "you people out in this great manufacturing part of the country." He was sarcastic in masquerading good will for GOP leadership by identifying "my friend, Senator Harding" and "another

27 Ibid., p. 13.
28 Ibid., pp. 1, 7, 8-9, 12.
gentlemen [sic] from Ohio, a very dear Soul, my old friend, Mr. Taft," while simultaneously condemning the actions of these men.\(^{29}\)

As a whole, FDR used ethos with discretion and good taste. Newspaper editorials aided in establishing this facet of proof before the candidate's arrival:

The former assistant secretary of the navy is a man of action, possessed of magnetic personality and fluent oratory. It was foresightedness, executive ability and capacity to meet emergencies . . . that won for him undying fame in the manner in which the American transport system was handled during the war. It was Roosevelt, remember, who saved the first American troopships from destruction off Brest . . . .

One of the best orators that ever took the stump. Wheeling will miss much if Franklin D. Roosevelt is not heard tonight.

Democrats will miss much if they fail to hear the man who handled the coming and going of America's transports during the Great War and never lost a man.\(^{30}\)

His ethos continued to be held in high regard after the Wheeling experience, as reflected by the observation: "If the Democratic ticket is elected this year the people can rest assured they will have a vice president sound in mind and body." The presence of his wife on this tour seemed to elevate this favorable impression even more. In a press interview, Mrs. Roosevelt made an obvious effort to attract female support for the League of Nations. The article

\(^{29}\)Ibid., pp. 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 3, 4.

\(^{30}\)Wheeling Register, September 29; 27, 1920.
praised her intelligence and poise before concluding: "She is a
typical home woman, all interest in her husband and five children,
and in the vital questions of the day."31

FDR's pathos fell into several different categories. He used
the emotional appeal humorously by declaring that Hughes "got those
audiences out there weeping and his own tears went down his face and
wet his beard," and that Harding "would have been tarred and
feathered and ridden down the streets of Washington." He issued a
warning to the West Virginians:

Give up, if you like, the present tariff - go back
if you like to the high protective tariff . . . and
if I come back here four years hence and you have had
a high protective tariff . . . throughout that time,
I want to see the kind of audience I will address.

He enlisted a sense of pity by explaining:

. . . think of the conditions that made it necessary
to have to legislate on a subject of that kind. And
it provided that they should have a square meal, at
least one square meal a day, that they should [be]
treated for the first time as human beings and not as
animals . . . . nations that can put their sailors in
what we call pig-stys and feed them on stuff we
would not give to our pet cat . . . . bring pressure
on the nations that allow rotten conditions like that
to exist, so that they treat their sailors as men and
not as beasts.

He appealed to exalted ideals and unswerving patriotism when he
referred to the League of Nations and the World War in the following
terms:

31 Ibid., September 30, 1920.
It is a subject which is American and not political . . . the deepest principle of our national faith and our religious faith, and I am ashamed tonight to have to be here on this platform talking about a thing that is sacred . . . the task of eliminating future war through the League of Nations . . . .

. . . we were going into this war to win a military victory and then to obtain . . . an association of the nations of the world to make a crime of that kind against humanity . . . impossible in the generations to come . . . .

His pathos reached a climax in urging a unified effort on the part of all Americans:

[Republicans and Democrats were] united in the belief that a league to enforce peace, a league or association of nations to be formed so effectively as to prevent war . . . . Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, Independents, Prohibitionists . . . know we did go into the war for the sake of humanity.32

Roosevelt placed equally effective reliance on logical, ethical, and emotional modes of persuasion. His premises received the most exacting methods of supporting material yet demonstrated in the campaign. In directly refuting the contentions of Senator Harding, he seemed to rise to new heights of argumentative discourse.

Speech Structure

The Vice-Presidential nominee implied his central idea throughout the address. In focusing attention on the Senator's speech of the preceding night, his theme could be paraphrased:

32 FDR Wheeling Speech, pp. 5, 12, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13.
Senator Harding has erroneously interpreted every issue in the current campaign. The brief, which follows, shows that his thought was clearly developed throughout the address:

I. Harding stands for a high protective tariff, for
   A. It would benefit the "special interests."
   B. It is necessary to create false impressions of economic stability.
   C. It will take the tariff away from "non-political" control.
   D. It supposedly will prevent competition from "cheap foreign labor," for
      1. It will insure high prices.
      2. It will maintain monopolies.
      3. It will increase the cost of living to the detriment of "labor."

II. Harding opposes an "international congress of labor," for
    A. He claims it would "damage" the "scale of pay in this country."
    B. He claims it would benefit other countries "at our expense."
    C. He claims European countries would dictate American labor standards.
D. He detects an "unselfish moral purpose," for

1. It advocates safe, clean working conditions.
2. It proposes a fair rate of pay for labor.

III. Harding opposes the League of Nations, for

A. The progressive element of "both parties" support it.
B. He does not believe in making the world "safe for democracy."
C. He selfishly believes only in protecting "the honor of America and American rights."
D. He does not realize that we went "into the war for the sake of humanity."

The logical order of arrangement was used, with the introduction devoted to a greeting, an attack on a local paper, and a reference to the speech subject. He did not preview his points, although he did add: "I want to refer, first of all, to two subjects." These "two subjects" were not identified, but he probably was referring to national and international topical areas. As shown in the preceding brief, he developed three major points and the allusion to "two subjects" could have been confusing. He led into the initial point by stating, "I want to talk first about . . . ." In indicating the fact that this first area was still

---

33 Ibid., p. 2.
under consideration, he added later: "My friends, one more point on this tariff . . . ." He began the second point by observing: "And then last night I understand Senator Harding took up . . . home affairs. He spoke about some clause . . . relating to an international council or congress of labor."

His final division was introduced: "And now I want to come down to my last topic . . . ." The short conclusion defended Woodrow Wilson as "an autocrat," lambasted Harding's concept of a "syndicated Presidency," associated the GOP candidate with "weak" ideals, and praised Governor Cox as a potentially "great" President. Even without a preview or a summation, the central thought and major ideas were clear.

This speech was dependent upon Early's advance telegram and the reports in contemporary newspapers. Roosevelt's busy schedule afforded little opportunity for preparation. Yet, he seemed to be quite effective in quickly assembling a rebuttal speech which reflected a sound structural pattern.

Use of Language

Roosevelt continued to use those stylistic devices which were detected during the initial tour. His mean sentence-length totaled 26.6 words. Unlike the previous speeches, he tended to

---

34 Ibid., pp. 2, 6.
35 Ibid., pp. 7, 10.
utter statements in both the introduction and the conclusion which were shorter than the overall mean. Average sentence-lengths for the introduction equaled nineteen words and for the conclusion only seventeen words. The figure for each major point in the body exceeded these means by fully ten words per sentence. One statement totaled eighty-six words, but the language was usually simple and direct.

There was an abundance of common idioms. Roosevelt tried to clarify the GOP position, interpret Harding’s speech, and explain the Democratic political outlook. In order to accomplish these things, he relied on expressions which were familiar to his listeners, such as "this nation would go on the rocks," "a lot of water has passed over the dam," "got on the nerves of the West," "not playing the game on the level," "in the old days," "a slack period," "rotten conditions," "all big men in the country," and "without firing a shot."36

FDR persistently utilized his familiar clarification devices. A small sampling of the synonyms which were pressed into service included: "the price of the necessities of life, prices of the things you and I need," "Give up, if you like . . . go back if you like," "some clause - a long section in the Treaty of Peace," "foreign nations are able to under-sell us and under-bid

36 Ibid., pp. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10.
us... We have been put out of business because of foreign competition," "Every nation, every man in Europe was engaged, engrossed in this great military struggle," and "the pacifists back home, the people who could not see beyond our own borders." 

Brief remarks, which employed repetitious words or phrases, were found in equal abundance: "the wealth of this country, and wealth of the average citizen in this Country," "they had faith in something more... they had faith in the future," "must be changed to meet changing conditions, must be changed in a scientific way," "would work damage to our conditions of labor, would work damage to our scale of pay... would bring some kind of benefit," "Think of that boon - think of the conditions," "I call it not merely sound economics but I call it also an extension of that great principle," "in that great task... the task of eliminating future war," and "to seize the port of Laguira, to seize its custom-house." 

The speaking of two Republican Presidential nominees in two different campaigns was described with repetitious terminology: "He was painting some old picture of closed shops, abandoned mines, bank failures, closed factories[,] bread lines.... He painted a picture of gloom... of closed factories, abandoned

37 Ibid., pp. 6, 7, 9, 11.
38 Ibid., pp. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
mines and farms gone to waste, bread-lines [sic], bank failurues [sic]."  

Likewise, Roosevelt developed his usual array of parallel sentences, as reflected in the following examples:

It wants to give labor in those places where it never has had a chance, a right to come forward. It wants to take up in the nations of the world where the rights and living conditions . . . .

... how we have maintained The Monroe Doctrine for 99 years; how in 1830 Spain tried to re-gain control over her colonies ... and how we told Spain to keep her hands off ... How in 1866 France sent an Army to Mexico; how we told France to take her troops off Mexican soil . . . .

... we had been doing a lot of thinking. We in this country had been thinking . . . we were not thinking only in terms of military victories. We were not thinking in terms only of the lines of the armies . . . we were not only thinking in the terms of the ships . . . .

If one characteristic of style excelled in the Wheeling speech, it was in the area of metaphorical expression. The Vice-Presidential nominee seemed aware of the difficulties in motivating an interest in the tariff issue. On the preceding night, Harding made damaging remarks on this subject which had to be answered. Roosevelt wanted to avoid a complicated statistical explanation, and yet he wanted to recall historical data as counter-arguments to his opponent's contentions. Therefore, he chose to introduce his first

---

39 Ibid., pp. 4, 5.
40 Ibid., pp. 8, 10, 12.
major point by using a lengthy metaphor that embodied varied qualities of effective language:

I want to talk first about a dead friend of ours, a friend of ours that was buried seven years ago. You buried him here just as they buried him back in New York - just as the whole Country buried him in 1913, because that old friend, a political nuisance, kept cropping up every two years - every time there was a Congressional Election - every four years when there was a Presidential Election - and we got heartily sick of our old friend because no one understood him. He was one of those people you could not make head nor tail of. This old man was the tariff. Along about 1913 both parties - I will not say both parties, I will say the Democratic party plus the progressive element of the Republican party - got together. They got together down there in Congress in a sincere effort to carry out the American wishes of their American constituents. They had a magnificent funeral - a political funeral, for our old friend and they buried him just where he belonged, out of politics for all times. They turned him over - what was left of him, to the care of an undertaker called the Tariff Commission, a non-political, non-partisan board made up of experts, made up of trained men who could understand things called schedules. We were all agreed on what the old boy died of...

Last night we find right in this hall that my friend, Senator Harding has gone and opened up that grave and he has taken out that poor old corpse. He has dressed it up in a suit of new store clothes and he is asking people to believe it has the breath of life in it once more.41

He taunted his enemies by alluding to "the select few who happened to have the ear down in Washington" and by declaring, "Senator Harding would cut this nation off from the rest of the

---

41 Ibid., pp. 2-3.
world, build a Chinese wall around us." He appealed to the spirit of unity and patriotism with these terms: "joining around the table," "we are going to keep that flag on the high seas," and "the duty of the American people to join hands." He appeared always to personify warfare, such as "we told Spain to keep her hands off," "England reaching down into Venezuela," "we would be caught napping and the other fellow would jump on us," "throw her concentrated armies," "went to war against her," "the lines of armies as they swayed back and forth," and "this country rose as one man . . . as one man and one woman."  

For a lengthy address, there were few attempts to utter striking phrases. Some effort was made by including references to "the 'Aint [sic] it awful Mabel Campaign'," and "Some people say, 'Give us a change'." Only the first remark was reported as making any lasting impression on the audience.

FDR lustily attacked the Republicans with biting invective. Unlike most of the earlier speeches, he did not strive to appease the rank and file GOP voter. The Market Auditorium provided seats

---

42 Ibid., pp. 7, 13.
43 Ibid., pp. 8, 9, 10.
44 Ibid., pp. 10, 11, 12.
46 Wheeling Intelligencer; Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.
both to the front and on each side of the rostrum which accounted for this opening sarcasm:

I have never seen a hall shaped like this before. Frankly, I am accustomed to speaking out of the front of my mouth; though I can conceive very readily that this hall was built on purpose for some candidates in this campaign. I will begin with . . . the speech made in this 'Both Sides of Your Mouth' Hall last night.47

A local GOP newspaper "has got so much humor in it that I am going to give up my subscription to 'Puck' and I am going to take this paper instead. I could talk all night about the humor in this paper."48 With the temper and tone thus established, the opposition leadership became "the special interests," "The Old Guard Republican ticket," "ineffective, narrow, and unAmerican," "a handful of big men," "the reactionary element," "stand patters," and "that little clique."49 Harding was charged with attempting to make "the Presidency a messenger boy's position."50 The Republican platform created "the same old impression," "the same old bogey," "a picture of gloom," "old shop-worn argument," "the same old ghosts of the past." It was "dishonest, that is the only word to call it" because it granted a "special privilege to

48 Ibid., p. 1.
49 Ibid., pp. 3, 5, 6, 8, 13.
50 Ibid., p. 13.
special friends . . . to obtain a monopoly." This speech was the most bombastic of those presented up to this time. FDR seemed to muster extensive ridicule in directly refuting the Harding address.

In 151 sentences, first person pronouns were employed 155 times. Third person pronouns appeared on 138 occasions. The speaker spent relatively equal time in defending and attacking which accounts for this rather close numerical division. There were only twenty-two second person pronouns, but this number was considerably higher than those detected in preceding addresses.

The nominee inserted both direct and rhetorical questions. Four direct interrogatives were encompassed in quoting "A man" in California. The remaining four questions were rhetorical in nature, with the obvious answers being supplied immediately before or after each one.

Ex-President Roosevelt's style was not imitated anywhere in the Wheeling address. The nominee seemed to take his cue from Early on this subject and the "advance man" failed to refer to this topic in the West Virginia telegrams. Yet, FDR did praise his kinsman four times. Two days before his arrival, the Wheeling

---

51 Ibid., pp. 3, 4, 5, 6.
52 Ibid., pp. 4, 5, 9, 13.
53 Ibid., pp. 10, 11, 13.
Register carried a lengthy article devoted to explaining the "striking parallel" in the lives "of T. R. and F. D. Roosevelt." Perhaps he felt that this publicity, together with the presence of Mrs. Roosevelt, offered sufficient identity with the famous Progressive.

The candidate's style was not markedly different from the initial tour. He used simple sentences, synonyms, repetition, and parallel sentence structure. His lengthy metaphor relating to the tariff was a stylistic gem. His language did reflect a change of emphasis when he used bombast and ridicule. There was a more vigorous and direct attack on the opposition without trying to separate Republican leaders from Republican voters as clearly as in former speeches. The language was clear, vivid, and impressive. It exhibited intense enthusiasm, fervor, and partisan prejudice.

Delivery

Contemporary reports were in agreement on the effectiveness of Roosevelt's delivery. He possessed "a magnetic personality, but is downright eloquent in his forcefulness when speaking." One account reported his popularity among the new women voters as follows:

---

54 September 27, 1920.
55 Editorial, Wheeling Register, September 27, 1920.
It has been said that the women will vote for the best looking man regardless of politics. If this is true, why go any farther, let Mr. Roosevelt go home and rest in peace. No need for any more campaigning, his fight is won, and he has carried Gov. Cox into the White House with him. This is the first trip Mrs. Roosevelt has made with him, and she may be glad she made this one. He never could have survived the admiring glances, and the 'Ohs' and 'Ahs' which greeted him when he first made his appearance ... 56

However, his "spontaneous hit" was not limited only to the female greeters.

Brown as a berry from a cyclonic tour of the country, his six feet one made the most imposing figure of the thousands who swarmed at the B. & O. depot to greet him. His face is clean shaven and fairly sparkled with virility, enthusiasm and energy ... with a smile and hand-clasp that was ... absolutely devoid of the perfunctory salute of the professional office seeker ... .

Whether he felt in unusually good spirits, or whether it was his natural condition, Mr. Roosevelt was most affable and chatted and joked with his many impromptu acquaintances ... 57

FDR was introduced "as an extemporaneous speaker who did not read from a manuscript." 58 He proceeded to leave the impression that his speech was based on the writings of the local opposition newspaper. In the introduction, he stated: "I have got in my hand a paper I only got two hours ago when I struck town — a copy of one of the Wheeling papers of this morning ... . I will begin with

56 Ibid., September 30, 1920.
57 Ibid.
58 Wheeling Intelligencer, September 30, 1920.
the first column story of this paper." Later, in trying to find a remark made by Harding, he added: "I wish I could find it, but there are so many things in here. However, he was quoted as saying somewhere in this paper . . . ." Analyzing both content and delivery, the Cincinnati Enquirer related that "Mr. Roosevelt's speeches were vigorous expressions of his thorough young Americanism, and the people of West Virginia took to them as they used to take to those of Theodore Roosevelt."^59

Somewhat contradictory reports were issued concerning the speaker's voice. Before beginning the southern swing on the second tour, the New York World observed: "After campaigning forty-five consecutive days, during which time he spoke in 300 different cities, Mr. Roosevelt now complains of hoarseness. He expressed confidence last night that a day of rest would help to relieve the trouble."^61 Two days later, the Wheeling Register contended:

As strenuous as his travel has been, Mr. Roosevelt shows no sign of fatigue nor of the physical wear and tear his travels have entailed. His voice has never failed him and is as clear today as it was at the first. His manner of speech is pleasing. He talks in a conversational tone, without jesture [sic] or

^59 FDR Wheeling Speech, pp. 1, 7. These statements tend to indicate that this speech, as filed in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, was recorded after its delivery.

^60 October 3, 1920.

^61 September 27, 1920.
oratorical delivery that characterize the majority of political speakers. All this has been possible, despite the fact that he has spoken about half the time in the open air, and in the noise of traffic in the streets and railway yards.62

FDR used the "most pleasing mannerisms and . . . voice" in the Wheeling speech.63 He was vocally effective in "bitterly" challenging Harding's political position.64 As an added asset, "He packs an eighteen carat laugh that is refreshing to hear."65 Even the opposition Wheeling Intelligencer, which FDR hotly condemned for its political "humor," recognized the fact that "Mr. Roosevelt was repeatedly applauded during the course of his address."66 Even though this newspaper was harsh in contesting the nominee's speech content, it did not dispute the general effectiveness of his delivery.

Final Evaluation

Franklin D. Roosevelt received a tumultuous reception in West Virginia. He delivered a fiery speech to more than 3000 people who literally jammed the Market Auditorium in Wheeling. Closely following the recommendations of his "advance man" and the accounts

62 September 29, 1920.
65 Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.
66 September 30, 1920.
in contemporary newspapers, he attempted to refute Harding's speech in the same city on the preceding evening. His premises drew a comparison between Democratic and Republican political philosophy.

The major points investigated the tariff, the international congress of labor, and the League of Nations. An impressive array of logical, ethical, and emotional proofs were offered to support these points. Ethos and pathos maintained their former high level of effectiveness. Factual evidence, which included examples, testimony, and statistics were improved substantially over the logical appeals presented during the first campaign tour. A Democratic editorial found the speech to be replete with the good common sense that American people understand . . . no ambiguous platitudes that may be interpreted from both ends and the middle — just plain Democratic Americanism.

Where Mr. Roosevelt made his knock-out was in telling the truth about the League of Nations and what it contains, and the people enthused spontaneously and vociferously because they recognized the truth, which must ever prevail, as delivered.67

Although minor organizational problems were detected, the speech structure was satisfactory and did not reveal any serious shortcomings.

The Rooseveltian language characteristics were similar to those noted in the initial tour. However, the nominee demonstrated

67 Wheeling Register, September 30, 1920.
a masterful command of metaphors and his invective was a stinging condemnation of the GOP program and its leadership. He failed to appease the rank and file Republican voters, as he had done in previous speeches, and he refrained from imitating President Roosevelt's style.

FDR's delivery was vigorous and well adapted to the rebuttal content. His attractive appearance and pleasing personality appealed to the electorate, especially the new women voters.

The Cincinnati Enquirer reporter, Walter D. Sullivan, summed up the candidate's accomplishments as follows:

West Virginia this week has witnessed some of the heaviest political firing it will witness in the present campaign. Senator Warren G. Harding spent a part of two days in the state, having spoken at Wheeling and from the rear platform of his train at a number of stations.

The Democrats sent Franklin D. Roosevelt, the nominee for the Vice Presidency, for three days. He addressed big meetings in Fairmont, Clarksburg, Wheeling, Morgantown, Parkersburg and Charleston, and made train-platform speeches at a number of smaller places.

Not only have the Harding excursions from his front porch been a blessing 'not even disguised' to the Democratic cause in this state, in the opinion of the Democratic leaders, but the tour through the state by Franklin D. Roosevelt, the running mate of Governor Cox, 'aroused the Democratic forces and favorably impressed the voters wherever he appeared,' they declare.68

68 October 3, 1920.
Charles McCarthy faithfully reported from campaign headquarters: "The papers have been giving you a fine showing here in New York, and there has been a great deal of highly favorable criticism ... particularly your West Virginia trip ... everybody is of the opinion that we will have West Virginia ..." 69

Frank Freidel possibly was accurate in contending that the "acceptance speech set a standard which was difficult if not impossible to maintain," 70 if he had limited this evaluation to the first tour. The overall oratorical quality of the Wheeling speech far exceeded any of Roosevelt's preceding utterances in the 1920 campaign. Harding's departure from his 'front porch' inspired the Democrat to rise to the occasion and to formulate a brilliant rebuttal speech. Overlooked in the wake of a losing election and later national prominence, the Wheeling address deserved a better fate as an outstanding product of the famous New Yorker's public speaking ability.

69 Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 1, 1920.

Louisville

Audience, Occasion, and Setting

Leaving West Virginia "with the firm conviction that the State will be found in the Democratic column," Roosevelt proceeded into Kentucky on Friday, October 1, for a two-day campaign. His first speech was delivered from an outdoor platform in downtown Mt. Sterling, followed by a noon, rear platform address at Winchester, before presenting an afternoon talk to a large audience in a cold auditorium at Lexington. He made a brief appearance at Union Station, Frankfort, and went into Louisville for the major Kentucky address that night.1

In the meantime, Mrs. Roosevelt planned to return to Boston in order to comfort their sick son, James. However, the campaign party was informed at Lexington that the candidate's mother was visiting the patient and there was no reason for alarm.2 Consequently, Mrs. Roosevelt chose to remain with her husband.

Churchill Humphrey, a former naval officer and a close personal friend, met the candidate at Mt. Sterling and ushered him into Louisville. Extensive preparations were made during the day.

---

1Louisville Times, October 1, 1920.
3Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 1, 1920.
at the Gypsy Smith Tabernacle to make ready for the evening meeting. More than 5000 seats were provided, with ample additional space reserved for standing room only. With the second campaign tour rapidly drawing to a close, one newspaper maintained that the Louisville appearance marked Roosevelt's "288th speech since the campaign opened, during which time he has traveled 17,500 miles."  

The size and the enthusiasm of the Blue Grass audiences disrupted the itinerary and forced the party to be consistently behind schedule throughout the Kentucky visit. Billed for an 8:30 p.m. arrival in Louisville, the "Westboro" pulled into the station one hour late. The weather was cold and wet, but the native spirit was high and the reception committee grew in number as it waited.

As Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt stepped off the train, the band burst forth with "My Old Kentucky Home." The music was "drowned by cheers of more than 200 persons who crowded inside the gates in order to be near the rousing candidate. The cheers were caught up by those outside until thousands joined in the greeting." FDR shook hands with six officials of the State Democratic organization.

Then, amid cheering, "the nominee gripped the hand of a Boy Scout to pose for a photograph. Asked why he had selected the boy in uniform, Mr. Roosevelt explained that 'the soldier and the widow come first.'" Next, he took time "to shake the black, greasy hand..."

---

74 Louisville Times, October 1, 1920.
of the engineer who had just crawled down from his cabin." After these manifestations of good will, he and Mrs. Roosevelt made their way "through thousands gathered outside the station's gates" and took their places in the awaiting automobile. A band and a delegation of marchers led a parade of "150 automobiles bearing flags, 'Cox' banners and displaying redlights." The streets were lined with men and women who were "cheering, waving handkerchiefs and flags, firing redlights and clapping for Mr. Roosevelt, who rode in the first automobile."75

Mrs. John D. Wakefield, leader of the Women's Bureau of the Louisville Democratic organization and chairman of the night meeting at the Gypsy Smith Tabernacle, opened proceedings at eight o'clock. She was unaware that the train was delayed and, consequently, faced the awesome responsibility of keeping the crowd entertained until the candidate arrived. Mrs. Wakefield introduced James H. Richmond, Democratic nominee for Congress, and the Reverend Dr. E. L. Powell, pastor of the First Christian Church. Both of these gentlemen spoke in support of the League of Nations. Finally, the torchlight procession "arrived at 9:45 o'clock. More than a thousand persons, unable to get inside the hall, cheered the party and strained for a glimpse through the windows of the new structure."76 Roosevelt's

75 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 2, 1920.
76 Ibid.
"entrance into the hall started a long demonstration by the thousands of persons who had waited for him there for more than two hours." 77

Fully 8000 "sat and stood and packed the new tabernacle until the walls bulged under the strain." 78 All 5000 seats were taken and thousands "stood in the aisles, the entrances, inside and outside of the big building, wherever they could, eager to see and hear the man who had achieved distinction as one of the most notable aspirants for the office of Vice President." 79 No tickets of any kind were needed for admission.

All Louisville ministers were placed on the reception committee and seats for them were reserved on the stage. 80 A local Republican paper contended that efforts "to 'deliver the clergy' of Louisville over to the Democratic party . . . met with complete failure," and added:

Notices had been carried in the Democratic press to the effect that all ministers of Louisville and members of the Ministerial Association were invited to 'serve as vice presidents at the rally' and 'occupy seats on the platform.' Invitations were said to have been sent out to ministers affiliated with the association asking them to

77 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 2, 1920.
78 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 2, 1920.
79 Louisville Evening Post, October 2, 1920.
80 Louisville Times, October 1, 1920.
attend the meeting. However, when the meeting was held, less than a dozen of the more than 135 Protestant ministers of the city were to be seen in the audience. Only two, Dr. Charles W. Welch, and Dr. E. L. Powell, the latter being called on for a speech, occupied reserved seats.81

No hint of this problem was carried in any of the three other local newspapers. In fact, the politically independent Louisville Evening Post described the "cheering audience," the "enormous crowds," and felt that for "enthusiasm and size the rally last night was one of the greatest held here in years by either party."82

Mr. Roosevelt received thunderous applause upon being introduced by Mrs. Wakefield. After the address, he "was surrounded by hundreds of admirers, with whom he shook hands."83 Immediately after completing the Louisville meeting, his party boarded the train and left for a visit to western Kentucky. The day was devoted to stops in Guthrie, Hopkinsville, Nortonville, Earlington, Morton, Madisonville, Hanson, Slaughters, Sebree, Henderson, Owensboro, and Bowling Green. Most of these assemblies were addressed either from the rear platform of the "Westboro," or from open-air bandstands in isolated communities.84

81 Louisville Herald, October 3, 1920.
82 October 2, 1920.
83 Ibid.
Choice of Subject and Speech Goal

In Kentucky, Roosevelt moved into an area which was interested intently in the League of Nations issue. Steve Early joined the campaign party in Louisville, therefore no advance telegrams were necessary and he was able to communicate verbally with the candidate. A big Republican rally, headed by Governor E. P. Morrow of Kentucky, was held in Louisville's Phoenix Hill Park the night before FDR's speech at the tabernacle. Morrow attacked the Democratic position on the League. Harding also preceded the New Yorker into the Blue Grass area and concentrated on the same subject. From campaign headquarters, Charles McCarthy sent a special delivery letter to Louisville which warned that there was "a keener interest being taken in the League of Nations question than at any time since drawing up the covenant." The League was Roosevelt's major subject, although he did treat other topics. He pointed to Republican arguments in opposition to the Democratic Administration, to the execution of the war, and to "progress" in general. His central thesis called for support of the Democratic Party. The party's advocacy of the League

85 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 2, 1920.
86 Louisville Herald, October 1, 1920.
87 Ibid., September 30, 1920.
88 Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 5, 1920, quoted this letter.
was only one reason why it deserved popular backing. The specific speech goal was aimed toward a general refutation of the theses brought forward by Governor Morrow, Senator Harding, Congressmen Swope and Ogden.

Reflecting on the Kentucky visits of Harding, Roosevelt, and Cox several weeks later, the Cincinnati Enquirer reported:

The three special trains which have visited the state established conclusively that the League of Nations is the issue in Kentucky. Newspapermen coming into the state on scouting tours report this noteworthy fact: that Kentucky is the one state [sic] they have visited where the League of Nations is a vital issue. That it is true can't be doubted. Mere mention of the issue brought cheers from many audiences. That the Republican campaigners in the state recognized this condition is seen from the fact that they have dropped other issues and are devoting themselves to the League of Nations.

Within the past two weeks the league has gained much ground in the state. Senator Harding's absolute rejection of the document, coupled with bolting by the pro-league Republicans, has had its effect. It has started [sic] tide, especially among the women, who are taking hold of the world peace issue with a sort of quasi-religious sentiment. The spirit of idealistic crusaders is pervading their work, bringing to politics a tone that was certainly not noticeable when men ran the whole works. This drift has made the Democrats very optimistic. 89

Therefore, FDR's concentration on the League subject apparently was well chosen in helping to place the Republicans on the campaign defensive in Kentucky. His idealistic treatment of

89 October 17, 1920.
the topic in recognition of the "quasi-religious sentiment" was indicated by the following newspaper item:

Mr. Roosevelt also, for the first time during his tour, pointed out that the League of Nations is backed by all the great moral forces of the nation. He referred particularly to the churches.90

He made the League of Nations "his chief theme" during the entire "sweep through Kentucky."91

Premises and Methods of Proof

The Louisville premises were almost identical to those established in the Wheeling address. They formed a hypothetical syllogism, as indicated by these statements:

Major premise: If we do not want a reactionary, disreputable Republican Administration, then we must elect a progressive, peaceful, prosperous Democratic Administration.

Minor premise: We do not want a reactionary, disreputable Republican Administration.

Conclusion: Therefore, we must elect a progressive, peaceful, prosperous Democratic Administration.

These premises were emphasized quite clearly in two separate remarks, one at the beginning and the other near the end of the speech:

90Louisville Courier-Journal, October 2, 1920.
91Ibid.
... men and women ... would come forward and tell me that they know that the issue this year was between reaction on the one side and progress, peace, and prosperity on the other, and that they were going to vote to make James M. Cox the next President of the United States.

... we must decide between putting into office a man who has stood for progress, a man whose associations are clean all the way through, a man who is willing to stand on his own two feet and be President of the United States and on the other side you have got—well, an amiable gentleman, who, all his public life has been associated with the men of this country who have been looking backwards ... controlled by the faction interests ... controlled by the railway rings ... men who are thinking of normalcy ... "

The supporting material also was similar to that used at Wheeling. There were some fourteen references to the remarks made by other people. Several of these were too general to add any real logical value to his arguments. He identified the source of some quotations with: "people are going around the country telling you," "They are telling you," "they talk about," "People tell me," "Men representing every church ... have come to me ... to assure me," and "The head of a large church in New York said to me." Only the

---

92Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Louisville, Kentucky, October 1, 1920, pp. 1, 15. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the Louisville address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR Louisville Speech. The pages of this text were not numbered, therefore, the author has taken the liberty to number these pages in order to designate the quotations more clearly. See also, the complete text in the Louisville Evening Post, October 2, 1920.

93Ibid., pp. 2, 3, 4, 11.
final reference was a direct quotation and it was excessively long, consisting of some 126 words. Thus, almost one-half of the total amount of testimony employed probably possessed more emotive than referential value. These statements were less effective due to the lack of clear documentation.

Speakers for the opposition were favorite testimonial sources in the Louisville speech. Two comments by Governor Morrow, "who is quoted the other day as saying that the United States would have to send an Army overseas in case of war between the King of Siam and the Emperor of Timbucktoo [sic]."94 were scrutinized closely. Roosevelt assured the listeners that proper safeguards would be written into the League Covenant to protect American sovereignty. He attributed similar accusations to Congressmen Ogden and Swope of Kentucky. Senator Harding's speeches came in for the greatest share of rebuttal. At five different points, FDR either paraphrased or quoted the Senator directly, then proceeded to refute the Republican's remarks. He made these quotations brief and forceful, as shown by the following excerpt:

He [Senator Harding] said: 'I am at present without any special constructive program in foreign affairs.' I think possibly comment is wholly unnecessary on my part but he did do this, he did have the grace to tell the American people that some day he would have a policy and then he went on and said in all solemnity, he said, 'The first thing I will attempt to do as

94 Ibid., pp. 2, 13.
President will be to find a program of World Association and Co-operation. 195

FDR repeated "the solemn pledge made both by the Great Governor of Ohio and by me" that "not one single American soldier shall leave our shores without the approval of the American people, and the joint consent of the Congress of the United States." 96 The mere mentioning of Woodrow Wilson's name drew "tremendous and sustained applause." 97 Reiterating Wilsonian ideals for an international organization "brought the audience to its feet at this point, and for fully a minute there was deafening applause." 98 Therefore, this technique carried emotional as well as logical impact.

Roosevelt persisted in using historical examples. He reminded the audience: "Today, my friends, is the second anniversary of the beginning of one of the world's greatest battles, I think probably the greatest battle we were engaged in during the war, the Battle of the Argonne." 99 Next, he recalled the great moral purposes of the war, paraphrased Woodrow Wilson's goals, and explained the problems in drafting the American Constitution. He

95 Ibid., p. 7.
96 Ibid., p. 5.
97 Louisville Evening Post, October 2, 1920.
98 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 2, 1920.
99 FDR Louisville Speech, p. 7.
drew an excellent analogy between the problems faced by "our forefathers" and those confronting the contemporary peacemakers:

Our forefathers knew that that constitution was not perfect, and every one of them had an objection to this clause of that clause, or to that sentence, or that word . . . So we have become a nation, and as the days have gone by we have amended our constitution.

So, over in Paris, the nations . . . drew up a document which was not perfect, but a document which they believed in good faith would be made more perfect as the years went on . . . 100

Only two contemporary examples were used. He recited the names of the nations that remained outside of League membership:

"First, is Revolutionary Mexico, secondly, unspeakable Turkey, thirdly, Bolshevik Russia, and fourthly, the United States of America." He questioned, "Do you like the company you are in?" 101

Loud cries of "No!" rang out from the audience. 102 Also, FDR attempted to show female approval for the Democratic position by inserting the example "that the National Board of War Mothers . . . had passed a resolution in favor of our joining the league." 103 His examples were satisfactory, but did not achieve the quality of logical forcefulness obtained in the Wheeling address.

100 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
101 Ibid., p. 5.
102 Louisville Evening Post, October 2, 1920.
103 FDR Louisville Speech, p. 13.
Statistics were used on several occasions. Three times he recognized the fact that thirty-nine nations were currently in League membership. He employed personal experience in explaining war preparations:

My friends, at the end of the war down in the Navy Department I had one billion dollars worth of stock of various kinds on hand that I have been trying to get rid of ever since, because . . . if it took ten billion dollars we would put it up and if it took twenty billion or forty billion dollars we would put it up and if it took two million soldiers across the sea we would send them over and if it took ten years to win the war we would stick at it until we got the victory.

He adequately refuted Harding's advocacy of "a permanent court of arbitration" by showing that The Hague "had been there for fifteen years and in those fifteen years . . . there had been more wars all over the world than in any previous fifty years of history." However, he was too dependent on the listeners accepting his "experience in these past two months" in generalizing: "Polls have been taken in many localities and on the average have shown that over 80 per cent. of the heads of churches in those localities are in favor of having the United States join the League of Nations."

104 Ibid., pp. 4, 5, 13.
105 Ibid., p. 3.
107 Ibid., p. 11.
Obviously, personal experience became a factor in logical support, but it was involved also in an aspect of **ethos**, specifically high character in ethical appeal. He capitalized on this element of proof, as shown in the following remarks:

I am in a position to know something about the attitude of the churches throughout the nation, because I have visited over thirty States, and in every one of those States and in all the cities and towns I have been in I have conversed with clergy—men of every kind—pastors, ministers, priests and rabbis.

I ask you to go into the universities, into the colleges, into the high schools, and into the primary schools of the nation, and to take a poll of their teaching staffs. You will find, as I have found, that the great majority of them in every section of the country favor the entrance of the United States into the league.\[108\]

He focused on the standards of the Democratic leaders by magnifying the lack of ethics by the GOP nominee:

Yes, men who are thinking of normalcy, as of the days when in the Senate of the United States the great trusts of this nation openly controlled and owned individual members of the upper house of our Congress. Go back and see the associates of Warren G. Harding, in Ohio, go back to the time when he spoke of George R. Cox, that boss of Cincinnati, as 'one of our great Americans.' Go back to the days when Warren G. Harding was the political crony of 'Standard Oil' Joe Foraker.

... I can bear witness to the fact that the Senator from Ohio has stood... with that same reactionary element in the Senate... who

\[108\] Ibid., pp. 10-11, 12.
control it [the Republican Party] for their own selfish ends.\textsuperscript{109}

He devoted more attention to degrading the character of the opposition than to enhancing his own.

Sagacity, as a facet of ethos, was utilized infrequently and with candor. FDR clearly established his personal association with the current issues by inserting such remarks as:

\ldots we in Washington \ldots

Yes, I saw our men—I saw the sons of those mothers on the other side. I saw them in the North Sea. I saw them at Chateau Thierry \ldots

And in the Senate of the United States this year, and I have been fairly close down there and seen some things with my own eyes \ldots \textsuperscript{110}

The nominee made no extensive effort to gain good will. The enthusiasm of the waiting audience probably indicated little need for this type of ethical appeal.

"My friends" was used six different times to aid in gaining rapport. Early in the speech, attention was focused on "This wonderful gathering."\textsuperscript{111} Roosevelt seemed justified in spending less time on ethical proofs inasmuch as local newspapers contributed markedly in this area before his arrival. For example, the following editorial appeared on the day he began the Kentucky tour:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{109} Ibid., pp. 15-16.
  \item \textsuperscript{110} Ibid., pp. 8, 13, 16.
  \item \textsuperscript{111} Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 3, 7, 14.
\end{itemize}
The political campaign could bring no worthier visitor to Louisville than FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT. If the high standard he follows in playing his part in it were observed by its participants generally we should indeed have a referendum adequate for the intelligent decision of the momentous issue at stake. He comes not as a partisan to rouse the partisan rabble. It needs no rousing. But he comes as a knightly crusader in a cause which he holds sacred and supreme, infinitely greater than the success of any party in winning a few offices. He is a Democrat, but a thinking, not a branded, Democrat, and he makes his appeal to thinking men and women of all parties.112

The feeling expressed in the preceding editorial that Roosevelt "comes as a knightly crusader" was born out in the candidate's many emotional phrases. A major portion of his pathos was directed toward appeals to morality, to religion, and to exalted ideals, as indicated by these remarks:

It is the undoubted fact that all of the great moral influences in the United States believe that this country should join with the other thirty-nine nations of the world in . . . the existing league . . . I refer particularly to the churches throughout the country . . . Never before in our history have the churches meant more in the life of the nation—they are growing daily and extending their influence for better citizenship and better living.

. . . it was faith which enabled the Thirteen States to ratify the constitution . . . we have chosen the path of faith, the path of new things which, after all, were but the making clearer of the simple truths of religion.

There is no question that the churches of the nation and the schools of the nation are indicative of the highest moral sense of the nation . . . I feel very confident that the moral sense of the

112 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 1, 1920.
voters of the nation will follow its best and highest thought, and that they will put behind them fear and set before them faith when the day of decision comes.

I have enough faith in the womanhood of this country, in the mothers and sisters and daughters of the United States to know that . . . they are going to speak in no uncertain term. Let us keep that vision of faith. 113

Thus, he used repetitiously such terms as "moral influences," "moral sense," "faith," and "fear" in generating a spirit of religious fervor. He appealed for "the unified effort of the men and women of America without regard to party" and expressed "the hope that in some way out of that terrible war in Europe something might come that would prevent a repetition." He extended the military references by saying that "most of those boys in their hearts were thinking of home, too, and thinking . . . that later in their own lives or later on in their children's lives—that the next generation would not have to follow in their footsteps and cross the ocean once more."114 Basically, all of the pathos was offered as arguments for the adoption of the League Covenant.

Roosevelt did not rely equally on logical, ethical, and emotional proofs as he did in Wheeling. The Louisville speech was directed predominantly toward the emotions of the audience. Although his methods of persuasion were adequate, they were not as effective as those observed in the West Virginia address.

113 FDR Louisville Speech, pp. 10, 12, 13, 16-17.
114 Ibid., pp. 3, 8, 14.
Speech Structure

The central idea, which revolved around "progress" versus "reaction," was implied throughout the text. Doubtless, it was clearly discernible to any attentive auditor. On the other hand, the body of the speech did not present a well-constructed rhetorical unit. The logical order of arrangement continued to be the favored method of development, but the following brief reveals the excessive duplication of ideas:

I. Republicans are untruthful in describing the League of Nations, for
   A. Governor Morrow of Kentucky said American boys would have to fight in foreign wars, for
      1. He does not know geography.
      2. He has not read Article X of the League Covenant.
   B. Congressmen Ogden and Swope have been "spreading the same old fiction" about sending troops overseas.

II. Republicans desire only "a change," for
   A. They discredit "every single act" of the present Administration.
   B. They charge wasteful practices in wartime, for
      1. They do not understand materiel procurement.
      2. They do not understand the cost of warfare.
C. They falsely credit a GOP Congress with fiscal responsibility, for
   1. Congress failed to appropriate all necessary funds.
   2. Congress advocated a "false economy" which "lost money to the nation."

III. The Democratic platform advocates joining the League of Nations, for
   A. The League has international support, for
      1. Thirty-nine "of the civilized nations of the World" have joined.
      2. Only four big nations have not joined, for
         a. Mexico has not joined.
         b. Turkey has not joined.
         c. Russia has not joined.
         d. America has not joined.
   B. No American boy will fight without congressional consent, for
      1. Democratic leaders have publicly promised support for this ideal.
      2. Safeguards will be written into the League Charter.
   C. The League stands as a force against conflict, for
      1. It protects small nations against aggression.
2. It provides an instrument for peacefully settling all disputes.

D. The League is supported by "the great moral influences in the United States," for

1. The spiritual forces support the League, for
   a. Church members support it.
   b. Clergymen support it, for
      (1) They "know what history means."
      (2) They have read Article X of the League Covenant.

2. The intellectual forces support the League, for
   a. Students understand the League Covenant.
   b. Teaching staffs support it, for
      (1) They know geography.
      (2) They have read Article X of the League Covenant.
      (3) They are "not bound by narrow partisan ties."

3. The National Board of War Mothers support the League.

E. The primary purpose of the League is to prevent war, for

1. It will arbitrate disputes.
2. It will keep other disputes from ever occurring.

IV. Democratic leaders stand for progress, for

A. They are opposed to "normalcy."

B. They are opposed to "the faction interests," for

1. They are against political control of gas companies.

2. They are against "railway rings."

C. They sympathize with "the fight" made by the Progressive Party in 1912.

After beginning with the League of Nations issue, Roosevelt took up the sentiment which favored "a change" in political leadership. Then, he returned to a more extensive concentration on the League, and led into praises for Democratic progressive ideals. His major points were not numbered. He only employed one "signpost" to assist the listener in following the major ideas: "Let me call attention to one aspect of the discussion of the League of Nations issue which I have not yet brought out."\textsuperscript{115} Newspaper reports indicated that the speech was concerned with the League question.\textsuperscript{116} Undoubtedly, the League was the primary point, but the speaker also

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., p. 10.

\textsuperscript{116} Louisville Courier-Journal; Louisville Times; Louisville Evening Post; Louisville Herald, October 2, 1920.
treated other topics. The introduction did not preview, nor did the conclusion summarize, and the organizational pattern was not clear.

Continuing to travel without any break in the schedule, the nominee was afforded little time to polish a well-structured oration. The Louisville address failed to duplicate the rhetorical craftsmanship of several preceding campaign utterances.

Use of Language

Adding to the structural difficulties noted in the preceding section, the Louisville speech was the longest in total length and reflected the largest mean sentence-length. The 174 sentences averaged 30.8 words per sentence. The means for both the introduction and the conclusion exceeded the mean for the body of the speech. A half dozen sentences used over one hundred words each. Therefore, Roosevelt's language was not consistently simple. Once more, the pressure of time could have deprived him of a chance to edit the address and to simplify the sentence structure.

Homely remarks continued to be a popular method for clarifying and holding attention. FDR uttered such common expressions as "down in Washington," "a little thing that comes home to you people," "this treaty business and the peace business and this League of Nations business," "nip them in the bud," "willing to

---

Mean sentence-lengths were as follows: Introduction-32.8; Body-30.3; Conclusion-39.1.
stand on his own two feet," and "has stood hand in glove." Rather 
than use the word "compromise," he explained that "the nations of 
the world gave a little here and a little there and took a little 
here and there." 118

Roosevelt's many synonyms and repetitious phrasings indicated 
his desire to avoid any misunderstandings. He charged his opponents 
with "the most inefficient, and most do-nothing, and most 
reactionary Congress," "a kind of false appeal to this country, a 
kind of appeal to our material side," "the doctrines of despair, the 
appeals to fear and hate." 119 He offered to place "right into the 
instrument of ratification, putting it right there in writing, in 
black and white" a protection for the Constitution as drawn up by 
"our forefathers—our ancestors." The League would give small 
countries "the right to work out their own destinies, their doctrine 
of self-determination," because "we have chosen the path of faith, 
the path of new things." 120 A small sample of the repetition is 
indicated in the following phrases:

They tell you that we were wasteful in the war. 
Yes, we were wasteful in the war. We were wasteful 
in the war because we went in to win the war . . . . 
it became the policy of the administration, it became 
the policy of the people . . . .

118FDR Louisville Speech, pp. 2, 3, 6, 14, 15, 16, 9. 
119Ibid., pp. 2, 3, 12. 
120Ibid., pp. 5, 9, 8-9, 12.
... that is the way in which we are going to finish the part in the war, finish it not by a mere military victory, but finish it by putting into effect ... the League of Nations.

I have been having a good deal of trouble ... with a gentleman across the river, a gentleman I have been asking a single question for some time, a gentleman who has been a member of the Foreign Relations Committee ... a man who is running for the office of President of the United States on the Republican ticket.121

The speaker devised an excellent group of parallel sentences which were both expressive and rhythmical. Lengthy sentences were avoided in parallelisms, which made the style clear and precise, as shown by these examples:

Most of them, men and women, represent in very true fashion the thinking element in our electorate. Most of them are not bound by narrow partisan ties. They are students of history, and they have full opportunity to observe also the present-day conditions ... Also they know what history means. They have read Article 10 of the existing Covenant of the League of Nations. They have read that thirty-nine nations of the world did not fear that Article 10 will take away any of their independence or the rights of their Congresses. They have read, also, the repeated declarations of Governor Cox and myself ...

We could do that by treaty. We could do that under the old-fashioned method that did not work. That was not the object. The object was something greater. The object of the League is to prevent disputes between nations from every [sic] occurring ...

... I have enough faith in the American people not to believe but to know that they are going to do that one thing. I have enough faith in this country to

121 Ibid., pp. 2-3, 4, 6.
know that they will tell the truth from fiction. I have enough faith in the womanhood of this country...

Metaphors played a significant role in the language of the Louisville address. The short, metaphoric expressions were plentiful, such as "brought the enemy to their knees," "held before the eyes of the American people a great hope," "the small peoples of the world," "carry it over the dark days," "sink their differences," "study and dissect point by point," "winnow out the wheat from the chaff," "leaving in the cold all of those who were our associates," and "let us keep our eyes fixed to the star of our destiny." The only extended metaphor was developed skillfully, as follows:

We believe in preventive medicine, rather than curative medicine, for, after all, this proposition for revamping that Hague court is this, in affairs between nations there comes a time when they begin to . . . tread on each other's toes and all the time they are approaching a precipice—cliff and the cliff is the cliff of broken relations and if they fall over that cliff you know the damage that comes to them when they strike the bottom . . . . [Harding's] proposition for a permanent court of arbitration is to build at the foot of the cliff of international relations a hospital to try and put together again the nations of the world that have fallen over the edge and been mashed and broken at the bottom.

When he asks for a hospital, we want it built, not at the foot of the cliff, but at its top, we want to build all the way around the brink of the cliff a

122 Ibid., pp. 12-13, 14, 16.
123 Ibid., pp. 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 17.
splendid international fence that will keep the nations of the earth from falling over the edge and getting hurt. 124

FDR adapted one of the striking phrases from the Wheeling address for the Louisville audience when he said: "And people are going around this country telling you that we want a change, and I tell you that I want a change, too." Another statement was taken from the Seattle speech and altered only slightly as he declared: "Yes, I have faith that we will not make our god the god of things that have been, that we will not take as our god the things that are, but that men and women will unite the taking for our god the god of things as they ought to be." 125 In both instances, the Louisville language was more cumbersome and less meaningful than the earlier expressions. However, the candidate's method of contrasting "faith" and "fear" caught the imagination of those who reported the Kentucky rally. 126 He proclaimed: "Let us keep that vision of faith. Let us put behind us the visions of fear." 127

The Vice-Presidential nominee persisted in sarcastically condemning Republican leadership. He accused GOP speakers of "spreading the same old fiction," and characterized them as "the

125 Ibid., pp. 2, 17.
126 For example, see Louisville Courier-Journal, October 2, 1920.
127 FDR Louisville Speech, p. 17.
people who are trying to deceive Kentucky" because they constitute "that same reactionary element . . . who still have their fangs on the machinery of the Republican party who control it for their own selfish ends." In answer to Governor Morrow's speeches, he promised: "My friends, the first chance I get I am going to find a school geography and send it to the Governor of this State." He singled out Senator Harding as the recipient of the following denunciations:

For weeks we got no answer until he got off of that front porch and he turned up in Baltimore the other night at a great mass meeting and he read a very carefully prepared statement which had a lot of figures in it. He read it all the way through and after he got through a man in the audience said: 'Senator Harding, may I ask you a question?' and the Senator said yes. And before the police could grab that man he got the question out. He asked Senator Harding what was his position on the foreign questions of the United States and the police grabbed him and dragged him off before the answer could be given.

But he caught Senator Harding unawares and Senator Harding didn't have the answer down in writing. He hadn't prepared it or had it prepared for him and his answer came right from his own lips and right out of his own head . . . . He said: 'I am at present without any special constructive program in foreign affairs.'

I do not suppose there has ever been in our history a man running for the Presidency on any one of the major tickets who after three months'

---

128 Ibid., pp. 4, 5, 16.
129 Ibid., p. 2.
campaign has had the nerve to get up before the American people and tell them that he didn't have a foreign policy.

But times do change in this country and men learn a lot in this country, and they will learn much more before November if he will only get off that porch once or twice before that time.  

This bombast represented the most skillful piece of invective Roosevelt had introduced into the campaign since his nomination. It was based on an incident which caused great embarrassment to the opposition and the young Democrat was determined to capitalize on it. Harding did speak in Baltimore on September 27. His speech was interrupted by an interrogator who was arrested and jailed. He did respond extemporaneously in much the same language that Roosevelt attributed to him. After suffering abuse for the impromptu Butte, Montana, remarks, the Democratic nominee probably realized the damage which could result from these seemingly harmless comments. He wisely reminded the audience of his adversary's autocratic tactics.

Later in the speech, FDR condemned "politicians of both parties, strutting up and down the stage and telling us this thing and that thing and the other thing about the League of Nations." This statement made him appear to uphold the claim of a local

\[^{130}\text{Ibid.}, \text{pp. 6-7.}\]
\[^{131}\text{Baltimore Sun, September 28-29, 1920.}\]
\[^{132}\text{FDR Louisville Speech, p. 10.}\]
editorial that depicted him as "an American who knows that no political party has a monopoly or a preponderance of Americanism." Roosevelt did not indiscriminately utter irresponsible sarcastic retorts. He was calculating and precise. These statements further emphasized his ability as a rebuttal speaker in refuting the arguments of the opposition.

The nominee resumed his former practice of distinguishing between GOP leadership and the rank and file Republican voter. He appealed for the votes of all parties in the following statements:

... I have been in this State all day, and at every point along the railroad, men and women would come forward, not only Democrats, but Republicans and Independents, and every other kind...

When people tell you that the war was won by Republicans or by Democrats, I tell you that it was not, that the war was won not as a party war, but won... without regard to party.

They [GOP leaders] are misrepresentatives of Republicans, and this year the men of the rank and file of the Republicans ought to be progressive. After failing to make any strong overtures for opposition and independent votes in West Virginia, Roosevelt reversed his tactics in Louisville. There seems to be no explanation for this contrast, however, the action did affect the speaker's style.

---

133 Louisville Courier-Journal, October 1, 1920.
134 FDR Louisville Speech, pp. 1, 3, 16.
FDR used third person pronouns 223 times and first person pronominal expressions 203 times in 174 sentences. However, "I" was uttered more frequently than any other pronoun. The second person appeared thirty-seven times, which was more than in any speech analyzed up to this point. Although the third person did predominate, the Kentucky speech did not lose the personal touch.

There were seventeen questions in the manuscript, sixteen rhetorical and one direct. On several occasions, a series of interrogatives, which were structurally developed in parallel order, aimed toward achieving historical recall, as indicated below:

Do you remember the position of the American people two years ago? Do you remember what our thoughts were then? Do you remember how, without regard to party lines, we were all united in the great cause? Do you remember how all through that war we had sought something more than a military victory[?]

Do you want to go back to that—to what we had before? Do we want to build a hospital for the nation?¹³⁵

Most of the rhetorical questions were answered as quickly as the one which asked: "Prevent war? Yes, that is the primary purpose of the League of Nations."¹³⁶ The many questions provided an unusual departure from Roosevelt's rhetorical style. Their frequency could indicate the work of "ghost writers" on the

¹³⁵Ibid., pp. 7-8, 14.
Louisville address, although no extant material supports this assumption.

FDR offered a staunch defense of former President Roosevelt and used the term "splendid" on two occasions, as reflected in the following statements:

Yes, go back to the days of 1912, when a great man made a gallant effort, a splendid fight to redeem the Republican party from reaction, and in that fight and in that year it was Warren G. Harding, of Ohio, who lined up with the reactionary forces and called Theodore Roosevelt, first an Aaron Burr, and then a Benedict Arnold.

... we are going to obtain for this nation once more that splendid leadership in world affairs. . . .

He placed little emphasis on imitating Teddy's style, but seemed to utter the Roosevelt name in an attempt to discredit the opposition, to attract Progressive votes, and to issue bombastic comments.

At Louisville, the candidate used longer sentences than in any previously analyzed address. He continued to develop synonyms, repetition, parallel structure, and metaphors. Two of his striking phrases gained considerable press attention. His bombast, which was directed only at the Republican leadership, was the most skillful yet employed in the campaign. First and third person pronouns were divided almost evenly in number, and an unusual array of questions were detected. Also, there was little imitation of former President Roosevelt's style, although he defended his relative's

---

137 Ibid., pp. 16, 17.
progressive ideals. At times, FDR's language was clear, vivid, and impressive. At other times, it was excessively wordy and confusing. This stylistic dichotomy possibly indicated the presence of one or more confederates in developing the speech with insufficient time afforded for the speaker to edit and to polish the language.

Delivery

Local newspapers were more concerned with content and total effect, than with methods of speech presentation. One publication noted that the "nominee resembles his pictures printed in the newspapers so closely that it was an easy matter for persons in the crowd to pick him out from the other members of his party."\(^{138}\)

At Mt. Sterling, FDR read a clipping quoting "the statement credited to Governor Morrow in a speech at Henderson."\(^{139}\) Apparently, he read a Harding quotation to the Louisville audience from another clipping because he said: "I am going to read it to you out of the paper."\(^{140}\) A small clipping, which could have been the one used, is extant in the speech file at Hyde Park.

Roosevelt's physical manifestations seemed to meet the demands of the moment. When he "stepped to the front of the speakers' stand his face was beaming. While the audience applauded he turned and

\(^{138}\) Lexington [Kentucky] Leader, October 1, 1920.

\(^{139}\) Louisville Times, October 1, 1920.

\(^{140}\) FDR Louisville Speech, p. 6.
shook hands with Mrs. John D. Wakefield, who presided over the rally.\textsuperscript{141} An action shot of the campaigner, which was identified as "a characteristic speaking pose," pictorially revealed a restrained arm gesture accompanying steady eye contact.\textsuperscript{142}

FDR was concerned with vocal volume. After completing his brief introduction, he added: "If you people in the back of the hall cannot hear me, just say so."\textsuperscript{143} He "shouted" his opening comment "as the roar of welcome from the audience subsided." As the speech continued, he was interrupted by applause frequently\textsuperscript{144} and possibly resorted to shouting intermittently throughout the delivery. Another publication mentioned that he presented the speech "forcefully."\textsuperscript{145}

In the absence of adverse critical remarks, the nominee's delivery apparently fulfilled the demands imposed by the Louisville speaking situation.

**Final Evaluation**

Roosevelt moved his tour into Kentucky and received an exceptionally enthusiastic reception in Louisville before a packed

\textsuperscript{141}Louisville \textit{Courier-Journal}, October 2, 1920.
\textsuperscript{142}Louisville \textit{Times}, October 2, 1920.
\textsuperscript{143}FDR Louisville Speech, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{144}Louisville \textit{Times}, October 2, 1920.
\textsuperscript{145}Louisville \textit{Evening Post}, October 2, 1920.
house of some 8000 people at the Gypsy Smith Tabernacle. Although he began speaking almost two hours later than scheduled, crowds cluttered the aisles, doorways, windows, and streets. The major subject was the League of Nations, with references to Republican counter-arguments, to the execution of the war, and to progressive policies.

The premises were almost identical to those offered at Wheeling. His supporting material was satisfactory, with a heavy emphasis on emotional appeals. One Democratic editorial concluded: "It took FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT about two minutes to shatter completely the so-called argument in regard to the Covenant of the League of Nations being a violation of the Constitution of the United States." This remark initiated a local editorial war.

FDR claimed religious backing for the Democratic position on the League and the GOP press expressed "shock" that one party would have the "effrontery" and "carelessness" to claim that "churches" are "lining up" for any one candidate.

The speech structure was poor. The text was too long and the candidate failed to demonstrate a smooth structural progression of ideas.

---

147 Editorial, Louisville Herald, October 5, 1920.
148 Ibid., October 3, 1920.
The style was inconsistent in quality. The sentences were excessive in length, but the invective was handled exceptionally well.

The delivery seemed to meet adequately the demands imposed upon the speaker.

The major Democratic paper thought he "left a splendid impression both as a man and as an advocate," adding:

His is a personality of wholesome vigor and well fortified convictions, which exerts an influence stronger than any mere physical 'magnetism,' though he has that in abundance. His appeal to an audience is one of facts and reason addressed to reasoning beings, whom he places upon his own high plane, capable of his own broad outlook upon life. His speech was a sincere answer to sincere seekers of the truth, and ought to make votes among those who must be won by the party . . . 149

The Cincinnati Enquirer reflected on the campaign invasion of Kentucky by the major candidates several weeks after they departed:

Governor Cox spent two days in the state; Senator Harding one. The Democratic vice presidential candidate has been in the state two days; the Republican candidate is to duplicate this tour next week.

Senator Harding appeared in the Louisville Armory last Thursday night . . . The enormity of the inclosure and the crowd hurt his effort . . . When Senator Harding began to talk there were cries of 'louder' . . . though he was speaking in a tone that would have carried in an ordinary building . . . spectators became restless. Despairing of hearing his address, they began to leave the building, making a great deal of noise . . . .

An overflow crowd [waiting to hear Governor Cox] accumulated outside the confines of the Gypsy Smith Tabernacle. Instead of letting Cox make a short talk to the overflow before beginning his main address, the committee permitted him to get inside. Then they promised the street audience that Cox would appear [later]. Somebody failed to tell Cox of this promise, and he was hustled off to his private car . . . . This incensed the audience outside . . . some tore off their Cox buttons and threw them away. One angry delegation stormed headquarters.

The political sharps in the state believe that Franklin D. Roosevelt's Kentucky tour will have more effect on the result than the invasion of either of the Presidential candidates. The reason is that Roosevelt proved an exceedingly winning campaigner . . . . Roosevelt proved a winner with the new factor in suffrage.150

Conclusion

Roosevelt's second campaign tour failed to receive the volume of national publicity which the first tour generated. For this reason, a superficial investigation could conclude that his September speaking efforts were less effective than those during the first month. Most historical studies place undue emphasis on the acceptance address and the initial western swing. In doing so, they overlook the West Virginia speech, which probably embodied the highest degree of rhetorical perfection achieved by the candidate in the entire campaign.

After stumping in the New England and Middle Atlantic states, FDR moved into Wheeling, a prime political target for major speakers

150 October 17, 1920.
of both parties. In an address that reflected great rebuttal skill, he answered the Harding speech of the previous night. His use of ethos and pathos was effective consistently throughout the first two tours. However, in Wheeling, he used equally forceful logical arguments.

As an oratorical product, the lengthy Louisville speech did not compare favorably with the Wheeling effort. In Kentucky, the nominee concentrated on an emotional presentation of the Democrats' League position. His speech structure was poor and the overall style, while showing flashes of brilliance, lacked consistency in clarity and impressiveness.

Applying the experience gained during August, the young Vice-Presidential prospect's overall rhetorical effectiveness improved during the second tour. With a less ambitious itinerary and fewer political meetings, he probably could have devoted more time to writing, editing, and perfecting his utterances. As he gained experience, he demonstrated increasing proficiency in the art of national campaigning. The Republicans continued to dog his trail with Theodore Roosevelt, Jr. The son of the former President supposedly made a "triumphant dash thru the heart of Kentucky,"151 riding on horseback "over the 'Trail of the Lonesome Pine' in the heart of the Cumberland mountains."152

151Louisville Herald, October 5, 1920.
152Wheeling Intelligencer, October 7, 1920.
Immediately after leaving the Blue Grass State, Roosevelt conferred with Cox aboard a railway car in Terre Haute, Indiana, on Sunday, October 3. Cox had returned from his only western tour and FDR was preparing to move into some of the territory he missed on his first visit to the coast. This was the final face to face meeting of the candidates during the campaign, therefore, they probably compared notes and mapped out general strategy for the month of October. Following the meeting, the Governor departed for the East and Roosevelt crossed the Mississippi to prepare for his Missouri appearances.

---

CHAPTER VI

THE THIRD CAMPAIGN TOUR, OCTOBER 4 - NOVEMBER 1

Introduction

Cox and Roosevelt were both in St. Louis within a twenty-four hour period. The Governor arrived in the city at 8:24 a.m., Sunday morning, October 3. He was still asleep in his private car, "Federal," as 400 men and women assembled at Union Station to greet him. He did not dress completely, but pulled on a black and white checkered overcoat and went to the rear platform to meet the well-wishers. He refused to make a speech because "to do more than express my appreciation for your coming here this morning would be an impropriety on the Sabbath."\(^1\) He departed at 8:44 a.m. for the meeting with Roosevelt in Indiana.

After the two Democratic candidates met at noon in Terre Haute, Indiana, FDR rode with Cox as far as Indianapolis, returned to the "Westboro," and proceeded to St. Louis. He arrived at 1:30 a.m., Monday morning, October 4. He slept on the train until the "Westboro" was attached to a Frisco passenger train which departed for Cape Girardeau, Missouri, at 7:45 a.m. He hurriedly put on a raincoat and buttoned it up to his chin in order to receive

\(^1\) As quoted in St. Louis \textit{Post-Dispatch}, October 4, 1920.
newspapermen and photographers just as the train pulled out of the station. He released an optimistic press statement and continued to talk with the interviewers as they swung off the train when it began to move. Breckinridge Long, Democratic nominee for United States Senator, greeted both Cox and Roosevelt in St. Louis. He joined the FDR party and traveled to Cape Girardeau in order to campaign with the prospective Vice-President in southeastern Missouri.²

Roosevelt and Long delivered afternoon speeches at a large, open-air, mass meeting in Cape Girardeau. Returning to St. Louis for the scheduled night rally, the New Yorker presented rear platform talks at Menfro, Sainte Genevieve, and Crystal City.³ On this same day, President Wilson's first direct campaign appeal to the public, which urged indorsement at the polls of the Administration's stand on the League of Nations, was published in the nation's press.⁴

FDR delivered at least 126 addresses during the third campaign tour. From this period, five complete speeches and thirty-four excerpts of speeches are available in the Roosevelt Library. The addresses delivered at St. Louis, October 4, and at Cincinnati, October 16, are analyzed in this chapter.

⁴Complete text in St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 4, 1920.
Audience, Occasion, and Setting

Proceeding to St. Louis after southeastern Missouri engagements, the Roosevelt party was met at suburban Tower Grove by Governor Frederick D. Gardner, Democratic National Committeeman Edward F. Goltra, gubernatorial candidate John M. Atkinson, and former Governor David R. Francis. The train pulled into St. Louis about eight o'clock in the evening and the candidate was taken immediately to the site of the mass rally at the First Regiment Armory. The meeting was scheduled to begin at 8:30, but it was opened thirty minutes late.\(^5\)

Ed Goltra did a commendable job as chairman of local arrangements.\(^6\) The Democratic City Committeemen acted as ushers to seat the crowd. The Democratic Women's Committee of St. Louis occupied a balcony opposite to the speaker's platform. In fact, fully one-third of the estimated 6000 listeners were women. Seats were arranged to accommodate 3000, but these were filled quickly. The space behind the seats, in the aisles, and out into the lobby was occupied as the audience overflowed into the street outside the

\(^5\)St. Louis Star, October 4; St. Louis Globe-Democrat, October 5, 1920.

\(^6\)Telegram, Early to FDR, October 3, 1920. All letters, memoranda, speeches, itineraries, and telegrams referred to herein are located in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York.
Armory. Although the final month of the campaign was underway, Roosevelt was the first major candidate of either party to speak in St. Louis. This fact alone probably motivated a visit to the rally by curiosity seekers as well as the Democratic faithful.7

Goltra called the meeting to order and presented Governor Gardner. The Governor, after speaking briefly about the state elections, introduced FDR by reminding the audience that he had "helped to nominate him and that he felt he had done a bully good job."8 The crowd applauded Goltra and there "was a noisy welcome for Governor Gardner" as "his speech was often stopped by applause." However, the wildest demonstration was reserved for the major speaker.

It was an audience unlike any gathered in St. Louis during this campaign. There was all the old-time enthusiasm of the Wilson candidacies of four and eight years ago, with cheers, applause and the waving of hats and handkerchiefs at frequent intervals . . .

Roosevelt, when he started to speak, was greeted with a prolonged demonstration. He had just come from an almost equally enthusiastic outdoor meeting at Cape Girardeau, and he showed his elation at what he declared was the unexpected enthusiasm in what had been described to him as a doubtful state.9

7St. Louis Globe-Democrat; St. Louis Star; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920.
8St. Louis Star, October 5, 1920.
9Ibid.
Breckinridge Long and John M. Atkinson spoke briefly after Roosevelt concluded. They were "cheered almost as enthusiastically as the vice presidential candidate." Finally, Mrs. Roosevelt, who occupied a seat on the platform, was introduced by Goltra. She was given a standing ovation. After the meeting, many in the audience filed past the stage and shook hands with FDR. The Roosevelts were entertained at the home of former Governor David R. Francis before returning to the "Westboro" to embark on an overnight jaunt across Missouri. The next day, October 5, was devoted to Kansas appearances, with speeches in Lawrence, Topeka, Manhattan, Junction City, Abilene, and Salina.

Choice of Subject and Speech Goal

The League of Nations continued to be Roosevelt's major subject. In addition, he continued to speak out vigorously in opposition to recent Harding declarations. Summing up the subject matter, a local newspaper said that he "made an appeal for the League of Nations with reservations, assailed Senator Harding as having no 'constructive program,' and attacked some of the St. Louis newspapers." Steve Early recommended this emphasis on the League

---

10 Ibid.
12 St. Louis Globe-Democrat, October 5, 1920.
in a telegram dispatched to Terre Haute during the final Cox-Roosevelt meeting. He asked the nominee to "go limit on transferring Articles [sic] 10, pointing on [sic] supremacy of Constitution and Theodore Roosevelt['s] support of League rather than Hague Tribunal." Goltra informed him that the League was a "patriotic rather than partisan" issue.13

Beginning with the month of October, the Vice-Presidential hopeful seemed to concentrate more completely on the League question. Possibly, at that time, he was moving into those geographical areas which favored the Democratic stand. Or, maybe, he felt that Harding's departure from the front porch and the Senator's subsequent defense of The Hague Tribunal made the GOP vulnerable on this issue. At any rate, the supremacy of the League question finally became apparent during the last month of campaigning. As his train sped toward St. Louis, FDR sent Cox some information on the subject and requested that the Governor wire him the "full list [of] churches endorsing league and text of encyclical letter."14 Therefore, on the basis of conferences with his running mate, Early's telegrams, and his own experiences, he planned to make his final pleas for support on this key issue.

At the St. Louis Armory, FDR's primary goal was to make a lasting impression with a strong argumentative speech. He was the

13 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 3, 1920.
14 Telegram, FDR to Cox, October 3, 1920.
first major speaker to appear, with the Governor scheduled to speak at the St. Louis Coliseum on October 11. In a sense, Roosevelt was laying the groundwork for a later Cox meeting in the same city, just as he had done repeatedly on the initial western tour.

Premises and Methods of Proof

Roosevelt did not choose to defend the League of Nations. He apparently presupposed that the people understood the advantages to be gained by joining the world organization. He chose to deal with those who opposed the League by questioning their political honesty on the subject. His premises formulated a simple, hypothetical syllogism:

Major premise: If the United States is to join the League of Nations, the Republican Party must be defeated in the November elections.

Minor premise: The United States must join the League of Nations.

Conclusion: Therefore, the Republican Party must be defeated in the November elections.

Components of this syllogism are suggested throughout the speech, and especially in these concluding remarks:

If the English language means anything at all, it means that... the American public have received from him [Harding] a direct approval of Senator Borah's opposition to our going into a League of Nations, not merely 'the' league, but 'a' league.
... Gov. Cox and myself favor going into the League of Nations ...  

He gambled on the audience accepting his minor premise and concentrated his arguments on establishing the major premise and the conclusion. The validity of this syllogism was as questionable as a similar line of reasoning followed in the acceptance speech. A Republican Administration was not in power during the most recent failures to gain League acceptance. Therefore, keeping the GOP out of the White House could not guarantee American entry into the world organization. Obviously, Roosevelt was requesting Democratic congressional victories also, but these were only implied.

The supporting material reflected the multiple efforts made to discredit those who opposed the League. In taking this approach, testimony became an important aspect of logical evidence. These quotations were often precisely stated and their authors were usually identified. Understandably, Harding was a favorite source, being referred to on five different occasions. Immediately after the opening greeting, FDR employed biting sarcasm in directly quoting one of the Senator's recent statements:

---

15 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," St. Louis, Missouri, October 4, 1920, p. 8. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the St. Louis address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR St. Louis Speech. Some pages of this text were not numbered, therefore, the author has taken the liberty to number the pages consecutively in order to designate the quotations more clearly. See also, the complete text in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920.
I read it [the statement] to you to show that I am always willing to give credit for any definite thing which he may say at any time. Here it is—Senator Harding's announcement, with all due solemnity beffiting [sic] such a statement, that 'Under no circumstances will I suffer any change which will affect the American flag or any substitute therefor.'

Later in the speech, he paraphrased the Senator's Baltimore remarks relative to foreign affairs, then quoted the opposition candidate precisely on this same subject as follows:

Here is his answer to that question: 'I am at present without any specific constructive program in foreign affairs.' But there is a ray of hope. He may stand somewhere sometime if the voters give him a chance, for in another speech he has said: 'If elected the first thing I will attempt to do will be to find a program of world association and co-operation.'

These remarks were emotionally charged. The local Democratic newspaper noted that FDR "evoked laughter by quoting some of Senator Harding's recent utterances, especially the one in which, three months after his nomination for President, Harding said: 'I am at present without any specific constructive program on foreign affairs.'"

Through the skillful use of testimony, Roosevelt firmly identified the Ohio Senator with the wing of the party which staunchly opposed the League:

---

16 Ibid., p. 1.
17 Ibid., p. 6.
18 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920.
Here is another one from Harding published this morning. He says: 'I approve what Senator Borah has said in his public addresses.' And at the same time we find Borah quoted as saying: 'I will fight anyone who tries to put over a League of Nations.' Note that he says not 'the' League of Nations, but 'a' League of Nations.19

Other Republican leaders were refuted by using their own words to indicate possible fallacies. Calvin Coolidge was quoted in a 1919 greeting to Wilson: "Here is what Gov. Coolidge said then: 'Mr. President, I welcome you on behalf of the people of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and I assure you that the people are behind you today as in the past . . .'." Of course, Coolidge was not "behind" the President a year later during the "national referendum," but FDR did not labor these obvious details. The Democratic nominee moved on to indicate how "Lodge and other Republican Senators suggested changes in the covenant, insisting that the words 'Monroe Doctrine' be specifically used in that instrument . . . The framers of the covenant saw the wisdom of it and the Monroe Doctrine was put in the final draft." Therefore, like Coolidge, Lodge was willing to see some value in the League before the 1920 election campaign. Substantial blame for the contemporary GOP attitude was placed on Will Hays, the Republican National Committee Chairman, because he "called Republican Senators together and told them that if they permitted the President to make a success of the treaty and League of Nations program it would mean

19 FDR St. Louis Speech, p. 6.
Republican defeat in the 1920 election." It sounded believable, but FDR had no source to enforce this controversial paraphrasing of the chairman. He proceeded to discredit more effectively the statements made by "men like Spencer of Missouri and Morrow of Kentucky who tell us that the league covenant would require us to send American boys overseas to fight the battles of other nations." He questioned the motives of the men who opposed while "Pope Benedict in his last encyclical approves the association of nations to prevent wars." 20

Roosevelt used several historical and contemporary examples. He developed a comparison between strong and weak Presidents by generalizing as follows:

If we look back in our history we will see that all our great Presidents have been the opposite of trimmers—they have stood for clear-cut, definite policies—they have been above partisanship for the mere sake of partisanship . . .

On the other hand, the weakest of our Presidents have lacked these essentials . . . They have considered party or party victory above the nation's good . . . . 21

He introduced other historical events by declaring: "Let us go back to the time when President Wilson returned from Paris with the treaty of peace and the draft of the League of Nations covenant." Contemporary examples were cited in references to Republican advertisements "printed in newspapers" and the favorable

20 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 6, 7.
21 Ibid., p. 2.
resolution passed "the other day" by "the National Board of American War Mothers."  

The use of definition as a device of logical proof was necessary in this address. Roosevelt introduced a nautical term and applied it to the opposition:

Tonight we are going to coin a new word. In my time I have had a great deal to do with boats. When they sail a boat they set the sails to catch the wind, whichever way it blows. They call that trimming the sails. 'Trim' — that's the term which gives us a word that has not been used yet in this campaign. And that word is 'trimmer' . . . Before Nov. 2 the American public is going to know to whom the word 'trimmer' applies . . . .

... It means a deliberate attempt so to frame one's words that they may be construed as having opposite meanings . . .

In our daily associations with men and women we run across this type, and we end by holding them in contempt . . . That type of individual not only never gets very far in this world, but contributes very little of good to this world as he passes through it . . . He is a 'trimmer.'

Obviously, considerable time was devoted to identifying clearly the political significance of the word "trimmer." This definitive detail was understandable in view of the later references to "a plot of 'trimming,'" "a campaign of 'trimming,'" "the use of 'trimming' language," "the real task of trying to 'trim' the American voters," "a hard task to 'trim' the American voters," "they

---

22 Ibid., pp. 3, 6, 7.
23 Ibid., pp. 2-3.
have 'trimmed,' and "going forward to rebuke 'trimmers.'" The term was applied to the Republican candidates, platform, strategy, and managers. It became the focal point of local newspaper and wire service reports on this address.

Statistics did not constitute a major component part of logical evidence at St. Louis. He did speak about the election taking place in "four weeks," Harding waiting "20 minutes before answering the man's question," and the Senator "being a presidential candidate for three months." But these statements were not uttered in order to prove a point statistically. Even the references to the "2,000,000 of our sons" who were sent "across the water," or the "81,000 graves of boys who died" contained more emotive than referential value. This factor was equally true in recalling the number of countries that held active League membership: "By far the greatest demonstrations occurred when Roosevelt mentioned the League of Nations. When he said, 'we are going into the league with the other thirty-nine nations already

24 Ibid., pp. 4-5.
25 For example, see St. Louis Post-Dispatch; St. Louis Star; St. Louis Globe-Democrat; Cincinnati Enquirer; New York Times, October 5, 1920.
26 FDR St. Louis Speech, pp. 5-6.
27 Ibid., p. 7.
in,' the crowd, which filled all the available standing room, cheered several minutes."²⁸

Fewer ethical appeals were employed in this address than any other single effort analyzed in this study. Judging from the reception offered by an enthusiastic audience in the packed Armory, any concentration on ethos seemed to be unnecessary. However, the candidate did attempt to degrade the character of his opponents, thus elevating the Democratic cause by comparison:

For one year that covenant was before those Senators and in that time there never was a moment when Lodge and his associates were willing to let it go through at any price. They were sacrificing their country to win a party victory.

... The difficulty which Will Hays encountered more than a year ago was that of reconciling irreconcilable differences ... He did this by attempting to divert attention from these differences, and this could only be done by creating false issues.

These men know they are misrepresenting the facts ... 

I want you to contrast this with the definite statements of Gov. Cox and myself ... we are wholly willing that it be made clear to every American that nothing in our going in the league shall take away in the slightest degree our existing rights under the American Constitution ... I trust that from now on there will be a noticeable falling off at least of the deliberate Republican misrepresentation of what Gov. Cox and I stand for.²⁹

²⁸St. Louis Star, October 5, 1920.
²⁹FDR St. Louis Speech, pp. 4, 7, 8.
These statements were augmented with only two other references to ethos. FDR referred to personal experience in claiming, "I was in Boston when the President was welcomed there by Gov. Coolidge." He made a general gesture of good will with the recognition of "the reading and the thinking public."\(^{30}\) Similarly to his Louisville speech, the ethical proofs in the St. Louis address were devoted to degrading the character of the opposition.

At the outset, emotional appeals were directed pugnaciously toward a spirit of party pride and national patriotism. FDR "aroused great enthusiasm at the start of his speech by saying 'Not a human being on earth can persuade me that Missouri is going Republican.' From all parts of the hall came cries of: 'You're right' and 'We know she won't.'\(^{31}\) This identical thought was applied to the Kentucky speech on October 1 when he began: "My friends, there is not a human being alive that can persuade me that Kentucky is going Republican in this election."\(^{32}\) However, FDR extended this opening pathetic appeal in St. Louis. His words were recorded by a local reporter as follows:

\(^{30}\)Ibid., pp. 3, 5.

\(^{31}\)St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920. See also, FDR St. Louis Speech, p. 1.

'When two days ago in Kentucky I read in a newspaper a statement by a Republican that Missouri was going Republican, I smiled,' Roosevelt said. 'I got into Missouri this morning, and I have been traveling through the state all day. The more I traveled the more that smile has broken into a loud laugh. Things are going all one way with us now. They are going all the other way with the Republicans.'

He continued to taunt the opposition by declaring that "they advocate . . . combining our own colors with the Crescent of Turkey, the Snake of Mexico and the Bear of Russia, thus symbolizing the four-party agreement of those who prefer to remain outside" the League of Nations.

Toward the end of the address, his pathos was directed into channels of morality and religion. It was combined with statistics, testimony, and references to sagacity and high character, as shown in these excerpts:

The churches of America are behind the league

On this question we have a right to ask those who suffered from the war—the women who gave their sons. Over there are 81,000 graves of boys who died for something. It was not mere military victory they fought for . . . We hoped to gain an end of war . . .

At a West Virginia railroad station I met a man who had lost two sons in the war. He said to me: 'I know they did not die in vain, for you will go on in your effort to get a League of Nations which will make it unnecessary to send our boys to war.'

---

33 St. Louis Star, October 5, 1920.

34 FDR St. Louis Speech, p. 1.
or Minneapolis I met an old lady whose only relative, a grandson, had died in the war, and she expressed the same thought.  

The Democratic press reported: "Tears came to the eyes of many women in the gathering when Roosevelt told of the 81,000 graves of American soldiers . . ." A few minutes later, he lifted the sadness with a rousing statement: "When he said that so far as the sentiment of the American people is concerned 'we have already joined the League of Nations' the entire audience stood up and there was cheering for several minutes." Therefore, Roosevelt was successful in molding a progression of varying audience responses. His pathetic appeals aroused "great enthusiasm," "laughter," "cheering," "tears," and "approving comment."  

Roosevelt placed considerable emphasis on testimony in developing his logical evidence. He also spent considerable time defining the term "trimming the sails," which was applied analogously to the GOP leadership and platform. His ethos was concerned mainly with destroying the character of the opposition. His pathos contained a variety of different appeals which seemingly gained the desired responses. The premises and methods of proof were argumentatively sound in the St. Louis address, although the speaker

---

36 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920.
37 Ibid.
presupposed that the audience favored American entry into the League of Nations.

Speech Structure

The central thought can be paraphrased: Republican leaders are dishonest on the League of Nations issue. Roosevelt stated this idea by declaring: "These men know they are misrepresenting the facts." The following brief reveals how this thesis was supported:

I. The GOP candidates have misrepresented their positions, for
   A. Senator Harding is a "trimmer," for
      1. He is "a man who says one thing and does another," for
         a. He considers "party victory above the nation's good."
         b. He seeks "to gain support of opposite factions at the same time."
         c. He is insincere in "thought and speech."
   2. He admits that he is "without any specific constructive program in foreign affairs."

B. Governor Coolidge has contradicted his position, for

38 FDR St. Louis Speech, p. 7.
1. He praised President Wilson and the League in 1919.

2. He subscribes to GOP condemnation of Wilson and the League in 1920.

II. Other major GOP politicians have been unfair with the League, for
A. "Lodge and other Republican Senators suggested changes in the covenant" and then voted against the changes.
B. Will Hays opposed the League for partisan political reasons, for
   1. He opposed the President and not the document.
   2. He sought only a national victory in the 1920 elections.
C. Senators Spencer and Morrow claim that American boys would have "to fight the battles of other nations."
D. Republican managers have printed false anti-League advertisements in newspapers.

III. The GOP League position is opposed by the churches, for
A. "Presbyterians, Methodists, Unitarians, Congregationalists and many other denominations have indorsed" the League.
B. Pope Benedict "approves the association of nations to prevent wars."

The structure was improved over the Louisville performance, although it was not up to the standard of several earlier addresses. Harding was criticized in the introduction, again in the body under the first point, and at brief intervals throughout the speech. The intermittent references to the Senator at times distracted from the major point under consideration. No "signposts" were used and the three divisions in the above brief were probably not distinctly clear to the listeners. This address was the shortest one analyzed in this study. It was about half the length of the acceptance speech, therefore, organizational shortcomings possibly were less serious than those noted in the longer utterances.

A copy of the speech, written in FDR's longhand scribbling, is available along with a typist's reproduction. Both the St. Louis address and press release are extant in these forms, which could indicate that they were assembled en route from Terre Haute. The Sunday trip, at the conclusion of the Cox-FDR conference, did provide the candidate a rare opportunity to contemplate, organize, and record his thoughts. The introduction and conclusion to the speech likely were prepared later, even after his arrival in Missouri. They were on typed copy and included some minor handwritten editing. The introduction was a regular insert, labeled
"I," and could easily be interchanged from one text to another. It was similar to the one at Louisville.

Although some minor problems were noted, the rhetorical craftsmanship of the St. Louis address was quite acceptable.

Use of Language

The length of sentences varied greatly as the speaker progressed through the speech. The mean sentence-length was 21.1 for 109 sentences, which was only a shade higher than the Seattle average. But the means for both the introduction and the conclusion far exceeded the mean for the body of the speech. These exceptional differences in sentence-length could indicate the influence of other authors in composing the exordium and the peroration, inasmuch as only the body of the address is available in the speaker's handwriting. However, the longest sentence totaled only sixty-nine words and two dozen statements were less than ten words in length. Therefore, the sentence structure was quite simple.

Although this address was considerably shorter than the earlier ones analyzed in this study, it possessed similar stylistic attributes. There were homely, common expressions, such as "let it go through at any price," "this nation will decide to keep on going forward," "there is a ray of hope," "we take no stock in men like

39 Mean sentence-lengths were as follows: Introduction- 26.8; Body- 19.6; Conclusion- 35.2.
Spencer of Missouri and Morrow of Kentucky," "we would have to send our boys over to settle it," "they did not die in vain," and "that is pretty plain English."40

Likewise, synonyms and repetitious statements were employed. He extoled "clear-cut, definite policies," "clear-cut, definite opinions," and those who "have been simple, direct and brave." He censured Republicans who "have 'trimmed' and criticized and slandered."41 After clarifying definitions, he freely used "trim," "trimmer," "trimmers," "trimmed," and "trimming." Additional repetition was apparent in charges of "partisanship for the mere sake of partisanship," and of "reconciling irreconcilable differences . . . forgetting the differences . . . attempting to divert attention from these differences."42

Parallel sentence structure was a valuable language device when "our great Presidents" were compared with "the weakest of our Presidents." In the first category, "they have stood for clear-cut, definite policies—they have been above partisanship . . . they have used language which could only be taken one way—they have carried through great measures for the good of the nation . . . Above all, they have never been caught seeking the support of people on both

40 FDR St. Louis Speech, pp. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.
41 Ibid., pp. 2, 5.
42 Ibid., pp. 2, 4.
sides of the same fence." In the second category, "They have played politics. They have considered party or party victory above the nation's good—they have tried to run with the hare and trail with the hound . . . ." Encompassed within the development are synonyms, metaphors, and repetitious remarks. Other parallelisms were less colorful, although equally effective. Early in the speech, he stated: "It means a deliberate attempt . . . . It means either a complete lack of convictions . . . ." In the conclusion, he followed a similar pattern in one sentence: "If the English language means anything at all, it means . . . . it means . . . ."44

Unlike the Wheeling or the Louisville addresses, FDR did not develop an extended metaphor at St. Louis. However, he did make ample use of short metaphoric phrases which contended: "The tide has turned," "a mill-stone round the neck of progress," "cast the good of the nation overboard," "a platform . . . . which a Hottentot or an Esquimaus [sic] could equally well swallow," "The straw that broke the back of a patient public," and "Senator Harding is at last being driven into a corner."45 He favored one metaphor by using variations of it three times as follows: "to carry water on both shoulders, at the same time," "'trimming' for

43 Ibid., p. 2.
44 Ibid., pp. 3, 8.
45 Ibid., pp. 1, 3, 4, 5, 8.
four months without spilling any of the water from either shoulder," "to 'trim' ... without spilling water from either shoulder." 46

One short, striking declaration was especially effective. A local publication sub-titled its report: "Speaker Calls Harding a 'Trimmer,' Saying One Thing One Day and the Opposite Next Day." It went on to explain: "Early in his speech he announced that for the first time in his campaign he would introduce the word 'trimmer' as applicable to Harding and his party advisers." 47 This new term made its impression on the listeners. However, another attempt to utter the striking phrase was less effective. He described the Republican campaign as being based upon "a monumental vacuum." Strangely enough, this statement seemed to gain notable publicity only in the local Republican Globe-Democrat. 48

Bombastic condemnations of the opposition were uttered throughout the address. The GOP platform "meant everything and it meant nothing" at a time when "the managers of the Republican party have mapped out a campaign of 'trimming.'" 49 Will Hays, the

46 Ibid., pp. 3, 4-5.
47 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920.
48 October 5, 1920.
49 FDR St. Louis Speech, p. 4.
GOP National Chairman, was singled out as the target for an unusually large amount of invective:

I will confess that I have been secretly much worried since Chairman Hays some time ago appropriated the American flag as the exclusive patented property of the Republican party. I have wondered what they would do with it after they got it.

Then, laying the foundation of a plot of 'trimming,' Will Hays . . . and those Senators agreed that the only hope of Republican success was to cast the good of the nation overboard.

. . . the campaign of the Will Hays organization is merely destructive . . . it is based on hate of anything accomplished for the nation by any Democrat.50

Roosevelt was bitingly sarcastic in introducing several Harding quotations:

I want to preface my speech tonight with some good news to every lover of this country: Whichever party is elected they can be assured that . . . our country will be safe. Senator Harding has at last made another definite statement. I read it to you to show that I am always willing to give him credit for any definite thing which he may say at any time.

I know the Senator too well not to know he has not made such an important announcement without long and serious consultation with Senator Penrose and Senator Lodge. I feel sure that in thus speaking he expressed not only his individual determination but that of the Senatorial Syndicate . . .

Harding waited 20 minutes before answering the man's question. There was no chance to consult Penrose and Lodge.51

50 Ibid., pp. 1, 4, 5.
51 Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 5.
The candidate's comments were bitter in referring to the GOP managers, leadership, and platform. He caustically singled out Harding, Coolidge, Hays, Penrose, Lodge, Borah, Spencer, and Morrow. He individually attacked more national and sectional leaders than he had done in any previous speech. However, he carefully offered quotations and was not irresponsible in these charges. Furthermore, he took care to maintain: "I do not speak of the rank and file of Republicans who hold definite convictions." 52

His many references to the opposition was reflected in the fact that third person pronouns were used ninety-five times. First person pronominal expressions appeared only seventy-two times in 109 sentences. The second person was uttered only nine times. Therefore, many of his comments were not as direct as those noted in some of the earlier addresses.

There were four questions in the manuscript. The one direct query was used in quoting the gentleman in Harding's Baltimore audience. Two interrogatives were employed in parallel structure:

Do we respect the man who agrees with us today and a moment later with someone holding the opposite view? Do we look up to the man who has no definite convictions about any subject but seeks merely to avoid argument? 53

52 Ibid., p. 4.
53 Ibid., p. 3.
His rhetorical questions attempted to focus attention on the answers which followed them.

Judging from newspaper accounts, the speaker departed from his prepared text:

In the course of his speech Roosevelt said: 'I bet that the Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Times will not print a word of my remarks about Harding.'

From all parts of the hall came the cry: 'You mean the Globe-Democrat.' Roosevelt quickly made the suggested correction, showing that he had not meant to say that the Post-Dispatch would not fairly report his speech.54

The publication under attack noted that Roosevelt realized "that he had attacked the Post-Dispatch, which is giving him active support, so he corrected his statement and mentioned the GLOBE-DEMOCRAT." He added, "Now you've got it. The GLOBE-DEMOCRAT! How'd it ever get that name?"55 Eager to prove that Roosevelt's "bet" was wrong, the Globe-Democrat printed his speech in full, which was probably his purpose in issuing the challenge.

The St. Louis Star detected another small item of ad libitum:

'Your votes may turn a state,' he said. 'The result of this state may turn the result in the nation. On the result of the election in this nation, the hopes of hundreds of millions are resting. They are watching to see what you do. It is a matter above party. It ought to be

54St. Louis Post-Dispatch, October 5, 1920.
55St. Louis Globe-Democrat, October 5, 1920.
treated as above party. It is being treated above party.156

This hypothetical causation was not reported in either the Post-Dispatch or the Globe-Democrat which purported to carry the complete text. It could have been uttered during a question and answer session at the conclusion of the formal presentation.

In St. Louis, the candidate used short sentences predominantly as a stylistic vehicle for his usual fare of common idioms, synonyms, repetitious remarks, parallelisms, and metaphors. His sarcasm was directed against a number of specific GOP leaders which accounted for the preponderance of third person pronouns. Two minor deviations from prepared remarks were reported in the press, but neither tended to alter the conclusions already reached concerning the orator's use of language. Overall, his style was effective in communicating the desired message.

Delivery

Roosevelt's presentation was praised by the local press. The politically friendly Post-Dispatch commented:

Tall and 'fine-looking,' he early captured the interest of the newly enfranchised women in the gathering, and while not 'Rooseveltian' in the sense of being an explosive orator, he made a telling speech without apparent effort and few gestures. His voice, while not strong, had a ringing quality which carried his words to all corners of the hall.57

56 October 5, 1920.

57 October 5, 1920.
The Star added an interesting dimension to his appearance which was somewhat unique: "Roosevelt bears only a slight facial resemblance to his famous cousin, the late Col. Roosevelt, although his teeth are reminiscent of 'Teddy.' Newspaper men present today remarked on his resemblance to President Wilson, and upon his measured manner of speaking, which was also Wilsonian." This association was precisely the one which the Republicans wished to establish publicly. They wanted the FDR political identification affixed to the harassed Woodrow Wilson and not to the martyred Theodore Roosevelt.

At the conclusion of his presentation, the candidate fielded several questions from the audience. The opposition press report left the impression that all inquiries were made by a single listener: "Roosevelt was repeatedly cheered, the audience having much 'pep.' When he concluded a young man got up and asked a few questions." However, a more complete account in the Post-Dispatch seems to contradict this impression:

There were few interruptions of the speech, most of them being in the way of approving comment. One man with long gray whiskers, called out: 'How about that Roosevelt family brand that they say you haven't got?'

'My only reply to that,' said Roosevelt, 'is that I wear no man's collar.' He further digressed to say: 'I have heard that a silly young man is going about the

58 October 5, 1920.

59 St. Louis Globe-Democrat, October 5, 1920.
country trying to make the people believe the Republican party won the war.'

As is known, the assertion that Franklin D. Roosevelt ‘does not have the brand of our family’ was made recently by Lieutenant-Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, who is campaigning for the Republican ticket.

A young man in the audience asked why Democrats did not prevent the removal and imprisonment of a man who tried to question Harding at a meeting in Baltimore.

‘They couldn't prevent it, because Baltimore has a Republican Mayor,’ replied Roosevelt. The same young man asked for an explanation or [sic] article 10 of the league covenant.

Roosevelt explained that action under the article would be called for only in the case of a threat of external aggression . . . .

Another questioner said: ‘Suppose Canada should want to withdraw from the British Empire?’

‘That would be none of our damned business,’ replied Roosevelt.

Referring to a Republican slogan of the McKinley-Mark Hanna days, Roosevelt said: ‘What workingman in this hall tonight would be satisfied merely with the promise of a full dinner bucket?’

From the rear of the hall came a cry from a parched throat: ‘No! what we want now is a full beer bucket.’ Roosevelt joined in the laughter.60

By all accounts, the nominee seemed quite adept in handling the questions with well-phrased impromptu replies. The interrogations from the “young man” focused on points which FDR desired to make infinitely clear to everyone. Therefore, this auditor could

60October 5, 1920.
have been a member of the Democratic organization who was "planted" in the meeting for the specific purpose of asking friendly questions. No extant materials support this supposition, but its employment probably was utilized by both major parties.

Final Evaluation

As Roosevelt pressed westward after his final meeting with Cox, he received an enthusiastic reception from an overflow audience of 6000 at the First Regiment Armory in St. Louis. The League of Nations continued to be his major subject.

His premises and supporting material were directed against the moral integrity of the GOP in its opposition to the League. He was more concerned with destroying the character of his opponents than in defending the attributes of the world organization. Logical proof was built primarily around strong references to testimony. Much of the address was based on an analogy with the nautical term "trimming the sails." His logical supports were well-documented generally. He minimized ethos, except for attempts to show a lack of virtue in the Republican cause. His pathos carried the fighting spirit of a political partisan and the evangelistic pleadings of a moral crusader. However, his argumentative appeals were effective and sound.

Some minor difficulties were noted in speech structure. The candidate could have utilized "signposts" and a clear division of material, nevertheless, his organization was adequate.
His language usage was similar to that reflected in earlier speeches, except for a marked difference in the stylistic quality of the body as opposed to the remainder of the text. The body of the speech is available in FDR's handwriting, which created some speculation that other speech writers may have played a significant role in producing the exordium and the peroration.

His delivery was friendly and conversational in both physical and vocal qualities. Questions from the floor were answered impromptu with economy, force, and humor. One newspaper summed up the St. Louis appearance by concluding that FDR "made a fine impression."61

David Lawrence, after a tour of the West following the Cox visit, painted a bleak picture of Democratic prospects. Superior political organization, overwhelming newspaper support, coupled with irritating domestic issues such as taxation, the tariffs, the railroad rates, the congestion of freight, the high cost of living, and "the whole after the war mess" favored the Republican cause. The Democrats of the West, "lacking funds and a friendly press," faced "an almost hopeless task." Lawrence noted that "the newspapers[,] friendly even to the Wilson league, are submerging the controversy over the kind of league America is to enter and convincing their readers that Senator Harding will do the right

61 Ibid.
thing at the right time whatever it is ... and restore
normalcy." Therefore, Roosevelt was bucking overwhelming odds
as he continued his ambitious itinerary. Succeeding events proved
Lawrence's analysis to be amazingly accurate. Thus, the Democratic
choice of the League issue as a major subject area in political
speeches can be validly challenged on the basis of a contemporary
observation.

Cincinnati

Audience, Occasion, and Setting

After leaving St. Louis, the Vice-Presidential nominee spent
the next eleven days touring Kansas, Colorado, Iowa, Missouri,
Illinois, and Indiana, respectively. He traveled by airplane on one
leg of the Missouri tour and became involved in a minor automobile
accident in Indiana. Nevertheless, Louis Howe reported that
"Franklin" is "going great guns."  

The nominee had "made more than 300 speeches since the
campaign started" and the Cincinnati speech was billed as his "most
important" one in Ohio.  

Steve Early observed that the county had

62 Ibid., October 4, 1920.
63 Telegram, Howe to McCarthy, October 13, 1920.
64 Cincinnati Post, October 16, 1920.
a "strong" Democratic Committee, but he further warned that the city was a "strong Republican community." Political conditions produced a real challenge. There was a "race issue" in the "state ticket between whites and Negroes"; the city was anti-prohibitionist "and very liberal in views"; the Germans were "most influential" and opposed the League; Negroes held the balance of power; and the Irish, the "third element in influence," were politically "OK." Therefore, Roosevelt could expect a veritable checkerboard of racial and social prejudice.

The "Westboro" pulled into Cincinnati at 6:00 p.m., Saturday, October 16. The Democratic National Committee of Hamilton County formally opened its 1920 campaign at the Music Hall, October 14. Bourke Cockran, popular Democratic orator from New York, was the key speaker. In addition, Cox campaigned in northern Ohio and left for Detroit the day before Roosevelt's arrival in the Buckeye State. Therefore, FDR was not the first major speaker on the scene as he had been in some other areas. A large crowd greeted him at the Pennsylvania Station. The official reception committee from the local Democratic campaign headquarters included Thomas J. Nector, Stephen W. McGrath, Judge Robert S. Marx, Joseph W. O'Hara, August Tietig, Edward M. Hurley, Grover Cleveland Maxwell, Leo Evans,

65 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 15, 1920.
John L. Shuff, and Mrs. W. A. Julian, wife of the candidate for United States Senator. Members of the Vice-Presidential campaign party were dinner guests of the committee at the Hotel Sinton.

Following the evening meal, they were escorted to the Emery Auditorium for the mass rally at 8:00 p.m. A band entertained the audience before the meeting began. The "big auditorium" was "packed to the roof" with "at least 2,500 persons," including those on "the crowded stage." For purposes of maintaining order, "the doors were locked and more than 2,000 persons were turned away, unable to gain admittance." Apparently the venture was successful. A local newspaper reported:

Emery Auditorium was ablaze with enthusiasm last night, the occasion being the Democratic mass meeting given under the auspices of the Cox-Roosevelt-Julian Club. The beautiful hall, the scene of many political gatherings, never held a more orderly audience. When the meeting opened every seat in the auditorium was occupied. The balcony held many women and permitted a brilliant scene from the stage.

Roosevelt was introduced by the Reverend Dr. George A. Thayer, "pastor emeritus of Avondale Congregational Unitarian Church," who was "a life-long Republican" but supported the

66 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 14-16; Cincinnati Post, October 14; Cincinnati Tribune, October 17, 1920.

67 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 17, 1920.

68 Cincinnati Tribune, October 17, 1920.
Democrats in 1920 because of the League of Nations issue. Steve Early described Thayer as an "Independent Republican" with "high influence." The meeting was opened when Dr. Thayer was presented by Judge Robert S. Marx, "who accompanied Mr. Roosevelt on his first Western trip." The judge took occasion to extol the personality and public record of Mr. Roosevelt, which he declared is a 'record which is parallel in many respects to that of his illustrious kinsman, Theodore Roosevelt.' Tribute was paid to the services of Mr. Roosevelt during the war as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, emphasis being laid on his patriotism, keen judgment and courage.

The candidate made a "hit" with the audience. "At frequent intervals throughout his entire address Mr. Roosevelt was interrupted by outbursts of cheering. His remarks took well with the big crowd. Loud outbursts of applause greeted the mention of President Wilson's name." In fact, the auditorium gathering "compelled him to continue" even when "he wanted to stop." As a result, FDR spoke for two full hours.

---

69 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 17, 1920.
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71 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 17, 1920.
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The Roosevelts stayed overnight at the Hotel Sinton and attended services on Sunday morning, October 17, at Christ Episcopal Church, "hearing a sermon preached by Rev. Frank H. Nelson." After a ride "through the suburbs," they were entertained at a Country Club luncheon. In the afternoon, they were the guests of Mrs. W. A. Julian, whose husband was out of the city campaigning for the United States Senate. The campaign party left Cincinnati at 7:40 p.m. 75

FDR likely took time for both business and relaxation during his visit. He scheduled a meeting with his "advance man" in the city for some strategy conferences. 76 Also, he wired Judge Marx the day before his arrival: "Three amateur golfers in my party wish to play on Sunday. Can you arrange?" Whether the foursome ever reached the fairways remains a mystery. But the honored guest did enjoy his visit. During a press interview in his hotel room, while seated "at a portable typewriter table ... diligently plying a fountain pen," he reminisced:

'I think that Cincinnati is one of the most homelike cities we have visited on our tour,' Mr. Roosevelt said. 'Never before have I felt so much at home as at the services at Christ Church this morning and at dinner with Mr. William A. Julian's

75 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 18, 1920.
76 Telegram, Early to FDR, October 15, 1920.
77 Telegram, FDR to Marx, October 15, 1920.
family . . . It will be with genuine regret that I leave for Detroit at 7 o'clock this evening.\textsuperscript{78}

Choice of Subject and Speech Goal

Roosevelt's choice of subject and speech goal at Cincinnati corresponded exactly with the St. Louis address. The "advance man" encouraged him to deal with the League of Nations "in detail with particular reference to Germany getting on feet etc."\textsuperscript{79} This suggestion was offered as a reminder to appease the influential German-American element in the southern Ohio city. The day of his arrival, one local newspaper noted: "He is making the League of Nations the principal issue of his campaign and calling attention to the lightning changes of Warren G. Harding, Republican candidate, who has had a number of distinct changes of mind on the league since he was nominated."\textsuperscript{80}

FDR's goal was to defend the League, to expose the fallacies of GOP anti-League arguments, and to make it clear that the Democrats were willing to accept certain reservations. He apparently was successful in clarifying these goals because the \textit{Enquirer} observed: "Most of the address of Mr. Roosevelt was devoted to the League of Nations, which he indorsed absolutely, but

\textsuperscript{78}Cincinnati \textit{Tribune}, October 18, 1920.

\textsuperscript{79}Telegram, Early to FDR, October 15, 1920.

\textsuperscript{80}Cincinnati \textit{Post}, October 16, 1920.
declared that both Governor Cox and himself were not opposed to any clarifying interpretations which would safeguard the United States. On the train "En route Cincinnati to Grand Rapids," FDR wrote: "Things are really going vastly better. The President's judgment that the League would be the only true issue is wholly borne out."

Premises and Methods of Proof

Roosevelt developed the League of Nations topic far more extensively than he had done in St. Louis. He did not presuppose that the listeners understood the advantages to be gained by joining the organization. Possibly he was more precise because Early warned that Cincinnati was "a strong Republican community."

He historically explained past American international policy, revealed how the League would operate within the framework of future policy, and answered the GOP charges against the League. His premises formed the following hypothetical syllogism:

Major premise: If the United States consistently follows its traditional role in international affairs, it must join the League of Nations.

---

81 October 17, 1920.
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Minor premise: The United States must follow consistently its traditional role in international affairs.

Conclusion: Therefore, the United States must join the League of Nations.

The premises were developed throughout the text of the address, as the following excerpts indicate:

I picked up an old volume containing the messages of President Washington to the Congress of the United States, and in those messages was paragraph after paragraph with reference to the duty which this country owes to other nations.

Did not James Monroe say to the world in 1821, 'We guarantee the territorial integrity of those nations against external aggression'[?]

There are still some people in this audience that still do not know the fact that this [is] a direct quotation from Article Ten of the Covenant of the League of Nations . . .

Through all of our history we have fought for principle. We have established over the years the right to say to the world, 'We are an unselfish nation, with a mission in the world. We care about the rights of the downtrodden people . . .'

We have done our part . . . insofar as through our leadership we have brought the nations of the earth around the table in this solemn covenant . . . they are carrying out the covenant in a spirit of high purpose. The same kind of a spirit that Americans had carried out what our fathers sought to obtain in the Constitution of the United States in 1788. Why, the nations of the world are meeting almost every day and they are taking up problems for the benefit of mankind . . . They are doing it, and we are absent . . . They are going as slowly
as they can in the hopes that we will come along and help them . . . .

You have got to go into the Association. 84

In order to enforce these premises, an impressive assortment of supporting material was applied. Roosevelt called upon the New York headquarters for additional references before moving into Ohio. George White promised: "I will have information for you at Cincinnati." 85 FDR talked to his headquarters manager by phone on October 15 and, after asking for more information, expressed his disgust "that hardly anybody has seen a copy of the Covenant." 86 Unlike the St. Louis address, he decided that a rather complete explanation of League machinery and activity was necessary.

Testimony continued to be a popular segment of logical proof. Some of these sources were identified vaguely as "people began to say," "an independent voter back in my own county on the Hudson River," "a woman came to me and said," "A man came up to me the other day in West Virginia," and "Over in Minneapolis . . . an old woman tottered up on the stage." 87 Other testimony derived from

84 Carbon typescript (complete), in "FDR Speech File, Campaign of 1920," Cincinnati, Ohio, October 16, 1920, pp. 2, 4, 8, 15-16, 17. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations from the Cincinnati address are taken from this manuscript which will be referred to hereafter as: FDR Cincinnati Speech.

85 Telegram, White to FDR, October 14, 1920.

86 Memorandum, McCarthy to White, October 16, 1920.

87 FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 2, 4, 5, 18-19.
historical sources, which included "a Naval Officer ... Stephen Decatur, Commodore Decatur" and "James Monroe, the President of the United States." Of course, there were references to "what I have been saying," "what Governor Cox has been saying for weeks and months," ideas "made clear by Governor Cox ... made clear by President Wilson." A final friendly testimonial was "Pope Benedict himself."\textsuperscript{88}

In an effort to refute the position taken by his political opposition, FDR cited several of the leading GOP campaigners. He persisted to contest the remarks made by "the Governor of the State just across the river, Governor Morrow of Kentucky," and "Governor Coolidge of Massachusetts." Naturally, Harding continued to be the primary target. The audience was reminded of the Senator's Baltimore speech "when he said in reply to the question as to what his foreign policy was, said, 'Frankly, I am at the present without any constructive specific policy in foreign affairs.'"\textsuperscript{89} FDR was wise to exploit this statement to the fullest extent because it had caused considerable unrest in the Republican camp and created a belligerent press reaction.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., pp. 1, 3, 4, 12, 18.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., pp. 6, 9-10, 14.
\textsuperscript{90} For example, see "The Story of the Week: Has Harding Scrapped the League?" The \textit{Independent}, CIV (October 16, 1920), 89.
At this point, he referred to a published statement signed by thirty-one prominent "gentlemen in New York" who "said that they stood absolutely in line with Senator Harding as Senator Harding expressed himself in his speech of August 28th." Some of these men formerly had supported the League to Enforce Peace and Roosevelt exclaimed:

August 28th!! I do not know how many different positions he [Senator Harding] has taken since then. Why, it was back on August 28th that he intimated... he was in favor of the existing League with certain modifications. August 28th, and they quoted him that way on October 13th. And what has happened in the meantime? Why, the Baltimore speech for instance, two weeks ago last Monday... afterwards he kept on going, made a lot more speeches and up in Des Moines, Iowa, a week ago last Thursday he made the famous speech in which he told the nation, 'Governor Cox is in favor of going into the League of Nations, I am in favor of staying out and I turn my back on any reservations or amendments.'

This excellent chain of argument not only revealed Harding's opposition to the League in its existing form, but also disclosed that he was opposed to any amendments. Even the Republican press admitted: "Harding urged the U. S. to stay out of the League of Nations altogether." Charles McCarthy called Roosevelt's attention to the emphasis on Harding's "speech of August 28th" and forwarded press clippings to show that the list of signees included "a few college professors to cover up the terrible showing of the

---

91_ PUR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 13-14.
92_ Wheeling _Intelligencer_, October 8, 1920.
Reactionaries. The Democrats pursued this same strategy and came out with a list of "121 representative men and women, who in other years supported the Republican or Progressive tickets," but announced on October 17 "that they would vote for Cox and Roosevelt."

A final quotation was inserted into the speech to destroy the value of Harding's argument through reductio ad absurdum:

Do you think Senator Harding could go to the other nations and say, 'Gentlemen, I hereby' -- no, not 'notify', the word Senator Harding used the other day in Kansas City when he was trying to put across something nebulous like that? He said he wanted to 'dictate' -- get it -- an American association to the rest of the world. And do you think that the rest of the world will take it? Do you think they will scrap the present League, that they will tear down the structure they have built up? Do you think they will forget the toils of Paris of this year and last year, and accumulate and sell the machinery, and at the dictation of the President of a nation outside the League accept what he puts up? A vote for Harding is to stay out; a vote for Cox is a vote to go in with every American right protected.

Historical examples played a key part in establishing the precedent for the Democrat's opposition to the isolationists' philosophy. As "particular examples," he recalled "1792, 1793, 1794 and 1795," when George Washington advocated "the preservation of the

---

93 Letter and Telegram, McCarthy to FDR, October 15, 1920.
95 FDR Cincinnati Speech, p. 18.
right of the peoples to sail with their commerce... in safety and happiness." This principle was exemplified by the "war down in the West Indies for the suppression of piracy," the war "against the Barbary Powers... on the coast of Africa," the battles "in 1805" to "put an end forever to the pirates that infested the north coast of Africa and the south shore of the Mediterranean," and "the war of 1812" against England "for the freedom of the seas." Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine of 1821 was carried out "in 1898, down there in Cuba," when "we" told "the old world powers that... we were going to make Cuba a free Republic."\(^{96}\)

Contemporary examples revealed the dishonest and contradictory positions taken by the Republicans. A cartoon was printed showing "poor old Uncle Sam on the verge of a precipice being firmly pushed over the edge by six dangerous characters labeled England, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, India and South Africa." FDR later statistically refuted the validity of the "lying title, 'ENGLAND HAS SIX VOTES TO OUR ONE IN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS'." In addition, he recalled "a great meeting held in Indianapolis a year ago, May 28, 1919, a great meeting for the ratification of the League of Nations' Covenant." Some of those "prominent Republicans," such as William Howard Taft and Doctor A. Lawrence Lowell, now opposed the League.\(^{97}\)

---

\(^{96}\) Ibid., pp. 2-3, 8.

\(^{97}\) Ibid., pp. 6, 10.
The other contemporary examples were used positively to show the power and effectiveness of the world organization. An instance of superb, timely, direct refutation is found in the following remarks:

... 41 nations of the earth are today in the League of Nations and it is a going concern. Harding called it a failure, he called it a 'monumental fraud' in a speech before some GAR veterans. And while he was saying that, within 24 hours of his speech, the news came that the Council of the League of Nations had averted its first war -- Sweden and Finland about to take up arms over the question of ownership of some islands had agreed that the League should decide the matter. That was Senator Harding's failure and fraud. Later on -- the League had not only prevented war. Poland and Lithuania had been fighting. The League had stepped in ... Poland and Lithuania ended that war. That is Senator Harding's failure and fraud.98

An example was combined with statistical evidence when it was disclosed:

... Switzerland ... which has for centuries kept out of entangling alliances, Switzerland, more jealous of her own right to run her own international relations in her own way, Switzerland, the other day, held a referendum on the League of Nations and the men and women of Switzerland voted two to one to go into the League and today Switzerland is a member because the people of Switzerland realize that the two great purposes of the Swiss Republic were bound up in the League itself, first of those, the respect of and the protection to the rights of the smaller peoples of the world, and secondly, the keeping down of the armaments of the world ... 99

98 Ibid., p. 15.
99 Ibid., p. 16.
FDR supplemented his "question of disarmament" with an analogy. He reminded the listeners that "every other citizen goes heeled" in "any community when two or three dangerous characters are permitted to roam the streets with six shooters on their hips firing them at occasional passersby." He suggested pecuniary reasons as to why League membership would work to the advantage of the "farmers out West in Kansas and Nebraska" and the people "in the manufacturing districts, too," because "we" have "become a nation that trades with all the world."\textsuperscript{100} Two hypothetical examples were mentioned, which stated that Lodge would have opposed the Monroe Doctrine in 1821, and Harding would have lacked patriotism in 1917-1918, if their campaign speeches were applied to those periods.\textsuperscript{101} Roosevelt merely was implying that, regardless of the historical setting, both Lodge and Harding failed to typify the American ideal of international cooperation.

FDR balanced his testimony and examples with numerous statistical points. He utilized figures loosely to show the magnitude of time and size by such declarations as "about four columns long," "can read it in fifteen minutes," "several thousand or rather several million copies," "fully two thirds of the front part," "about five minutes," "nine out of ten," "a hundred fold

\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 7, 9.
almost," and "by the hundreds and thousands." He was more exact in pointing to "a hundred and fifteen years ago," "only seven years later," "ninety nine years ago," "one of the thirty one who signed," and "thirty one of them."103

He used numerical evidence to prove that England would not have a six to one voting advantage:

They have got to get a unanimous vote in the Council before they can recommend. That means nine, for there are only nine members in the Council . . . there are five big powers and four smaller powers. The five larger powers are Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States; (if we go in); and the smaller powers in the Council are Belgium, Brazil, Spain and Greece. They are the nine; where are the six votes . . . in the governing body of the League?104

He proceeded to ask: "Have you ever realized that forty one nations are in the League, that Germany and Austria will soon become members of the League? That will be forty three then, and four outside. I think you know that quartet of nations."105 This prediction turned out to be entirely accurate.106 Finally, Roosevelt used the following arguments against Harding:

102 Ibid., pp. 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13.
103 Ibid., pp. 3, 10, 13.
104 Ibid., p. 11.
Think of it, a man six years a Senator, a man two years a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, a man for three months the standard bearer of a great party, and he tells this nation he is without any constructive specific policy in foreign affairs. 107

The Cincinnati address included more individual items of logical evidence and reflected the most exhaustive research of the seven speeches analyzed. These proofs were divided rather equally between testimony, examples, and statistics. Obviously, FDR recognized the necessity for presenting detailed information in precisely defining the advantages offered by League membership.

Ethical appeals, which centered around an approach to character, were evenly distributed between building up the mission of the Democrats and degrading the principles of the GOP. FDR visualized his effort to be one which was above partisan politics:

I would like to be able, in my small way, to help in bringing the great issues of this campaign in person before every man and woman voter in every State of the Union . . . . I began to realize that there was something bigger than party, and the people in this campaign were discussing issues that were bigger than party.

I do not believe that I am as good a party man as I was in the beginning of this campaign. I think you will see a little how deeply I feel, but not in my election, not Governor Cox's election . . . but how deeply I feel that the great purpose for which we fought . . . should be decided right by the American people . . . . 108


108 Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 19.
The opposition made a poor contrast to these noble goals:

... you will find Republican candidates, yes the chief of them all, Senator Harding and others, going around this country talking about the Democratic position, deliberately misrepresenting it, and telling the citizens that Governor Cox and I want to go into that League and insist on going in without any reservation or any amendment; just in the same way they tell you that President Wilson declined to change the crossing of a 'T' or the dotting of an 'I'. And the man who does that is politically dishonest ... Senator Harding ... will try, and the rest will try by November second to persuade [sic] you that if you elect a Democrat ... you will be doing a terrible thing .... Almost everything connected with that Republican campaign about this big issue has been a deliberate attempt to prevent the truth. In their pamphlets, in their posters and in almost everything, they have gone back and have overlooked this or that, and have quoted only the parts helping them.109

Roosevelt's virtuous mission was depicted in a friendly newspaper two days before he arrived in Ohio. It noted that his "specialty is to keep track of the 'wiggles' and the 'wobbles' of Warren G. Harding ... and telling the public about them. His is a difficult task, for wiggle follows wobble in continuous succession, as Harding flits about the country, changing his views from day to day."110

Sagacity often was combined with high character to show that the candidate was fully cognizant of current developments:

I have travelled now in well over thirty States of the Union ... I knew about your Governor ...
but frankly I was surprised in my travels to find out through the West, far off in the distant corners of the East, the extraordinary knowledge that men and women had of the things which he had done for your State. . . .

I make this prophecy because I have been somewhat acquainted with the campaign the Republican managers are waging against the League of Nations. . . . we know pretty well what each new move will be and we have not been surprised in this campaign. . . .

. . . . and on the public platform, and in my presence. . . .

. . . . I have read the Covenant so often I can see no reason for doubt. . . .

And I know something about the relative power among the navies of the world.\textsuperscript{111}

Good will was expressed throughout the address with fifteen variations of the terms "my friends," "my good friends," "my friend," and "my old friend."\textsuperscript{112} He referred to Cox as "your great Governor" and to the electorate as one "of intelligence." His opening statements constituted the most extensive effort to gain a friendly hearing:

After that introduction by my old friend, Bob Marx, I think I must feel a good deal the way Mark Twain did after hearing his own obituary. But I can assure you that I am not dead by a long shot. It is a very great pleasure to come here to Cincinnati. . . .\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{111} FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 1, 5, 9, 10-11, 17.

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., pp. 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 20.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., pp. 1, 2.
Finally, his **ethos** was enhanced considerably by the presence of Mrs. Roosevelt. The Cincinnati Post proudly observed: "In fact, there will be two Democratic Roosevelts at Emery Auditorium. The other is the wife of the Democratic candidate. She, too, is related by birth to the Roosevelt who was president." However, this same publication erroneously added: "She has accompanied her husband on all his campaign tours . . . ."

The emotional proofs followed a progression of changing moods. At the outset, the speaker was vigorous and aggressive in declaring: "I have come here full of fighting spirit, fully able to go through with this campaign, not merely for the next two weeks but even if it were to last for two months to come." Then, he visualized a politically honest Democratic Party because "I had been out there to that great convention at San Francisco, and had seen them at work in the open, every move before your eyes and nothing in a locked room of a hotel." Next, he became concerned with the humane side of international relations:

And so when the world war came, and the great catastrophe spread over Europe, the peoples of the world looked to us for an expression of something they had in their hearts . . . . [to] put international relations on the same scale and plane that the relations between individuals had been since the days of Christianity.

[The League of Nations] will affect not merely human slavery in a small section of the earth, but

---
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will save the lives of countless human beings, boys and girls, all over the world in the generations to come.\textsuperscript{115}

He challenged the morality of wasting tax money on armaments, of associating with disreputable countries that were outside the League, and of going against the wishes of clergymen and teachers. These contentions were developed in the latter portion of the speech, as follows:

\ldots if you want your army to cost you half billion dollars a year to keep it going up and up and up, and shell factories and powder factories and military preparations on every side, then adopt your policy of staying with Russia, Mexico and Turkey, and tell the rest of the world we do not care what they do, you can go into it, but not us.

The churches are behind this movement \ldots take a poll of the men and women of education who are bringing up our boys and girls, and you will find nine out of ten are for the League \ldots Does that mean anything to you, that the teachers of the land are behind it as well as the churches\textsuperscript{116}

The concluding pathetic proofs played upon the emotions of those whose friends and relatives were killed in the recent war. A man who lost two sons "reached up to the platform of my car and took hold of my hand with both of his and said, 'Mr. Roosevelt, God bless you'." He added, "'I want you to go round telling the mothers and fathers of this country that the sacrifice of their boys and my boys

\textsuperscript{115}FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 1, 2, 8, 15.

\textsuperscript{116}Ibid., pp. 17, 18.
must not be in vain.'" A woman over ninety years of age gave him two medals, a Croix de Guerre and a Distinguished Service Cross, which were won by her deceased grandson. She asked FDR "'to have these and carry them around in the campaign'' as a reminder that other children should be spared "'the horrors of war.'"\textsuperscript{117} Therefore, his pathos moved from the "fighting" opening remarks to the sadness suffered by individual American citizens.

Obviously, the evidence which contributed to logical, ethical, and emotional appeals was in greater volume than in earlier speeches. Most of the specific citations were selected carefully and developed with skill. In the Cincinnati speech, Roosevelt made a conscientious effort to clarify America's international relations of the past, to point to the problems and solutions of the contemporary conflicts, and to chart a course for the future. It was a valiant effort which deserves high praise for the proficient and adept application of supporting materials.

Speech Structure

The central thought, which called for American entry into the League of Nations, was pointed out clearly in the statement: "You have got to go into the Association."\textsuperscript{118} This thesis was supported by four major points, as shown by the following brief:

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., pp. 18-19.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., p. 17.
I. League goals are consistent with past American international obligations, for

A. George Washington outlined these obligations in his messages, for

1. He said we must protect "American shores and American commerce."

2. He said we must preserve the right of others to sail "in safety and happiness."

B. We fought to uphold Washington's principles, for

1. We suppressed piracy in the West Indies.

2. We fought the Barbary Powers "to make the Mediterranean Sea safe for the commerce of the world."

3. In 1805, we ended the pirate threat "that infested the north coast of Africa."

4. In 1812, we fought England "for the freedom of the seas."

C. The Monroe Doctrine was established to protect small nations from "external aggression."

II. League goals are consistent with future American international obligations, for

A. The League Charter is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine, for
1. It recognizes the individual national rights of governmental "self-determination."

2. Article X guarantees "the territorial integrity" of all nations "against external aggression."

B. We are an "unselfish nation" with a "mission in the world," for
   1. We care about "the downtrodden people."
   2. We care about "the rights of small nations," for
      a. We fought to make Cuba "a free Republic."
      b. We fought "a war to end war" in 1917-1918.

III. The Republican Party has distorted the goals of the League, for

   A. It has failed to inform the people about the League Covenant, for
      1. The GOP has not printed separate copies of the Covenant for wide scale distribution.
      2. The GOP "did not have nerve enough to put it in their campaign text book."

   B. It has tried merely to frighten the American voters, for
      1. The GOP has discredited President Wilson unfairly.
2. The GOP has advocated falsely a "position of isolation," for
   a. Its leaders lied about Canada being forced to send troops to Poland.
   b. Its leaders lied about England having six League votes to our one.
   c. Governor Morrow lied about American boys going to "Siam" and to "Timbuctoo" [sic].

3. The GOP "campaign is based on an appeal to ignorance," for
   a. Its leaders do not know geography.
   b. Its leaders do not know history.

C. Senator Harding has distorted America's international ideals, for
   1. He said our war mission was merely to defeat the German armies.
   2. He advocated signing a separate peace treaty with Germany.
   3. He admitted being "without any constructive specific policy in foreign affairs."
   4. He called the League a "monumental fraud."

D. Governor Coolidge has contradicted his position, for
   1. He praised President Wilson and the League in 1919.
2. He subscribes to GOP condemnation of Wilson and the League in 1920.

E. Other major GOP politicians have been unfair with the League, for

1. Lodge and Taft offered suggestions and changes to the Covenant.

2. The amendments were adopted.

3. These men now oppose the Covenant, as amended, for

   a. Lodge and Taft support Harding in 1920.
   b. Thirty-one prominent Republicans of the League to Enforce Peace support Harding in 1920, for

      (1) They support his August 28 speech.
      (2) They ignore his later speeches.

4. They "put party ahead of the good of the nation," for

   a. They have sold "themselves out for a political reason."
   b. They "misstate things" during "a campaign."

F. It has ignored the effectiveness of the League, for

1. Forty-one nations have joined.

2. The League has succeeded, for
a. It averted a war between Sweden and Finland.
b. It ended the fighting between Poland and Lithuania.

3. It has considered important labor and health problems.

IV. The Democratic Party has been honest in dealing with League goals, for

A. We explained the operation of the League Council, for

1. We revealed that any policy must have unanimous consent of the nine members.

2. We proved that England does not have six votes to our one.

B. We guaranteed the protection of American Constitutional rights, for

1. We will accept the Hitchcock reservations.

2. We will make other necessary alterations.

C. We advocated "going into the League of Nations," for

1. It is dangerous to remain outside, for

   a. Undesirable countries are not members, for

      (1) Russia is not a member.
(2) Turkey is not a member.

(3) Mexico is not a member.

b. Other nations will be suspicious of American goals.

2. It is expensive to remain outside, for

a. We will have to build costly armaments.

b. We will lose foreign trade markets.

3. It is immoral to remain outside, for

a. Churches support the League.

b. Colleges and universities support the League.

Obviously, this speech was lengthy and each major division contained a considerable number of sub-points. The introduction was devoted to ethical and to emotional appeals and was devoid of a central idea or a preview of main points. The body loosely progressed through a consideration of past, present, and future national and international circumstances. The material would have been clearer if the speaker had numbered his points and rallied the supporting material more distinctly under each heading. The lack of "signposts" definitely hampered speech structure in the long, twenty page manuscript. Roosevelt apparently desired to conclude his speech at several points, but the listeners "compelled him to continue."¹¹⁹ This factor undoubtedly imposed trying conditions on

¹¹⁹Cincinnati Tribune, October 17, 1920.
the rhetorical craftsmanship of the two-hour address. A summation of the central thought and the major ideas was not offered. The conclusion merely appealed for the "moral force of America" to "restore this nation to the leadership of the world."\textsuperscript{120}

The candidate hampered the orderly sequence of his points by straying occasionally from the topic under consideration. He could not resist interjecting the promise: "I will tell you a story about Senator Lodge in a minute." Several statements later he redeemed this promise by adding: "I was going to tell you a story; I see no harm in telling it." Then, he admitted: "It has not much to do with the thing we are talking about." However, he told it anyway. The humorous anecdote, relayed to FDR in Kansas City by Reverend Burris Jenkins, was constructed around the famous remark made by Kansas Senator Ingalls: "'I have met Lodge. I should say it is a case of thin soil intensively cultivated.'" After concluding the story, Roosevelt returned to historical events of the nineteenth century by saying: "But to get back to the point."\textsuperscript{121} A Kansas City newspaper described his original enjoyment upon initially hearing this narrative:

Roosevelt, youthfully impetuous in delight, doubled up like a ball on the stage of the Iris theater last night when another speaker told a

\textsuperscript{120} FDR Cincinnati Speech, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., p. 7.
new story on Senator Lodge. Before he had risen
. . . bent over in his chair and drawing his
feet high from the floor time and again, Mr.
Roosevelt gave vent to uncontrolable laughter.

Even though it damaged his Cincinnati organizational pattern, he
could not resist the temptation to use satire.

Use of Language

While the total length of the Cincinnati address was almost
twice as long as any other speech analyzed, the sentence length was
comparable with the other addresses. In 330 statements, the mean
sentence-length was 25.3. Similar to the St. Louis address, the
means for the introduction and the conclusion exceeded the mean for
the body. The only Cincinnati manuscript available includes the
initials "CAM" and the notation: "Reported by R. F. Camalier that
same night." It is unknown whether Camalier duplicated the text
from the original speaking copy, or transcribed the words in
shorthand while listening to the presentation. At any rate, the
secretary's typewritten document stylistically corresponds to the
other speeches in this study.

This address contained many common idioms and homely
expressions. The speaker used such terms as "old fashioned system,"
"old fashioned kind of Americanism," "thank Heavens," "the seven

123Mean sentence-lengths were as follows: Introduction-
32.9; Body- 24.4; Conclusion- 34.2.
seas," "I take off my hat to that woman," "did not have nerve enough," "For goodness sake," "one of the 48 States in the Union," "on everybody's tongue," "the people we fought with shoulder to shoulder," "that is what has been handed out to you," "long-winded discussion," and "it will come back home here in our own pocketbooks." He combined idioms with bombast in promising "to put it down in black and white, in plain English, not Marion, Ohio, English." He concluded with Biblical terminology by declaring that "the truth shall make us free."  

Synonyms were used to clarify a specific word or phrase, such as the following references: "to impress the seamen, to drag human beings out of the ships"; "little republics, small peoples, little able to take care of themselves, weak in numbers and power... they are small and weak, in danger of being attacked"; "these nations shall live their national life in freedom... they shall maintain their independence, work out their own system of government"; and "constitutional government... republics based on our own system." The candidate united metaphors and synonyms by identifying "Article Ten" as "that dangerous thing, that bogie, that ghost that has been called up before our eyes for months."

124 FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 15, 17.
125 Ibid., pp. 12, 20.
126 Ibid., pp. 3-4, 12.
127 Ibid., p. 4.
Words were employed repetitiously to indicate quantity or growth, such as "more and more," "paragraph after paragraph," "State after State," "dozens of them . . . . dozens of instances . . . . a dozen times," and "day after day." Other repetitious phrases were utilized for emphasis, as shown by the following: "They knew about the details of legislation, they knew about the things which he had promised"; "to insure the result . . . . to insure the carrying out"; "the gentlemen who have more money, the gentlemen on the other side"; "frighten America out of the League, frighten her so much that we would wish to maintain a position of isolation, frighten her so much that we could take that stand"; "thru its leaders, its leaders of both parties"; "a peace would come, a peace resulting"; "when we got into the war, when we got in"; "in case of aggression, or the threat of aggression . . . . to prevent aggression . . . . to stop aggression . . . . threatened aggression"; "taking up problems . . . . taking up labor questions, questions of sanitation . . . . taking up the questions of woman's slavery, children's slavery"; and "quarreling about the interpretation of words, quarreling about this article and that article and the other article." Parallel sentence structure, a product of repetitious wording, was detected less frequently than in most of the other

---

128 Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 5, 6, 12.
129 Ibid., pp. 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 15-16.
speeches. However, the nominee did develop the following parallelisms: "They talked about something to be gained from the war . . . They talked about an association of nations"; "You have the opportunity in this country to vote it from the selfish point of view. You have the opportunity to think in terms of dollars."130

As previously shown, several ideas were designed in parallel form within a single sentence.

Short, pungent metaphors were produced to add impressiveness and vividness, as shown by such comments as "blindly following a party," "the football of politics," "threw down the gauntlet to the great power of England," "Poor old Uncle Sam . . . one felt sorry for him in such company," "boys being lifted out of our homes," "they were all preaching this gospel . . . Harding . . . preached this gospel," "the greatest somersault ever committed in American public life," "cutting off that nation . . . boycott it, kick it out of polite society," "the country is swinging to us," "they could twist the language," "he got loose on a public platform," and "Harding answered the question right out of his own head."131

Slightly longer metaphors also appeared when FDR referred to:

... constitutionally doubting Thomases . . .
people of both sexes who are from Missouri, they want to be shown . . . Cox and I have been

---

130 Ibid., pp. 8, 17.
131 Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8-9, 10, 11, 13, 14.
going up and down this country . . . removing the doubts and the doubting Thomases and others.

'. . . we will hurry along the road and catch you . . .' And the nations said, 'We wish we could wait for you, but we must keep on the road to destiny. We expect you . . . to catch us on the highway' . . . . They want us to be the keystone of the arch.

We are beginning to understand that our daily life is wrapped up in the daily life of other peoples. So from the selfish point of view you can build a Chinese Wall if you want to.\(^{132}\)

The extended metaphor was never developed, although many metaphoric figures of speech contributed to a lively oral style.

The striking, pungent phrase apparently did not make a lasting impression. The Cincinnati Enquirer reported: "At frequent intervals throughout his entire address Mr. Roosevelt was interrupted by outbursts of cheering. His remarks took well with the big crowd. Loud outbursts of applause greeted the mention of President Wilson's name."\(^{133}\) Therefore, the auditors appreciated his remarks, but apparently no one statement became a brief slogan or a catchy quotation.

A steady flow of bombast was directed against the opposition in general and against specific individuals by name. He condemned the "cynics left in the old school of diplomacy"; "the Lodges, the Hardings and the Tafts"; and "men who . . . sell themselves out for

\(^{132}\) Ibid., pp. 12, 16, 17.

\(^{133}\) October 17, 1920.
a political reason . . . they will not only misstate things . . .

they were really misrepresenting things." He reserved biting
invective for "the eminent 31 gentlemen" who

have gone back to August 28th deliberately, oh, I
hope not deliberately, I hope accidentally. They
have believed that August 28th was the last
utterance of Mr. Harding on the subject. I like
to be charitable and if I said anything else . . .
I would be accusing these 31 gentlemen of
something very ungentlemanly.

As a result of these circumstances, "we are the partners of the

Bolsheviks [sic] of Russia, the Turks and the Mexicans -- a charming
company we are keeping today." FDR's denunciations became
especially harsh when he pointed to "the lying picture," "a lying
title," "these lies," "the nasty lie," and "the old stale lie."^

He singled out Chairman Hays, Governor Morrow, Senator Lodge,
and Senator Harding for individual attacks in the following
excerpts:

I could tell you about the deliberate untruths
that have been handed out by Mr. Will Hays and
his organization . . . .

... Governor Morrow of Kentucky, addressed an
audience in a small place the other day -- I
suppose because it was a small place he thought
he could get away with it . . . . I would suggest
to my good friends in Kentucky that they should
give him an opportunity of going to school and
learning geography. But you know this whole

134 FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 8, 10, 13, 14, 15.

135 Ibid., pp. 6, 11, 13.
campaign is based on an appeal to ignorance . . . an appeal to our baser elements . . . an appeal to our fears rather than our faith.

. . . Senator Lodge . . . would have gone around in 1821, with his satellites [sic], and he would have said to the good women of the country, the mothers, 'My good woman . . . do you realize the awful dangers in the Monroe Doctrine, what would happen to your dear boy[?] Do you realize that under this Monroe Doctrine, they can take him out of your home, send him down there to Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, Peru, Bolivia and all the rest of the world to fight somebody else's battles[?] Why, my friends, if we had only known that there would have been no such thing as the Monroe Doctrine. But, thank God, the Senators of 1821 were made of sterner stuff than they are today.

'. . . we will tell the other nations [that] . . . all the peoples of the world may go to the Devil.' And yet is not that exactly what Senator Harding has been saying on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays for the last two months[?] Or perhaps I am wrong, it may be Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays.136

A sympathetic publication concluded that "Mr. Roosevelt's address bristled with pointed thrusts at the political tactics of the Republican workers, and at several points he hurled barbed references at what he termed deliberate misstatements inspired by the opposing party."137 With some justification, a GOP newspaper struck back at the crude form of several condemnations:

According to Mr. Roosevelt, practically all the leaders of the Republican Party are liars and mean seekers after office. Root, Taft, Hughes,

136 Ibid., pp. 6-7, 9.

137 Cincinnati Enquirer, October 17, 1920.
Lowell and other pioneers in the cause of world peace, he hinted, are supporting Harding through hope of individual gain. And during the course of his speech he made a personal attack on Harding which was far beyond the limits of political decency.138

The "attack on Harding" did not necessarily go any farther "beyond the limits" of any speech given in the 1920 campaign, but the references to "lies" and "lying" did show poor taste.

On two occasions, Roosevelt made it clear that he was not including the rank and file Republicans in his censorious utterances:

... I began to get out campaigning and rubbing elbows, not with just Democrats, but with Republicans, Independents, Prohibitionists and Socialists in these different States of ours.

I want to emphasize the point, as I did at the very outset of this campaign, that our quarrel is not this year against the rank and file of the Republican Party, our campaign is not against the men and women who have done so much to make the Republican Party in the past a great party, a progressive party, but our quarrel is and always will be with the type of men whom Theodore Roosevelt fought in 1912, the type of men, my friends, who remain absolutely and unequivocally in control of the machinery of the Republican Party today.139

All during the campaign, he reached out to woo third party and dissident elements of the GOP into the Democratic fold.

139 FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 2, 5.
In 330 sentences, third person pronouns were uttered on 346 occasions, and first person pronouns were applied 335 times. The second person, which was not used often in the earlier addresses, appeared in eighty-two instances. Therefore, pronominal directness continued to be an important facet of oral style and contributed markedly to the conversational language.

At Cincinnati, FDR asked twenty-six rhetorical questions and five direct questions. These thirty-one interrogatives constituted almost as many as the total number for the other six addresses included in this study. His queries frequently were used in a collective series and even in parallel structure as shown below:

And do you think that the rest of the world will take it[?] Do you think they will scrap the present League, that they will tear down the structure they have built up[?] Do you think they will forget the toils of Paris . . . and at the dictation of the President of a nation outside the League accept what he puts up[?] 140

Teddy Roosevelt's name was used twice and FDR referred to "splendid education" and "splendid force." 141 Yet, there was no extensive attempt to imitate the ex-President's style.

The Cincinnati speech reflected similar language devices which were noted in earlier addresses. Major differences were noted in the lack of striking phrases, the multiple number of questions,

---
140Ibid., p. 18.
141Ibid., pp. 5, 8, 18, 20.
and the preponderance of bitter sarcasm which at times was excessively caustic.

Delivery

Roosevelt's delivery was praised highly by the press. He was described as a "big attraction" who "more than came up to expectations. Although a polished orator, he talked to his audience in a business-like manner and was given an ovation by the multitude." On the League of Nations, he "Waxes Eloquent." He was "Confident and serene over the prospect of victory and tremendously militant." Following the statement "I hope that Kentucky is ashamed of its Governor," a voice from the gallery shouted, "We are ashamed of him!" An opposition newspaper even published these laudatory remarks:

Personally, Mr. Roosevelt is a man of unusual attraction, in appearance and in manner. He is good-looking and has a good voice. Evidently a man of culture, he began his speech with an appearance of boyish frankness which was most appealing.

FDR's "good voice" apparently was giving him some difficulty at this point in the campaign. At Sedalia, Missouri, a week before reaching Cincinnati, he complained, "My voice has been pretty ragged,

---

142 Cincinnati Tribune, October 17, 1920.
143 As quoted in Cincinnati Enquirer, October 17, 1920.
144 Editorial, Cincinnati Times-Star, October 18, 1920.
but it is getting better."\textsuperscript{145} In Canton, Illinois, five days before the Ohio appearance, he contended, "I am still alive and going fairly strong, tho' my voice is that of a crow!"\textsuperscript{146} On October 15, he "was suffering slightly with hoarseness" after delivering ten outdoor speeches and covering over 100 miles of dusty roadway in Indiana.\textsuperscript{147} In opening the Cincinnati speech, he recognized the fact that "I have left part of my voice on the trails of Indiana during the past week."\textsuperscript{148}

Regardless of this shortcoming, "Mr. Sinnott of the Newark Evening News who has just returned from the West and Middle West" reported that FDR "made a very fine impression." He concluded that the nominee's "plain talk" and "willingness to more than meet the people half way reached the right spot with the people."\textsuperscript{149} Responding to the excited crowd, Roosevelt probably employed physical vigor and animation. He displayed various documents from which he quoted directly. Calling attention to a "telegram that came to me yesterday," he volunteered "to read it to you." Later, he declared, "I hold in my hand a program of a great meeting held in

\textsuperscript{145} Letter, FDR to McCarthy, October 9, 1920.

\textsuperscript{146} Letter, FDR to Daniels, October 11, 1920.

\textsuperscript{147} Indianapolis News, October 16, 1920.

\textsuperscript{148} FDR Cincinnati Speech, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{149} Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 28, 1920.
Indianapolis a year ago.\textsuperscript{150} He was depicted as being "as emphatic of speech and as strenuous of manner as the one who was known as 'T. R.'\textsuperscript{151} However, the comparison with Teddy Roosevelt, Sr., was treated differently in the Republican press. An Indiana newspaper admitted that "those who go to see and hear Mr. Roosevelt doubtless will find him an interesting man," but that he was "NOT MUCH LIKE COLONEL" and "Resembles Illustrious Cousin In Neither Physical Type Nor Party Record."\textsuperscript{152}

Although FDR suffered from hoarseness and there was some disagreement over his resemblance with the former President, his delivery was effective and stimulated favorable reactions from both the auditors and the reporters.

Final Evaluation

Roosevelt spoke before a capacity crowd of 2500 at the Emery Auditorium in Cincinnati. It was necessary to lock the doors and turn away another 2000 persons who clamored to hear the young nominee deal with the League of Nations topic.

His many logical, ethical, and emotional appeals were offered in an attempt to defend the League, to expose the shortcomings of the GOP position, and to show that the Democrats would willingly

\textsuperscript{150}FDR Cincinnati Speech, pp. 4, 10.
\textsuperscript{151}Cincinnati Post, October 16, 1920.
\textsuperscript{152}Kokomo [Indiana] Tribune, October 15, 1920.
accept reservations. These proofs were selected carefully and placed within a framework of past, present, and future events.

The two-hour address invited some obvious difficulties in speech structure. Although the central thought was stated clearly, the major points were not adequately designated. In addition, FDR could not resist the temptation to deviate from the topic and introduce extraneous material. However, the structural pattern was aggravated further by a zealous audience that "compelled him to continue" when he wished to conclude.

His use of language was comparable to the earlier addresses, except for the lack of striking phrases and the multiple number of rhetorical and direct questions. Also, his sarcasm was exceptionally bitter and, at times, even showed poor taste.

His delivery was hampered by an overworked voice which bordered on exhaustion. Yet, he was conversational, vigorous, friendly, and generally effective in speech presentation.

Understandably, the Republican press was hostile in its final appraisal:

"Mr. Roosevelt laid especial emphasis upon the claim—it has been advanced by other politicians!—that he is coming to care more and more for the country and less and less for party . . . . During the great days of his mob appeal, Bryan never put more highly colored nonsense into a single evening’s entertainment than did the polished and suave Mr. Roosevelt in his talk Saturday night."

---

The comparison with Bryan was an interesting one, since FDR was the first campaigner since the Nebraskan to travel as extensively or speak as often.

Roosevelt expressed pleasure "with his reception in Cincinnati" before leaving for a political tour of the state of Michigan.  

Conclusion

Roosevelt's final campaign tour was opened in Missouri on October 4. After meeting with Governor Cox the preceding day, he concentrated on the League of Nations topic in St. Louis. Obviously, he and Cox decided to force this issue during the final month of campaigning. Rather than defend the League, however, he chose to lambast the GOP position and to depict them as political "trimmers." In one of his shortest major speeches of 1920, he extensively developed arguments from Republican quotations, minimized ethos, and instilled both a fighting and a moral tone in his pathos. It was an effective address, although there were minor organizational problems. By writing out the body and using typed inserts in the exordium and peroration, the possibility of collaboration with one or more speech writers was detected.

From Missouri, FDR moved through several western states. During the 1936 Presidential campaign, he referred to some of these

---

154Cincinnati Enquirer, October 18, 1920.
visits in order to gain a friendly hearing, as shown by the following remarks:

At Greeley, Colorado, October 12:

'Good morning. I have just got through breakfast; and I am glad to come back here . . .

'The last time I stood here, I think, was with Mrs. Roosevelt in 1920 when I was running for Vice-President. A lot of things have happened since that time.'

At Pueblo, Colorado, October 12:

'I go back to a good many years, to the campaign of 1920, when I spent most of a day and evening in Pueblo; and I remember that I spent a good part of the evening trying to beat Alva Adams in bowling at the "Y." But I think he was a better bowler than I was.'

And so it went — all around the country. 155

The two-hour address in Cincinnati, on October 16, developed the League subject more completely than the one delivered at St. Louis. Roosevelt not only attacked the opposition, but he defended the League as an exercise in international relations which was consistent with America's historical position. He fully exploited numerous logical, ethical, and emotional proofs. Structural difficulties continued to distract from his overall effectiveness and his bombast became unfair and distasteful on occasion.

155Samuel I. Rosenman, Working with Roosevelt (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 120.
His fatigue, especially noted in vocal delivery, undoubtedly adversely affected the third tour. From Cincinnati, he proceeded through Michigan, northern Ohio, New York, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, and back to New York again. Concerning the 1936 Presidential campaign, Grace Tully notes: "As always, one of his final major campaign addresses was delivered that year in Madison Square Garden on the night of October 31." In 1920, he appeared on a political platform at the Garden with the New York State Democratic candidates on October 30. Apparently, the 1920 tours made a favorable impression on the Vice-Presidential nominee inasmuch as he chose to duplicate his itinerary closely in later national campaigns.


CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND APPRAISAL

Although young in years, Franklin Delano Roosevelt's background in national politics was impressive at the opening of the 1920 campaign. He was twice elected to the New York State Senate, gained administrative experience as Assistant Secretary of the Navy for almost eight years, received campaign exposure in a losing primary fight for the United States Senatorial nomination, completed two European trips in an official capacity, traveled widely and spoke often in the East during the first half of 1920, was nominated Vice-President on the Democratic ticket, and delivered several speeches prior to his official notification in August.

After enjoying a position of executive power for two successive terms, the Democrats faced an unhappy, discontented, and bitter electorate in 1920. The end of international hostility left a wake of economic chaos. Industry suffered from reckless speculation, over-production, inadequate transportation, and "profiteering." Nevertheless, the growing number of small stockholders and the industrial financial conditions tended to increase public sympathy for "Big Business." The labor market reeled under the pressures of strikes, violence, ascending living
costs, decreased wages, unemployment, poor housing, and returning veterans. Farmers were antagonistic toward capital and labor as a result of parasitic middlemen, "tight" money, indebtedness, overproduction, loss of European buyers, declining national demands, transportation problems, falling land prices, and labor shortages which were aggravated by an urban shift in population.

Each of these groups blamed the Federal government for its ills. The businessmen called for greater relaxation in wartime emergency measures, labor organizations attempted to rally the belligerent workers, and the farmers needed unity in publicly and politically airing their complaints. It was easy and simple to single out President Woodrow Wilson as the culprit who propagated all of these circumstances.

The populace was passing through an era of social and religious transition. The nation cleansed its conscience by approving the Eighteenth Amendment and by demanding patriotic "Americanism." Many labor movements were viewed suspiciously as subversive organizations; fundamental religious orders and "do-gooders" frowned upon strong drink; bootleggers thrived; corruption and organized crime increased; minority religious, racial, and political groups often were harassed, imprisoned, convicted, and deported. Nativism and morality were enmeshed and produced social confusion, fear, and frustration. The politician,
the evangelist, and the racist united to manufacture the "Red Scare."

The Administration left the impression of overlooking internal strife by urging the world-wide cooperation as afforded by the League of Nations. The Senate twice turned down American entry into the League and the Democrats decided to declare a national referendum. Overwhelming favorable support was expected from the new women voters. However, voter turnout proved to be disappointing in numbers and subsequent studies revealed that male and female voting habits were not significantly different. The country was politically conservative. The electorate demanded "a change" in executive leadership and a return to "the good old days." Warren G. Harding's plea for "normalcy" seemed to be the desired panacea.

Political issues in 1920 frequently circumvented the national conditions, attitudes, and trends. Confronted by a grave financial lapse at every level, the major party platforms focused on only one economic subject. The Democrats desired a tariff for revenue only, while the Republicans requested a return to the high protective tables. Although the country was embroiled in social turmoil, no campaign issues in this area were forthcoming. However, the candidates bandied about four topics with varying degrees of emphasis:
1. The League of Nations was supported by the Democrats who were willing to introduce necessary reservations. The Republicans were evasive at first and then rejected the world organization. This issue became dominant as the campaign progressed.

2. The Wilson Administration was condemned bitterly by the GOP. The Democrats vacillated on the subject, but FDR did advocate a program of accelerated governmental "efficiency."

3. Illicit political financing and violations of the Corrupt Practices Act became a controversy during August. The Republicans denied such charges and the Democrats lost favor by appearing to overstate their case.

4. Campaign methods, which resulted in the condemnation of Harding's "front porch" tactics, ignited some friction. This topic subsided after Harding and Coolidge consented to make a few appearances.

Therefore, neither party described how it planned to handle most of the challenging national economic, social, and political dilemmas.

Roosevelt faced his assignment with positive determination. He contended:

When we begin this fight we will not look upon a single State in the union as too hopelessly Republican to justify the most energetic effort that can be made
to win it for our cause. We will regard them all as promising Democratic battle grounds and this year as a Democratic year.¹

After preparing the acceptance speech, the nominee assembled a secretariat to assist him on his three campaign tours. As the party's "advance man," Associated Press correspondent Stephen T. Early preceded Roosevelt's private railway car and relayed coded telegrams which included information relative to future speaking engagements. Marvin H. McIntyre, a former newspaperman, received and interpreted Early's messages in addition to managing the car. On the regular staff were Renah F. Camalier, secretary; James P. Sullivan, stenographer; and Thomas M. Lynch, transportation manager. These men assisted the candidate in gathering source material and in writing the speeches. At intermittent intervals, they were aided by Louis Howe, Judge Robert S. Marx, Stanley Prenosil, Lorry Jacobs, and Mrs. Roosevelt. The nominee's New York headquarters was managed by Charles H. McCarthy, who also furnished a constant flow of advice, suggestions, and news items.

FDR's source materials came from his past experiences, reading, conferences, and staff. Although he collaborated with his assistants in preparing the addresses, the discourses were always the final product of his own development and delivery.

Mistakes were bound to occur in such an ambitious undertaking. Taken as a whole, the staff performed efficiently and effectively with only a few exceptions. McCarthy was probably the weakest member of the unit, but the candidate likely recognized his manager's ineptness in some endeavors. Itinerary planning was a major difficulty and many minor transportation problems evolved. However, it is worthy to note that most of the assistants were retained and similar procedures were followed in later campaign efforts.

The analysis of the first tour included the speeches delivered at Hyde Park, Chicago, and Seattle. The Hyde Park acceptance address was delivered from the gaily decorated porch of the family's ancestral estate to an open-air audience of 10,000 noisy local residents and national political leaders on August 9. FDR advocated a continuance of progressive ideals as the solution to both international and national problems. His ambitious premises urged American participation in world affairs, better Federal governmental organization, progressive legislation, and the election of an experienced Presidential candidate. Logical, ethical, and emotional proofs were used, although the referential materials were excessively general and vague. The discourse was lengthy, being the third longest one analyzed, but the organization was clearly developed. The nominee's language reflected a careful effort to
obtain clarity, vividness, and impressiveness by employing simple sentences, common idioms, synonyms, repetition, parallel sentence structure, metaphors, striking phrases, ridicule, and first person pronouns. The manuscript delivery was aided by a pleasing method of physical and vocal presentation.

Roosevelt's campaign was opened officially in Chicago, August 11, before an overflow crowd of 5000 enthusiastic men and women at the auditorium. He disregarded local problems and the League of Nations issue in appealing to progressive sentiment. His logical appeals were more specific than those utilized at Hyde Park. Ethos and pathos continued to be effective. His organizational pattern was damaged by the failure to clarify major points. Style and delivery maintained a high level of consistency.

One of his most difficult assignments was undertaken before a mixed audience of 2800 at the half-filled Seattle arena on August 20. The Far West was dominated by Republican newspapers and a deep-rooted bitterness toward President Wilson. The candidate avoided further friction by promising improvement of local port facilities, arguing for a strong peacetime Navy, giving the League of Nations only slight attention, and capitalizing on his famous relative's popularity by soliciting progressive support. The premises were built around national and international reform. Logical evidence was strong in dealing with international issues,
but national topics were excessively dependent upon ethos and pathos. The organizational pattern was poor, inserts being utilized without sufficient transitions. Language and delivery were satisfactory, but the speech was less effective than those presented at Hyde Park and at Chicago.

The second campaign tour considered the Wheeling and the Louisville speeches. At Wheeling, September 29, FDR received a tumultuous reception from more than 3000 people who literally jammed the Market Auditorium. His premises compared Republican and Democratic political philosophy in a fiery address which attempted to refute Senator Harding's remarks in the same city on the preceding evening. He was at his best in offering refutation to the tariff issue, the international congress of labor, and the League of Nations dispute. An impressive array of logical, ethical, and emotional proofs were introduced. Only minor structural problems were detected. The oral style was marked by a masterful command of metaphoric expressions and stinging invectives. His delivery was vigorous and animated. This address was a brilliant reply to the GOP nominee.

Moving into Louisville, October 1, Roosevelt enjoyed an exuberant reception before a packed house of some 8000 people at the Gypsy Smith Tabernacle. Even though he began speaking almost two hours behind schedule, the crowd was eager to hear his development of the League of Nations topic, condemnation of the
opponents, counter-arguments, defense of wartime executive management, and advocacy of progressive policies. His premises were similar to those espoused at Wheeling, but considerable emphasis was placed on emotional appeals. Consequently, logical proofs were less forceful than those which characterized the West Virginia rebuttal. The claim of massive religious backing for the League invited editorial criticism from GOP publications. The long speech was poorly organized, and the style was inconsistent in quality in spite of the fact that bombast was well handled. Delivery continued to meet adequately the demands imposed by the audience and the occasion. Probably the setting in a religious tabernacle encouraged the nominee to make a moral, pathetic plea. As a rhetorical unit, the Wheeling speech was considerably stronger than the one at Louisville.

After the last strategy meeting with Cox, FDR began the final campaign tour by facing another capacity audience of 6000 at the First Regiment Armory in St. Louis. By this time, the League of Nations evolved as the primary issue. The premises were directed toward destroying the character of his opponents rather than in defending the attributes of the world organization. In using strong references to testimony, he depicted Republican leaders as "trimmers" who dealt in deceitful practices. He minimized ethos. His pathos encompassed both the partisan, political, fighting spirit and the evangelistic pleadings of an
idealistic crusader. Structure continued to cause minor problems. Language reflected marked differences in the stylistic quality of the body as opposed to the remainder of the text. The speaker likely had insufficient time to edit and to polish the final draft. Delivery was friendly and conversational. After the address, questions from several auditors were answered with economy, force, and humor.

In Cincinnati, October 16, Roosevelt spoke before a packed house of 2500 at the Emery Auditorium. Another 2000 persons who desired to hear the young nominee deal with the League topic were turned away. Unlike the St. Louis approach, he tried to defend the League constructively in addition to exposing the shortcomings of GOP arguments. His modes of proof were excellent. But the two-hour oration invited some obvious deficiencies in structure. The major points were not clear and the speaker could not resist the temptation to introduce extraneous material. His language revealed a greater emphasis in the use of questions and his biting, bitter sarcasm was often distasteful. Delivery was damaged by a strained, hoarse voice, yet, he was generally effective in physical and vocal presentation.

Encumbered by wide-spread economic discontent, known as a progressive during an era of conservatism, identified as an active member of a discredited Administration, confronted by strong isolationist sentiment, and placed in a subordinate position on the
Democratic ticket, Roosevelt bucked against unenviable odds.

However, his audiences were large, demonstrative, and enthusiastic.

His popularity sky-rocketed in those areas where he campaigned.

Although biased in his survey, Charles McCarthy accurately reported this accelerated approval in the wake of FDR's personal speaking engagements:

Everybody is delighted with the wonderful fight you are making, and while I found in Washington and other places in the past a great admiration for you, I have found since being here ten times as much enthusiasm and admiration for you as I have in the past. It will amuse you to hear of the old lady in Boston who went to the register, and when asked if she was Democratic or Republican she replied that she was going to vote for Harding and Roosevelt because she had heard you speak up there. This was published in all the Boston papers.²

The Vice-Presidential candidate could be condemned for avoiding those troublesome subjects which permeated the 1920 political, social, and economic scene. However, he was no more evasive than the other nominees in the race. After all, as a secondary running mate, he had to adhere closely to the wishes of Governor Cox, the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic Speakers' Bureau, and various local officials. He made a valiant effort to offset this disadvantage by following the recommendations of his "advance man," Stephen T. Early.

FDR's premises and methods of proof differed in quality in the major addresses. Ethos and pathos were uniformly satisfactory,

²Letter, McCarthy to FDR, October 8, 1920.
however, logical arguments were vague at Hyde Park, weak at Louisville, and brilliant at Wheeling.

Speech structure was commendable in the acceptance address, adequate at Wheeling, and generally weak in the other discourses. The pressing itinerary apparently left the speaker little time to revise and to edit his manuscripts. Often his major points were not clear, inserts were awkwardly interjected into the text, and transitions were inadequate or nonexistent.

Language usually was characterized by devices calculated to give clarity, vividness, and impressiveness to his topics. Lengthy sentences in the exordiums and perorations and excessive sarcasm produced minor shortcomings. These were infrequent and were offset by attractive synonyms, common idioms, repetitious phrasings, parallel sentence structure, metaphors, striking statements, cunning ridicule, and first person pronominal usage.

Delivery was always effective. FDR was young, attractive, popular, friendly, conversational, and blended comfortably into any ethnic group. His physical and vocal presentation was praised continuously in Democratic, Republican, and independent publications. Although the opposition tried to counteract the advantages afforded by his kinship to the famous "Bull-Moose," he successfully capitalized on the Progressive's popularity. In addition, he skillfully managed the challenges of auditors who
interrupted his speeches, or followed his formal utterances with pointed questions.

Among those major addresses analyzed in this study, the best performances for each tour took place in Chicago, Wheeling, and Cincinnati. The overall outstanding presentation was the sparkling rebuttal speech at Wheeling.

Roosevelt did not discover with magical suddenness the secret of successful campaigning during the gubernatorial and Presidential races. Many of his rhetorical techniques, which were destined to gain prominence as his political fortunes mounted, were applied to the 1920 national effort. He gained invaluable speaking experience, formed a capable staff of assistants, developed methods of speech preparation, established lasting friendships, and learned how to conduct a nation-wide series of public speaking tours for the purpose of achieving popular acceptance. In retrospect, the 1920 undertaking cannot be classified as a losing battle. This campaign was an important stage in the development of a prominent speaker.

However, in 1920, numerous voters reacted as the Alabama lumberman who wrote the following narrative to the candidate:

I note with regret, that you are the nominee of the Democrat[ic] Party for the Vice-Presidency; the regret on my part arises from the fact that I shall, for the first time, cast my vote against a 'Roosevelt' . . . .
I am now placed in the attitude of a small boy, so the story runs, who was left, at his father’s death, with an older brother, a flock of goats all the earthly possessions of an old Mississippi ranchman; the ranchman, just before his death, instructed the older brother to divide the goats . . . equally between them.

A few weeks after the death of the father, the elder brother decided he would divide the flock, so taking advantage of his little brother’s absence, he takes all the fine, large fat goats and puts them in one pen, then gathers up all the one-eyed goats, the mangy goats and the ugly skinny goats and puts them, along with a little pet Billy that his brother had broken to harness and had been his companion for years, in a pen to themselves . . . . [After] his little brother reached home, the elder brother advised the little fellow that . . . in accordance with the wishes of their dead father, and that he being the younger, he should have the first pick of the two flocks . . . . [Looking] them over for some time, his little eyes, dim with tears, rested upon his little pet Billy, and climbing over the fence the little fellow put his arms around his pet Billy and sobbed out: 'Billy, you have been my constant companion since you were born; I have loved you, fed you, and led you to where the pasture was the greenest; your fights have been my fights, where I went you went . . . it breaks my heart to have to give you up, but I can’t stand this company you [are] in' and, to his brother, 'I’ll [sic] take the other pen'.

That is just how I feel, Mr. Roosevelt, and oh how I wish you were in the other 'pen'.

Although it was a "damn fine sail," too many voters picked the "goats" in "the other pen."

---

³Letter, Bolton to FDR, August 17, 1920.
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