APPENDIX

In which are reproduced one sample each of several types of Grandfather's speeches:

A Historical (George Washington)

B Religious (Paganism and Christianity)

C Educational (Optimism, Inspiration and Constructive Suggestion)

D Lecture Platform (Introduction to Lecture of Passion Play of 1910)

Also a sample of his writing on Research problems.

And in which are also reproduced some abbreviations of genealogical tables given in Volume I and additional tables for ancestors of children-in-law.

APPENDIX A

GEORGE WASHINGTON

An Address Delivered by Grandfather - February 22, 1904

The eminent Englishman, Lord Brougham has said, "Until time shall be no more, will a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and virtue be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington." It is therefore indeed most fitting that on this first anniversary of the formation of this Wausau Mens' Club, we should give evidence of the progress we have made in civic wisdom and virtue by meeting to pay our humble tribute to the name of the Father of our Country.

It is with civic pride that we venerate the name of Washington for in him we see personified those qualities that distinguish us as a city - integrity and broad Americanism. No charge of dishonest or dishonorable management has been made against those who have managed the affairs of the city; and the citizens, burying petty rivalries and differences, have always stood shoulder to shoulder for everything good for the city - nor has our vision been circumscribed by our city limits - but we have sought the advancement of our neighbors as well as of ourselves.

It is peculiarly appropriate that the Wausau Mens' Club should lay aside the cares of business and do honor to the name of Washington.

Washington had a splendid physique, he was six feet, two inches in height and had gigantic strength; the heavy colonial muskets he used as most men use pistols; his tent, a load for two men to lift, he would toss on to the baggage wagon with one hand. To this was added a striking face, and a reserved dignity of manner that gave becoming weight to his words. His intellect had not the qualities that dazzle by their brilliancy, but

he had that more rare and more practical quality of reaching a sound judgment. He never jumped to conclusions, but carefully weighed every matter and then reached decisions which were seldom if ever to be shaken. He had the patience and endurance to master every detail of a business in hand, e.g. we are told that in a controversey concerning two rival sites for a church, he personally measured the distance from each site to the home of every parishioner to demonstrate that his site was the most convenient - yet he never meddled when once he had entrusted a task to another.

But what did Washington do that in an age of great men, won for him alone the title "Father of our Country"? At first glance, other men appear to have done the striking things. It was the sterling patriot Samuel Adams that first roused the colonists to revolution, the voice that startled the hesitating congress into passing the Declaration of Independence was that of sturdy John Adams and the pen of Jefferson wrote that most momentous document of world's history. Schuyler entrapped Burgoyne and Cornwallis had been forced to retreat to Yorktown before Washington arrived.

Yet if Samuel Adams had sulked in his tent, some other voice would have proclaimed the end of tyranny, if John Adams and Thomas Jefferson had not been delegates to the continental congress, the progress of events would soon have forced the Declaration of Independence and another pen would have written it. If Schuyler, and Lafayette, and Gates and Green had never lived, other men would have filled their places, but if Washington had not performed the glorious services he did, the revolution would have failed and the nineteenth century would have found us a dependency of the British Crown.

To make this clear, a brief explanation of the peculiar conditions in America and England is necessary. Before the revolution every one of the thirteen colonies was virtually a self-governing republic. To be sure, in

most of them the governor was appointed by the King and judges and upper house were appointed by the King or subject to his approval. But in every colony the lower house was chosen by the people and this lower house controlled taxation and appropriation. If a governor saw fit to obey his master the King, rather than his paymaster, the popular house of the legislature, he might go hungry - and besides the King was across a wide ocean while the colonists could bring influence to bear at close quarters.

In the period of the Stuart Kings, while the American colonies were being planted, the English Parliament had wrested from the King all powers of legislation and taxation, and through the indifference of the first two Georges, Parliament had also acquired control of the ministers, thus seizing the executive and treaty making powers, leaving the King only the shadow of the scepter.

But George III had received from his dying mother the injunction "My son be King", and with all the narrow craft of his persistent mind he undertook to regain those powers. He would begin in America and when he had gained control of the men and money in America, he would by their assistance become King of England.

If he was to control the colonies he must himself pay the governors and judges; to get this money he quite logically taxed the colonies. The colonies rebelled - not because the taxes were burdensome (for they were light and the people prosperous), not because they were unwilling to contribute to the imperial expense of the mother country (for they were much attached to England by many ties of sentiment and business), not because they were taxed without being represented (for representation in the British Parliament would not have reconciled them to the loss of direct control of their governors and judges), but because self government itself

was at stake. If the King could levy taxes upon them and with the proceeds pay their officers, they were no longer virtually self governing republics but were in fact what they already were in theory dependencies of the British Crown.

The American revolution was not then a revolution to overturn an existing order of things and establish a new regime - it was a revolution to preserve the old order of colonial independence and to prevent George III from overturning it. Because of this fact, the situation in America presented just one supremely serious problem. The people were as unwilling to establish a strong central government of their own making as they were to allow the encroachment of the English King. "King Con", as they called the continental congress, might be as bad as King George, they said.

And the problem was, How could they be persuaded to establish an efficient central government? While the war lasted, it tended to hold the colonies together, yet the pitiful weakness of the continental congress was always apparent. The people were prosperous, yet in the midst of plenty the government could not reach out the strong hand of the law and take from the opulent citizens the needed sustenance for the starving army at Valley Forge; it had shoes, but could not get teams to transfer them to the barefoot soldiers, and here in a land enjoying comforts in abundance the soldiers died for lack of straw to put between their bodies and the frozen ground.

Could the Continental Congress of 1776 have commanded the men and resources of the country as did our National Congress in 1863, British Dominion in America would have ended at Long Island and the colonies would have been spared five years of blood and suffering.

Thru all these seven long years of petty wranglings and colonial

jealousies, just one man held together the discordant elements that tended to fly asunder, just one man kept spirit in that disheartened army until victory crowned their efforts at Yorktown and George III stuttered out to Parliament his acknowledgement of our independence, and rightly do we call that man the Father of his Country.

But the critical period of American history was not the war of the Revolution but the decade that followed Yorktown. During the war, the presence of a foreign foe and the appeals of Washington had held the colonists together, but with peace declared and Washington in retirement the new states swiftly drifted toward national anarchy.

Industry was ruined by paper money - attempts to collect taxes led to open rebellion in Massachusetts. New York and New Jersey harassed each other by tariff regulation, Connecticut and Pennsylvania started an interstate war over some western settlements and the Continental Congress, whom none now either respected or obeyed, was driven out of its hall by a band of drunken soldiers. Our debts were unpaid, our credit gone - we were bullied by France and England and insulted by Holland, while American sailors were enslaved by Barbary pirates with impunity.

But all this was to end, for a small assembly of men containing among themselves, says a great historian, "a greater amount of political sagacity than had ever before been brought together within the walls of a single room", were framing a new constitution and who could be found worthy to preside over such an assembly but Washington.

The shaping of our constitution was not so much his work as it was Madison's but it is doubtful whether the contending factions could have been held together until the work was done without the transcendent influence of their presiding officer.

But to frame a government was one thing - to persuade thirteen selfish and jealous colonies to adopt it was indeed different. Here, a second time, Washington merited the title Father of his Country. To be sure, the work of explaining the constitution on the floors of the several state conventions fell to others, for Washington had no such power of lucid reasoning as Marshall displayed in the Virginia convention, foreshadowing the coming of America's greatest jurist, nor had he such eloquence as Hamilton skillfully wielded in the New York convention until its big majority melted away and the opposition leader arose to acknowledge - not that he had been defeated but that he had been convinced.

Yet not so much the reasoning of Marshall or the eloquence of Hamilton persuaded these thirteen wrangling states to adopt this instrument, as did the character of Washington. The states feared that a strong central government would endanger their liberties as had the tyranny of George III, but every delegate thought of Washington as the first President and knew that he who so indignantly rejected the crown offered him by his soldiers would never abuse the powers of President.

But the Constitution when adopted was inanimate words - to call them to life and create from them the best government revealed to mankind devolved on our first President. This great constructive work was probably not so much Washington's as that of his brilliant Secretary of State Hamilton, but we must not suppose that our first President was a mere figurehead, he was in fact as well as in name, the President. He had remarkable ability to judge men and to give every man the task for which he was best fitted. Washington had the tact to keep at the same time in his cabinet men as different as Jefferson and Hamilton - and to turn to the public good the illustrious talents of each. Assisted by all the illustri-

ous men of his time but controlled by none of them, Washington laid the sound and broad foundations that support our glorious national government of today.

For our national independence, for our constitution, for our government under the constitution, are we indebted to Washington. But the result of Washington's work is not confined to the eighty million of people within our present bounds, for his example has inspired patriots in other lands until little republics have almost covered South America. That they are conscious of their debt may be inferred by the traveler to Bolivia's capital as he turns from the statue of their Bolivar to behold the statue of our Washington -- yet not ours alone - the world's great Washington.

The spirit of revolution flew across the Atlantic and shook every throne in Europe - and surely it is by no chance, if the press predictions are correct, that the Czar of Russia has selected today - the 172nd anniversary of the birth of Washington to give a popular legislature to the last country of Christendom under absolute rule.

Strange as it may seem, England herself has cause to remember gratefully the name of Washington, for the American revolution was the last war of that series of English conflicts in which the sovereignity of the people triumphed over the divine right of Kings. Yorktown not only cost George III his most precious colony; it ended forever the personal power of the King and the English people can well class Washington with Eliott and Hampton and William of Orange as one of the founders of their political liberties.

Without attempting any expansive analysis of the qualities of mind and character that gave Washington this unparalleled power of leadership, allow me in closing to call attention to his two cardinal political virtues:

The first of these was integrity. Chief Justice Marshall in his masterful biography says, "His whole correspondence does not furnish a single case from which even an enemy would infer that he was capable under any circumstances of stooping to the employment of duplicity. His ends were always upright; his means were always pure. What higher tribute can be paid to the integrity of a mortal - His ends were always upright, his means were always pure."

His second cardinal virtue was his broad Americanism. He was not a Virginian - he was an American. Brought up in Virginian aristocracy, he had a breadth of view and sympathy that led him quickly to appreciate the virtues of the rude soldiers of the New England democracies and win their admiration and affection. Obtaining his own schooling in the camp and in the field rather than in collegiate halls, he did not despise the education which he had missed. He deeply regretted the lack of early training and was always most eager by word and deed to promote education.

Almost alone, he appreciated the value of the land beyond the Alleghenies and foresaw the rapid development of new republics, while Jefferson was prophesying that the settlements would not reach the Mississippi for a thousand years.

It was this broad Americanism, rising above faction, or colony, or sect, and with unerring judgment seeing the good in all, and striving for the good for all, that made him the peerless leader of all.

To describe the character of Washington is difficult, for we are wont to describe a character by pointing out those peculiarities which distinguish the individual from the perfect and when we meet a character that approaches the perfect, powers of description fail, and the character of Washington, as Irving has well said, "possesses fewer inequalities and a

rarer union of virtues than perhaps ever fell to the lot of one man."

Let us then not attempt to analyze his character or to penetrate that veil of dignified reserve which he chose to put between his inmost thoughts and the public gaze. Let us be content to appreciate truly that he was indeed first in war and first in peace and may we ever think him first in the hearts of his countrymen.