
Franklin D. Roosevelt — “The Great Communicator”

The Master Speech Files, 1898, 1910-1945

Series 1: Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Political Ascension

File No. 223

1920 October 22

Elmira, NY - Campaign Speech

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F.D. ROOSEVELT
ELMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They know that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly, - They know that Mr. Cox wants us to join the League with every American right preserved. Third, - In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

among
ence of opinion ~~was~~ among the experts as to the exact amount of
obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in
case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments.
Last,^{ly} The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration
that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional
and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of
broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root
which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such
as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground.
He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of
Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by
constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to
keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as
a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should
cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The
election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions
and who have made up their minds that the United States must and
shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations.
In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not becloud the
real issue of the campaign.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F.D. ROOSEVELT
ELMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They know that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly,- They know that Mr. Cox wants us to join the League with every American right preserved. Third,- In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

Answer

ence of opinion under the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last, + The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not becloud the real issue of the campaign.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT
ELMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They knew that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly,- They know that Mr. Cox wants us to join the League with every American right preserved. Third,- In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

ence of opinion ^{among} under the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last, ⁴ The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not baffle the real issue of the campaign.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F.D. ROOSEVELT
ELMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They know that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly, - They know that Mr. Cox wants us to join the League with every American right preserved. Third, - In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

Among
ence of opinion under the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last, ¹⁴ The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not baulk the real issue of the campaign.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F.D. ROOSEVELT
ELMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They know that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly, - They know that Mr. Cox wants us to join the League with every American right preserved. Third, - In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

ence of opinion *among* the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last,^{ly} The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not bedevil the real issue of the campaign.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT
ELMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They know that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly, - They know that Mr. Cox wants us to join the League with every American right preserved. Third, - In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

ence of opinion ^{among} among the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last, the average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not becloud the real issue of the campaign.

EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH OF HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT
ALMIRA, N.Y., OCT. 22, 1920

The other day I referred to the mind of Mr. Root as that of a legalist. Since reading his reply to Mr. Cox I would say rather that he has the mind of a sophist. The easiest definition of a sophist is a man who cares more for argument about words than he does about the basic purpose or intent behind the words. Sophistry is a pleasant form of mental exercise, to which Mr. Root has long been accustomed - an exercise which has been altogether too prevalent among the legal profession in all countries during many generations.

One can only hope that Mr. Root pleases himself by his sophistry. I am quite certain that he pleases no one else except other sophists.

Of course Mr. Root misses the big point altogether. I firmly believe that American voters everywhere are heartily sick of the continued discussion by men like Mr. Root of the details of words and phrases in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. As we approach Election Day itself, the average voter is saying to himself: The lawyers and Senators can continue talking about phraseology to their hearts content in days to come - what we want to decide is whether we shall, as a nation, join the other forty-one nations in the association called the League or stay out. The confusion in the people's minds is giving way to a clear conception of the positions taken by Mr. Cox and Mr. Harding.

First - They know that Mr. Harding has said that he wants the League rejected. Secondly, - They know that Mr. Cox wants us to rejoin the League with every American right preserved. Third, - In regard to Article 10, the average voter knows that there is great differ-

among
ence of opinion under the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last, The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not becloud the real issue of the campaign.

Among
ence of opinion under the experts as to the exact amount of obligation by which the United States Congress would be bound in case we entered the League without any reservations or amendments. Last, - The average man and woman will accept Mr. Cox's declaration that he wants it made clear before we go in that our Constitutional and Congressional rights shall remain just what they are today.

In view of the simply, plain English statement of broad purpose such as the above, any argument like that of Mr. Root which tries to assume positions which he declares to be analogous, such as that of a money obligation under a Treaty, falls to the ground. He passes over with a shrug of the shoulders the suggestion of Mr. Cox that the language and phraseology can be worked out by constitutional lawyers like Mr. Taft and himself. He continues to keep his eyes on the individual sentence and forgets the chapter as a whole.

It is time all of this study of grammar and rhetoric should cease and give way to old-fashioned American commonsense. The election will be decided by those who are sick of endless discussions and who have made up their minds that the United States must and shall carry out the great purpose in common with the other nations. In other words, Mr. Root's continued quibbling will not becloud the real issue of the campaign.

