

(1)

Hale, Missouri,
18th March, 1892.

Hon. A. W. Longwell,
Mayville, N. Y.
Dear Sir:-

Your favor
of 8th inst. was read with in-
terest. No one admires "A
Bystander's Notes" more than
your humble correspondent.

My objection to your "rule",
as you term it, - "The radical of
to-day is the conservative of to-
morrow" - is based on general
principles and not on special
or extreme cases.

I am aware that some of
the old Abolitionists dropped
the Negro "like a hot potato"
as soon as the war made him
nominally free, and that Horace
Greeley's prescription was "Boot
Hog or die." I am also aware

(2)

that Mr. Greeley had an ambition for the Presidency that caused him to so far forget the work and record of his life as to consent to lead that motley host which arrogates to itself the name of "the Democracy." I am aware that Benedict Arnold didn't pull true to the end of his public career; neither did Aaron Burr, John Tyler, nor Andy Johnson.

But all these examples do not impeach the integrity of the main body of the people, nor of that freedom loving organization known as the Republican party.

I have heard a homely old adage to the effect that "the hottest love is soonest cold," and the examples I have cited are all of men

(3)

who were very hot at the beginning of the race.

They were extremists rather than radicals.

My definition of the term "radical" is one who believes in going to the roots of things, instead of digging a little at the surface and then giving it up as a bad job. Webster defines it thus:

"Radical - original; implanted by nature; democratic."

In a political sense, then, I understand a radical to be one who is rooted and grounded in the faith of that immortal declaration that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," etc. The Republican Party is the only political

(4)

organization in this country that answers to this definition.

In saying this I don't mean to be understood as thinking that there are no trucklers in the Republican party - six or seven such, in the United States Senate, who thought more of their silver than of human rights, were all that prevented the "Federal elections bill" from becoming a law - but its rank and file have the courage of their convictions and will not go back on the question of equal rights for all. If we can convert a Democrat, well and good, but when converted he will join that party in which, in the future as heretofore, the hope of the oppressed must abide. But I don't need to argue this point with you. You see it as well as I.

In "A Bystander's Notes," in the Inter Ocean of March 1st, the same in which you say, "the radical of to-day is always the conservative of to-morrow," you also say:

"The Bystander is in receipt of many letters which inquire what reason he has to expect that the Republican party will in the future perform the duty it has hitherto neglected.

There are three reasons:

1. Because the previous neglect has not been at the demand of the Republican party, but the errors of its manipulators.

2. Because the great mass of those who love liberty and believe in justice are of that party.

3. Because it is learning the lesson of many battles and many defeats. From the Proclamation of Emancipation until the present

(6)

devotion to the rights of man has brought it victory, and in every case their betrayal and neglect has brought defeat.

In fact, it is the distinctive principle of the party.

A Democrat may be a protectionist, but one who believes in equal rights for all citizens cannot be a Democrat.

To most of the above - as well as to most else in "A Bystander's Notes" - I can subscribe with a hearty amen.

I would not lay as much stress, however, as you seem to, on the "betrayal and neglect" of the rights of man by the Republican party. It has made too strong a fight, right recently, in behalf of those rights to merit such an accusation.

Six or eight U.S. Senators do not constitute the Republican party of the United States.

(7)

You and I can see exactly what ought to be; but the question, in our anomalous system of government, is a difficult one.

Many members of the Republican party were formerly Democrats and it is hard for some of them to entirely shake off the dust of "State rights and strict construction". As interpreted, for many years, by a majority of the American people, our government has consisted of two sovereignties liable to eternal clashings and antagonisms.

Our forefathers, amongst many blunders and mistakes, committed the one of leaving the regulation of the "right of suffrage" to the states. It ought never to have been so left, and now we have to struggle on against this and other blunders and flounder along in the old ruts until a revival of justice and common sense shall cause

(8)

"truth crushed to earth" to
"rise again!"

I hope for this consumma-
-tion and will do what I can
to help bring it about.

I cast my first vote for
John C. Fremont, in 1856, and
have voted the same kind of
ticket ever since; so, you see,
I was a "radical" of 36 years
ago and am a "radical" of
to-day," and whatever hope I
have of finally anchoring our
good "Ship of State" in the haven
of "Equal Rights for All" still
centers in the grand, old
Republican party.

Pardon this long letter,
and believe me

Yours, very cordially,

W. A. Bartlett