theodore roosevelt an american synthesis

george de vries, jr.

The United States was in transition in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century; an urban and industrial society was replacing an agricultural and rural one. A fixed, relatively static society was giving way to a society where "change" was the watchword. All of this had many implications, for change affected not only the material and physical situation but the non-material as well. Long-held ideas, values and mores were being subjected to assault by new and strange counterparts. The old did not immediately succumb to the new nor was the conquest to be complete in every case; nevertheless, elements of the old and the new can be discerned in various ways in the American society of that day. Thus, pragmatism could be heralded as a new American philosophy; yet, in a very real sense, it was a synthesis of Darwinism which was new and American practicality and adaptation which was old. It can be argued that most Americans had always been pragmatists really.[1] Similarly, historic American Protestantism, which had been subjected through the centuries to various liberalizing influences, was being modified by the impact of Darwinism and Higher Criticism as well as by the crying needs of an industrialized and urbanized society into a modern faith that preached more practicality and universality in human affairs. The new modern faith was a synthesis of the old and new, an adaptation to changing influences and conditions.

Theodore Roosevelt was a child of that age, an age which was at once progressive and yet reactionary, an age which demanded change while resisting it, an age which was groping for new rules by which to order a new kind of society and economy but yet clung to the old. Roosevelt, one might maintain, mirrored these inconsistencies faithfully as a product of late nineteenth century middle class America. This is evident in various ways, in his political progressivism, for example; but it is clearly evident also in his religious life, in the gap between his professed religious faith by virtue of his church membership and attendance and that faith

as expressed in other ways. There is no better place to go to discover the individual than to his roots, and especially his religious roots; much that he becomes, philosophically and ideologically, is linked to such roots though modified by change and experience. Theodore Roosevelt's active faith seems quite different from his professed faith, and what was true of Roosevelt was to a large extent true of American Christendom. It was being subjected to various stresses and strains which challenged many of its basic tenets. Its efforts to adapt to the new currents of thought and belief led it into strange and alien paths, strange and alien at least compared to that which had gone before. In Theodore Roosevelt can be seen the crosscurrents of the old and new, a synthesis of his heritage and of newer ideas and philosophies. No doubt this can be traced equally well in his political development; here, however, we shall limit ourselves to the religious element in his life and its influence where evident.

Theodore Roosevelt was, it seems, very much the child of his age. It was an age of optimism, activism, increasing secularism and emerging Protestant modernism. Increasingly popular among the middle classes were the teachings of Social Darwinism and Carnegie's "Gospel of Wealth."[2] Going were the devil and hell and original sin; in their place was a new, central concern, the establishment of heaven on earth. To speak of sin was taboo; instead, one spoke of practical Christian ethics. The application of Christian ideals and ethics to human society—to business and politics especially—was the new goal.[3] The Social Gospel was one influence; this combined with the democratic social ideology that was forming during the late nineteenth century plus a mixture of the new popularized scientific philosophy which stemmed from positivism and evolutionary theory helped produce the modern religious man.[4] The essence of this paper is that Theodore Roosevelt had many of the characteristics of that man, for he embraced a gospel of good works, he accepted much of Darwinian evolution and he doubted a number of basic Christian teachings. And this was true though the church to which Roosevelt belonged stood officially committed to Calvinistic standards.[5] Furthermore, there was little in Roosevelt's conduct of foreign relations that suggests a positive, Christian stance; Roosevelt, unlike Wilson, made little effort to apply principles of Christian morality, in which he presumably believed, to the international scene. Again, such would hardly mark him as a true Calvinist, one who seeks to apply the teachings of God's Word into all areas of human action and conduct.

Roosevelt was of Dutch ancestry on his father's side; and his Dutch inheritance included the Reformed Church in America, which he attended with some regularity during his lifetime. This church had the Belgic Confession, the Canons of the Synod of Dort and the Heidelberg Catechism as its confessional standards.[6] These standards indicate the decidedly conservative theological base of the Reformed Church, a base which is strongly Reformed. Roosevelt himself became a church member

at the age of sixteen; he was active in attendance and in participation of the Sacrament. As a youth he attended the Madison Square Presbyterian Church because there was no Dutch Reformed Church near; later, his family attended the little Episcopalian Church when at home in Oyster Bay though Roosevelt attended the Dutch Reformed Church in Albany when Governor and the one in Washington while President.[7] The Nicollet Church in New York, a Reformed Church, could probably lay claim to being his home church. The matter of church attendance and membership is relevant for it indicates something at least of what one might expect from Roosevelt in terms of his faith and works. The conservatism of his church's theology, however, finds little expression in Theodore Roosevelt himself; for that theology includes a belief in the sinful nature of man, that man is saved only by the sovereign pleasure of God through Jesus Christ and the idea of a sovereign God active in human affairs. There is in fact little of this conservatism in Theodore Roosevelt except perhaps in his strongly moralistic attitudes and ethics.

Theodore Roosevelt was from a tradition which revered the Protestant ethic, for the American middle class of the late nineteenth century was still strongly Protestant, in heritage at least. From his childhood he was taught the ethics of the Bible and received his introduction to social consciousness; his father was an avid practitioner of philanthrophy and social work, who believed in practicing what he preached.[8] For Theodore in time, philanthrophy and social work would not suffice; his concern for the poor would take legislative form in seeking to alleviate the distresses arising from a new urban and industrial society. This, in part at least, explains his progressive stance as Governor of New York and later as President.

Thus, it is not strange that the essence of Theodore's religious faith, as he once put it, was contained in the verse of St. James, "I will show my faith by my works."[9] He himself confided to William Taft "that his only religious feeling lay in the belief in salvation by works."[10] His good friend and contemporary, Jacob Riis, indicated that Roosevelt was reverent in attitude, pursued the highest ideals of Christian virtue and sought to implement his faith in helping others and building a better world.[11] Roosevelt's religion, then, was one of "works"; his Christianity was the means to the good life.[12] There was in Roosevelt, therefore, much emphasis on the moral, the good life.[13] This seemed to be the overriding passion in Roosevelt's faith. True Christianity consists in doing good; man must strive to translate into reality the ideal of doing his whole duty to his neighbor.[14]

Somehow, too, the good life was tied in with patriotism and good citizenship and moral responsibility. In an address before the Y.M.C.A. in New York City, Roosevelt had this to say:

> The true Christian is the true citizen, lofty in purpose, resolute in endeavor, ready for a hero's deeds, but never looking down on his task because it is cast in the day of small things; scornful of baseness, awake to his own duties as well as to his rights, following the higher law with reverence, and in this world doing all that in him lies, so that when death comes he may feel that mankind is in some degree better because he has lived.[15]

Theodore Roosevelt felt deeply for the moral and ethical values prized by his class; his father, whom he almost worshipped, had put great stress on such civic responsibilities as honor, courage, patriotism and disinterested service.[16] It followed that such an individual, one with the requisite qualities, had a role to play in history, that he and his like-minded fellows could improve their lot and the lot of mankind. Progress, then, depended upon the individual's sense of responsibility.[17]

This meant that the individual must work and succeed. Over and over again Roosevelt stressed the importance of the individual and his task. In a letter to Leonard Wood in early 1901 he points out "that in this life the best possible thing is to have a great task well worth doing, and to do it well."[18] Success comes in hard work; here, perhaps one observes a strain of the early Puritan emphasis upon industry coupled with the influence of the Horatio Alger, Jr. myth; one works with what one has and does the best under imperfect conditions. One of Roosevelt's favorite quotations from the Scriptures was Romans 12:11, "Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord."[19] Hard work redeemed the soul and formed the character; in the end, what is remembered is what one has accomplished. Even the ordinary person can achieve greatness if he is industrious and uses good judgment.[20] The central emphasis in all this is, of course, on the here and now; there is no reference to the role of the Spirit in leading and guiding one to the full Christian life. Nor does Providence have much to do with men's destinies; rather, man decides and acts. The focal point, in short, is man, not God, a far cry from the historic Reformed faith; and here Roosevelt is in the mainstream of American religious life which tended to be anthropocentric and moralistic. By his own statement he was ". . . mighty weak on the Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines or salvation by faith, and though I have no patience with much of the Roman Catholic theory of church government, including the infallibility of the Pope, the confessional, and a celibate clergy, I do believe in the gospel of works as put down in the Gospel of James."[21] Such assertion hardly squared with the teaching of his own church, which emphasized salvation by grace in Jesus Christ.

Like every American of his day and age, Roosevelt was confronted with the challenge of Darwinism. Darwinism offered a new explanation on the origin and continuance of life; thus, it challenged ideas and con-

cepts which had been well established for centuries. More particularly, it challenged Christian ideas, for the Bible spoke plainly on the origin of man, his nature and the meaning of life; it taught man's creation, his fall from grace and his restoration to God through Jesus Christ. Conservative Christians deplored an explanation which brought man from the animal world to a higher form of life with no recognition of God's hand in the process. Considering Roosevelt's church connections, one would have expected him to have been a bit more cautious in accepting the idea of Darwinian evolution. Instead, Roosevelt stood squarely with the Darwinists at least insofar as the origin of man was concerned. In a letter to John Burroughs in May of 1905, he states categorically, "Man and the higher anthropoid apes, for instance, have developed from ancestors which in the immemorial past possessed only such mental attributes as a mollusk or crustacean of today."[22] Certainly, then, Roosevelt could be termed an evolutionist, one who saw man's origin in a gradual rise from a lower form of life rather than in a sublime act of Divine Creation.[23] Indeed, he credited Darwin with having "spearheaded a tremendous intellectual revolution."[24] This was true though he was not convinced Darwin had all the answers, for in some respects, Darwinism conflicted with other cherished beliefs of his. He did, as we have noted, firmly believe in the role of the individual in shaping history and progress.[25] Admittedly this required superior character, but character could be formed and shaped with the proper training and influence. Thus, he was much less willing to accept Darwinism as an explanation for human experience and societal struggle.[26] Character, more than competition, was the key to achievement; again and again Roosevelt preached the gospel of character and its effects upon men and nations and history. Roosevelt's own youthful experience in overcoming a sickly, asthmatic condition was a strong influence here. It is true that he did pretty much accept the superiority of some races and nations, a rank inconsistency for one who regarded himself as progressive in other ways. He frequently bemoaned the decline of the old native stock in America, for example;[27] and he was quite content with the hegemony of Western Civilization.[28] All in all, though, Roosevelt found Darwinism much less acceptable as an explanation of human affairs than of the world of the universe. Like other Americans with an intellectual bent, he faced the impact of Darwinism squarely; he accepted in part, he rejected in part. In terms of his religious orientation what he accepted was more in line with liberal American Christian thinking than it was with the more orthodox Christian thought. Here, too, Theodore was more representative of America than his church was in its official position.

As far as some of the basic teachings of orthodox Christian thought and belief were concerned, Roosevelt shows little evidence of strong convictions. It is true that he made few public professions of his religious faith so that which can be gleaned comes by inference or, on occasion, by

brief reference. First of all, of course, it has already been indicated that Roosevelt's basic religious belief was in a religion of action which included doing good and striving hard for the right. The spirit of true Christianity was best expressed in the uplifting of mankind, in the practice of tolerance and charity; man best serves by leading an upright and useful life. This is the most common thread in his thinking; it runs throughout his writings and correspondence. And here, except for the matter of the centrality and emphasis, there is no conflict with Christianity. When we cast about for evidence on more specific matters, however, we do encounter such conflict. One such matter concerns his view of history; here there is no Sovereign God directing human affairs; instead, the human factor looms large. Man alone shapes his affairs. On one occasion Roosevelt writes, ". . . But we are all on the knees of the gods and must await events, though when the opportunity comes, we can improve it, and, indeed, can to a certain extent make it."[29] Elsewhere as well it is evident that Roosevelt's view of history was hardly a Calvinistic one. "Life," he wrote to George O. Trevelyan, "is a long campaign where every victory leaves the ground free for another battle, and sooner or later defeat comes to every man, unless death forestalls it. But the final defeat does not and should not cancel the triumph."[30] Also, by inference, Roosevelt's emphasis on the role of character spelled out a large role for man upon the stage of history.

Again, Roosevelt seems unsure of life after death itself; life is certain, therefore one must do much with it, but what comes after is unknown.[31] The dead are soon forgotten so what counts is the present; life must be lived to the fullest; Roosevelt's own life is real testimony to this belief. Nor does he ever speak of an afterlife; at the time of his father's death, one whom he greatly admired and loved, he speaks only of the fact that it is hard to realize he will never see his father again. There is no indication that he believed in eternal life nor does he speak of heavenly comfort for the bereaved.[32] So, too, when a little niece had died, a daughter of his sister Corinne, he advises her to forget it and speak no more of it since it is an event which is finished.[33] It seems fairly clear that to Roosevelt death was the end.[34] Immortality to him meant being remembered for one's deeds and actions.

Nor does Roosevelt speak of sin as such; there is evil and corruption and dishonesty in human life, of course, but these stem from lack of character and are the result of human weakness. American thought has generally placed much of the responsibility for human conduct upon environment rather than elsewhere; but here Roosevelt clings to the more traditional teaching of individual responsibility; the individual, and not society in general, is responsible for its exercise.

Theodore Roosevelt was a Christian, but a broadly tolerant Christian who saws scores of paths to the same goal; the real test was the test of conduct.[35] Thus, he was a Christian only in the broadest sense of the

term. The Bible was useful especially as an ethical and moral guide to the good life;[36] but there is no special recognition that Christ is the Way of Salvation. Roosevelt's daughter Alice was encouraged to read the Bible at an early age; but when the time came for her to be confirmed, she decided not to be; and her parents did not insist.[37] Here, it would seem there was no feeling of urgency; rather, it was typical of Roosevelt's broad tolerance and ecumenicity. Such indications as these mentioned are illustrative of the fact that Roosevelt's religious convictions were rather far removed from those of the church to which he belonged and to whose tenets he presumably subscribed. They typify, in fact, the divergence between modern, liberal Protestantism and conservative, orthodox Christianity.[38]

As already mentioned, character was *the* thing; and, like most Americans of his class, Roosevelt was strongly moralistic. A good character was the product of good, moral training; and in this respect at least, Roosevelt's religious background is evident. His ideas on morality are mirrored, among other places, in his reading tastes. He was, of course, an avid reader of history and anthropology though he was critical of those who treated history as science and not as literature—he characterized these as "gatherers of bricks and stones."[39] His moralistic tastes are best discerned in novels of moral heroics though he condemned historical figures like Napoleon and Frederick the Great for their immoral abuse of power.[40] He enjoyed Dickens as a writer, though he regarded him as no gentleman and a writer of much "bosh and twaddle and vulgarity."[41] He was strident in his condemnation of Tolstoi, though for a somewhat different reason; he felt that Tolstoi misled people with his pacifism and his condemnation of industrialization.[42] Though generally appreciative of Hamlin Garland, he was critical of some of his "crude" theories; and he had no use for Henry James, whom he characterized as a "miserable little snob."[43] In a way typical of his class and time, he wanted women treated in a chivalrous way; he detested any suggestion of immoral activity on their part, and he even opposed having women meet a tragic end in stories.[44] Stories must have a moral value as well as be interesting.[45] It is obvious that he had no use for the increasingly realistic novels of his day. Perhaps his admiration of a writer like Joel Chandler Harris best shows Roosevelt for what he was himself: he praised Harris' literary efforts, but he admired Harris' works even more for the good qualities they promoted—courage, honesty, generosity and citizenship[46]—qualities which Roosevelt himself held to be the key to character.

If individual character was the key to the making of the individual and the nation, what of the role of the nation? A legitimate question is how to reconcile Roosevelt's religious and philosophical position with his activities in foreign affairs. Again, one is struck by the inconsistencies between his moralistic preachments regarding the individual and his own militancy and open use of naked power in the interests of national af-

fairs. In the latter case he still talked in moral and ethical terms; but these must be judged hypocritical in many of his actions. Europeans, more accustomed to power politics, were not deceived; but many Americans, imbued with a sense of world mission, followed with enthusiasm their bombastic leader. Theodore Roosevelt was no Woodrow Wilson, determined to apply his Christian principles to international politics; rather, he was a pragmatic nationalist, willing to use power for his own ends.

Roosevelt was an open and militant expansionist; this was a logical outgrowth of his virulent nationalism. It was clear to him that the U.S. had a duty—to bring the blessings of civilization to the less fortunate.[47] Here was a secular, as opposed to a Christian, sense of mission. Thus, from the beginning, he favored intervention in Cuba and used every influence at his disposal to move the administration towards war.[48] With the war over, there were new challenges; and, as Roosevelt put it, "We cannot avoid the responsibilities that confront us in Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippine Islands."[49] A short time later he would be telling Californians, "I wish to see the United States the dominant power on the shores of the Pacific Ocean."[50] Thus, he supported McKinley's annexation of the Philippine Islands though his enthusiasm for the Filipino mission cooled perceptibly in subsequent years as the American position in the Far East fell under the shadow of the Empire of the Rising Sun. As President, he would find it necessary to checkmate the Japanese in their march south.[51]

Actually, his presidential foreign policy was presaged several years before he became President when he wrote to a friend: "For two years I have consistently preached the doctrine of a resolute foreign policy, and of readiness to accept the arbitrament of the sword if necessary; and I have always intended to act up to my preaching if the occasion arose."[52] T. R. saw clearly the importance of power; and he would use it, though cautiously, for what he regarded as legitimate American ends.[53] Furthermore, as President, he would use his executive power to the limit to attain his goals.[54] He moved aggressively against smaller, weaker nations; he did so against Canada in the Alaskan boundary dispute, against Colombia in the canal business and against the small Central American states following his promulgation of the "new" Monroe Doctrine.[55] In the Far East, American power could not so easily be brought to bear, and negotiation was relied upon to protect the Philippines and to keep China open to the world; this was true even though he did display the mailed fist on the occasion of the visit of the American fleet to Japan in 1908.

That Theodore Roosevelt acted sincerely and out of conviction of right, there is little doubt. However, one would be hard put to justify his militarism and his conduct of foreign affairs on Christian grounds, and especially is this true relative to his imperialistic and expansionistic policies where he often rode roughshod over the rights and sensitivities

of others. Such practices simply do not square with a professed Christian faith which, above all, enjoins love for God and one's fellow man and which lays down principles of practice to govern human relationships. Again, though, his errors were those of the majority of his fellow Americans who, too, were imbued with a sense of American righteousness and destiny, though presumably holding to standards of Christian morality. In that respect, things have not changed as much as we might suspect; many Americans today would still re-make the world in an American mold and impose American institutions upon the "backward" for their ultimate good. Nor is it true that we have reconciled the conflict between ideals and self-interest or even, for that matter, agreed on what our self-interest is. Roosevelt was the herald for modern America, for it was in the early twentieth century when our self-interest took on international overtones. But, again let it be said, there is no concrete evidence that Roosevelt sought to apply the principles of Christian morality to international relations; rather he was motivated by what he regarded as the nation's interests and its honors.

What can our conclusion be then? What was true of Theodore Roosevelt as a product of the varying influences of his time is to a certain extent true of every individual in every age. Still, there is that which gives Roosevelt special distinction. For he was no ordinary individual, nor even ordinary American. A member of a class always important in American affairs, he was destined to fill his country's highest office and to lead her during some important formative years. Furthermore, he lived as a leader during a tremendously vital period in American history, for the U.S. was emerging from the cocoon of rural and continental isolation into the swirl of industrial internationalism with all that this involved. Any historical study which throws light upon such change, or the reactions to such change, or the role of individuals in such change, contributes to a better understanding of that historical period.

Theodore Roosevelt was strongly reflective of the currents of change sweeping America but also was one of the forces of change. He mirrored some of the old, while at the same time much of what he said and did and stood for was productive of the new. In a very real way, his religious metamorphosis typified that of many of his fellow Americans who had their roots in the Protestant past but who accommodated themselves to such influences as the Social Gospel, the more general social emphasis in religion, pragmatism, the new scientism, Higher Criticism, Darwinism, our colonial expansionism and the like. Roosevelt was in this respect, as well as other ways, an American synthesis of such social, religious and political ideas. And it must be as such that we should regard him rather than as a devout Calvinist, zealous for his God and seeking to order his life and actions according to His will.

Northwestern College

footnotes

1. Philip P. Wiener, *Evolution and the Founders of Pragmatism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949; New York, 1964). Here is a careful and well documented study into the origins of those doctrines and ideas which are part of what we know as American pragmatism. Of particular interest is the diversity of interpretations by the founders of pragmatism on the effects of evolutionism in the various areas of inquiry; but the one common cement was a faith in man's ability to find answers through rational and intelligent approaches to his problems.

2. Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment* (New York, 1963), 134-155. See also Winthrop S. Hudson, *Religion in America* (New York, 1965), 302-317.

3. George Mowry, *The Era of Theodore Roosevelt, 1900-1912* (New York, 1958), 27-30.

4. Stow Persons, "Religion and Modernity, 1865-1914," *Religion in American Life,* edited by James W. Smith and A. Leland Jamison (4 vols., Princeton, 1961), 370.

5. Whether this was true of actual conditions which obtained is another question. The eastern wing of the Reformed Church tended towards more relaxation in matters of doctrine and faith than its more western wing, but that is another subject. A church's creeds do not always accurately reflect its beliefs.

6. Elton M. Eenigenburg, *A Brief History of the Reformed Church* (Grand Rapids, no publication date), 23.

7. Edward Wagenknecht, *The Seven Worlds of Theodore Roosevelt* (New York, 1958), 184.

8. John M. Blum, *The Republican Roosevelt* (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), 28-29.

9. Mowry, *The Era of T. R.*, 48.

10. Preface, *The Letters of Theodore Roosevelt,* edited by Elting E. Morison, *et al.* (8 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1951-1954), V, xv.

11. Jacob A. Riis, *Theodore Roosevelt, The Citizen* (New York, 1907), 306.

12. Wagenknecht, *The Seven Worlds,* 181-195. See also Richard Hofstader, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (New York, 1959), 102.

13. Riis, *T. R., The Citizen,* 403-408.

14. Theodore Roosevelt, "The Strenuous Life," *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt* (20 vols., New York, 1926), 498.

15. Quoted in Riis, *T. R., The Citizen,* 307.

16. Herman Hagedorn, "A Biographical Sketch," *A Theodore Roosevelt Round-up,* edited by H. Hagedorn and Sidney Wallach (New York, 1961), 7.

17. Richard Lewitt, *America's Ten Greatest Presidents* (Chicago, 1961), 186.

18. Morison, *Letters,* III, 31. See also letters to William H. Taft, March, 1901, in Morison, *Letters,* III, 11-12.

19. Letter to William Skillicorn, March, 1902, Morison, *Letters,* III, 342.

20. Letter to Henry B. Needham, July, 1905, Morison, *Letters,* IV, 1281.

21. Letter to William H. Taft, August, 1908, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 1200.

22. Letter to John Burroughs, May, 1905, Morison, *Letters,* IV, 1197.

23. One might assume Roosevelt was a theistic evolutionist though I found no evidence to support this.

24. Letter to Oliver W. Holmes, October, 1904, Morison, *Letters,* IV, 989.

25. See, for example, Theodore Roosevelt, "American Ideals," *Works,* XIII, 247-248.

26. See Blum, *The Republican Roosevelt,* 25-26, and especially David H. Burton, "Theodore Roosevelt's Social Darwinism," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* XXVI (Jan.-Mar., 1965), 103-118.

27. Letter to George O. Trevelyan, March, 1905, Morison, *Letters,* IV, 1135. See also "A Letter from President Roosevelt on Race Suicide" (American), *Review of Reviews,* XXXV (1907), 550-557.

28. Letter to Cecil A. S. Rice, May, 1897, Morison, *Letters,* I, 620-621. Here Roosevelt sees the extension of Western Civilization as an evidence of its vitality. In another letter to Rice in August, 1899, Morison, *Letters,* II, 1052-1053, he fears for the future of the Anglo-Saxons but feels their leadership is still strong.

29. Letter to Cecil A. S. Rice, Dec., 1907, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 6.

30. Letter to George Trevelyan. Quoted in Mowry, *The Era of T. R.*, 47-48.

31. Letter to Bellamy Storer, Morison, *Letters,* II, 992.

32. Letter to Henry D. Minot, Feb., 1878, Morison, *Letters,* I, 31. Also, Letter to Corinne, Morison, *Letters,* I, 32.

33. Letter to Corinne Robinson, Mar., 1908, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 966.

34. Mowry, *The Era of T. R.*, 111-112.

35. Roosevelt, "Realizable Ideals," *Works,* XIII, 648.

36. *Ibid.*, 642-651.

37. Alice R. Longworth, *Crowded Hours* (New York, 1933), 29-30.

38. Mead, *The Lively Experiment,* 177-183. Roosevelt typifies what Mead so aptly describes here.

39. Letter to Henry B. Bigelow, May, 1906, Morison, *Letters,* V, 290. Roosevelt had little use for the AHA which he described as full of "little pedants, each useful in a small way but having no large vision"; he decried their total emphasis on research to the detriment of the larger vision expressed in great writing. Letter to George O. Trevelyan, Jan., 1904, Morison, *Letters,* III, 707-708.

40. Letter to John Morley, Dec., 1908, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 1398.

41. Letter to Kermit Roosevelt, Feb., 1908, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 953.

42. Letter to Florence L. LaFarge, Feb., 1908, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 942-943.

43. Letter to James B. Matthews, June, 1894, Morison, *Letters,* I, 389-390.

44. *Ibid.*

45. Letter to Rudyard Kipling, Nov., 1904, Morison, *Letters,* IV, 1007.

46. Letter to Julian Harris, July, 1908, Morison, *Letters,* VI, 1109-1110.

47. Howard K. Beale, *Theodore Roosevelt and The Rise of America to World Power* (Baltimore, 1956), 23-26.

48. *Ibid.,* 59-60. Also, Letter to Hermann Speck von Sternberg, Jan., 1898, Morison, *Letters,* I, 763, and Letter to Alfred T. Mahan, Dec., 1897, Morison, *Letters,* I, 725-726.

49. Roosevelt, "The Strenuous Life," *Works,* XIII, 322.

50. Beale, *The Rise of America,* 76.

51. Mowry, *The Era of T. R.,* 183-190.

52. Letter to Paul Dana, April, 1898, Morison, *Letters,* II, 817.

53. Beale, *The Rise of America,* 449-452.

54. Mowry, *The Era of T. R.,* 143.

55. *Ibid.,* 143 ff. See also Foster R. Dulles, *The Imperial Years* (New York, 1956), 226-227.