

unprocrastinated repentance applied to the *sin of slavery*.⁶⁰ "I know not by what rule of the gospel men are authorized to leave off their sins by a slow process," Garrison argued.⁶¹ He berated the Reverend Lyman Beecher for supporting colonization while denying his congregation the luxury of gradually leaving off alcohol, adultery, and stealing.⁶²

Abolitionists preached immediate, not gradual, repentance and emancipation in an effort to persuade the American people of their duty and ability to abolish slavery immediately. They called for immediate repentance of the sin of slavery, believing that repentance would ultimately result in total abolition. Because abolitionists were willing to admit that immediate emancipation might in fact be gradually accomplished, their program appeared deceptively moderate. Actually, its purpose was a reform of society and individuals far more radical and thoroughgoing than has been imputed even to Garrison—not turning the slaves loose without any restriction whatever, regardless of consequences, but raising the moral tenor of a nation and changing the minds and hearts of white Americans with regard to the Negro, slavery, and abolition. It did not propose to use the method of judicial or legislative decree, but to effect the wholesale regeneration of the American people. In this respect the immediatist solution to the problem of slavery was typically evangelical. Confronted with a frustrating and burdensome evil, abolitionists approached it through the familiar experience of heart-searching, repentance, and conversion. They proposed to dispel human wickedness and moral evil by individual regeneration, and they believed that repentant sinners would turn from selfishness to active benevolence on behalf of the slaves. Preached in evangelical terms, "immediate emancipation" was very often indistinguishable from "immediate repentance."

⁶⁰ *Liberator*, August 17, 1833, p. 129; see also Wright, *Sin of Slavery*, 20-21. "Immediate Abolition," *Liberator*, January 7, 1832, p. 2; Garrison, *Thoughts*, 79. Atlee, *Address to the Citizens of Philadelphia*, 10-11.

⁶¹ "Strange Obliquity of Moral Vision," *Liberator*, November 12, 1831, p. 153.

⁶² *Ibid.*, July 9, 1831, p. 111.

"Radicals" and Economic Policies: The Senate, 1861-1873

By GLENN M. LINDEN

IN A VOLUME PUBLISHED IN 1963 WITH THE TITLE *Generalization in the Writing of History*, Professor David M. Potter quoted a generalization concerning the "Radical Republicans": "The Radical Republicans defeated Lincoln's mild program and inaugurated the era of drastic reconstruction." In analyzing that generalization, Professor Potter expressed the conclusion that this relatively simple sentence, though apparently devoid of theory, contains at least three very broad generalizations, each one treacherous in the extreme. First is a generalization which ascribes to an unstated number of individuals a common identity strong enough to justify classifying them as a group—namely, the Radical Republicans—and ascribes to this group a crucial role in defeating one policy and implementing another. Yet, in terms of analysis historians have had great difficulty either in defining what constituted a Radical or in proving that any given aggregate of individuals formed a truly cohesive Radical bloc.¹

Historians have indeed had "great difficulty either in defining what constituted a Radical or in proving that any given aggregate of individuals formed a truly cohesive Radical bloc." One example of this difficulty may be seen in the continuing exchange of views on the subject between Professors T. Harry Williams and David Donald; and their dialogue may suggest one possibly fruitful way of approaching the complex problem posed by Professor Potter.² Professors Williams and Donald, in their most recently published essays on the subject, present contrasting

¹ David M. Potter, "Explicit Data and Implicit Assumptions in Historical Study," in Louis Gottschalk (ed.), *Generalization in the Writing of History* (Chicago, 1963), 184.

² T. Harry Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals* ([Madison], 1941) and "Lincoln and the Radicals: An Essay in Civil War History and Historiography," in Grady McWhiney (ed.), *Grant, Lee, Lincoln and the Radicals* (Evanston, 1964), 92-117; David Donald, "Devils Facing Zionward," *ibid.*, 72-91, and "The Radicals and Lincoln," in Donald, *Lincoln Reconsidered* (New York, 1956), 103-27.

MR. LINDEN is assistant professor of history at New Mexico State University.

descriptions and interpretations of Radical Republicans. In so doing, they point up the problems involved in classifying individuals as members of the group.³ Moreover, Professor Donald suggests one way of identifying the political position of individuals in his statement that "Too many historians have failed to look at the voting patterns of the Civil War Congresses."⁴ The identification of individual Radicals by name through analysis of votes and the identification of specific policies or actions as "Radical" seems to be one of the most fruitful avenues for future studies of Radicalism.

This article attempts to use quantitative methods to test certain historical generalizations—particularly that there was a group of "Radical Republicans" in the Civil War and Reconstruction period and that these Radicals tended to support economic measures favorable to big business. Although the word "Radical" has had many different meanings, it is safe to say that most historians have equated it with severity towards former Confederates and support for Negroes in the political area and with support of dominant Republican industrial and business interests in the economic area. The present author has collected records of the voting behavior of congressmen from July 1861 to March 1873 (the Thirty-seventh through the Forty-second Congress) and has sought to identify "Radicals" by name.⁵ Evidence drawn from only one source, the votes in Congress, and reflecting the views of only the senators and congressmen, obviously cannot provide a picture of the entire society and of the entire range of behavior. Such evidence may, however, throw at least some light on the society and on the range of behavior by providing as precise an identification and description as possible of the particular group based on the one type of evidence.

³ Although neither author was attempting to provide a complete listing of the Radicals and they did not restrict themselves to senators and congressmen, each mentioned Zachariah Chandler, James A. Garfield, George W. Julian, Wendell Phillips, Thaddeus Stevens, Charles Sumner, and Benjamin F. Wade as Radicals. Donald also named John A. Andrew, Benjamin F. Butler, Salmon P. Chase, Henry Winter Davis, James W. Grimes, and Horace Greeley; Williams referred to Lydia Maria Child, Joshua Giddings, Owen Lovejoy, and Henry Wilson.

⁴ Donald, "Devils Facing Zionward," 79.

⁵ See Glenn M. Linden, "Congressmen, 'Radicalism,' and Economic Issues, 1861-1873" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1963). This study includes both senators and representatives, and it reaches essentially the same conclusions for both houses, suggesting that any differences in the rules and procedures of the Senate and the House of Representatives did not reflect themselves in the roll-call vote. The present article restricts itself to a consideration of senators because of the limitations of space.

In seeking to identify "Radicals" in Congress by name during the era of Civil War and Reconstruction, the writer analyzed eighty-two roll-call votes in the Senate from the Confiscation Act of 1862 through the resolutions on Arkansas and Louisiana in 1873.⁶ These votes constituted the writer's test of "Radicalism" in Congress from 1861 to 1873. On this total of eighty-two votes (thirty-two final votes and fifty votes on amendments), the senators were classified as supporters or opponents of "Radical" measures. A list was compiled of thirty-two Republican senators and one Democratic senator who supported "Radical" measures (1) in at least 75 per cent of the votes they cast on the eighty-two roll-call votes described above and (2) for all the terms they served in the Senate from 1861 to 1873. These thirty-three senators, who constitute the writer's list of "Radical" senators as determined by roll-call votes for the period from 1861 to 1873, are presented in Table 1.

Senator John B. Henderson, Democrat from Missouri, voted in support of all "Radical" measures under consideration here during the period May 1865 to November 1866. During the period December 1866 to March 1873 Henderson voted in favor of "Radical" measures in 78 per cent of the votes he cast, but he voted in only nine of the sixty-five roll calls under consideration during this period and for this reason he is not identified by the writer as a "Radical."⁷

⁶ The writer compiled his list of test measures from those mentioned in fifteen standard histories of the period. A complete list of the eighty-two roll calls is given in Linden, "Congressmen, 'Radicalism,' and Economic Issues," 119-26. For charts showing the vote of each senator on each of the roll calls, see *ibid.*, 127-33. Among the key measures used were: Confiscation Act, *Congressional Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 Sess., 3276 (July 12, 1862); Thirteenth Amendment, *ibid.*, 1490 (April 8, 1864); Wade-Davis Bill, *ibid.*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 3461 (July 1, 1864); Freedmen's Bureau Bill, *ibid.*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 421 (January 25, 1866); Civil Rights Bill, *ibid.*, 606-607 (February 2, 1866); Fourteenth Amendment, *ibid.*, 3041 (June 8, 1866); Reconstruction Act over veto, *ibid.*, 2 Sess., 1976 (March 2, 1867); Omnibus Bill over veto, *ibid.*, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 3466 (June 25, 1868); Fifteenth Amendment, *ibid.*, 3 Sess., 1641 (February 26, 1869); bill to admit Virginia, Mississippi, and Texas, *ibid.*, 41 Cong., 1 Sess., 656 (April 9, 1869); bill to admit Georgia, *ibid.*, 2 Sess., 2829 (April 19, 1870); Enforcement Act, *ibid.*, 3 Sess., 1655 (February 24, 1871); Ku Klux Klan Act, *ibid.*, 42 Cong., 1 Sess., 709 (April 14, 1871).

⁷ Linden, "Congressmen, 'Radicalism,' and Economic Issues," 131. In addition many senators did not vote on enough measures to be classified in any one of the three categories during a given period. If they did not participate in one-third of the votes of a period, they were not included in that period. Several senators voted on enough economic measures to be included in Table 4 but not on enough political measures to be included in Tables 1, 2, or 3. They are S. G. Arnold, J. F. Simmons, P. King, A. Kennedy, and M. S. Latham.

TABLE 1*

"RADICAL" SENATORS				
State	July 1861- April 1865	May 1865- Nov. 1866	Dec. 1866- March 1873	
<i>Republicans:</i>				
Buckingham, W. A.	Conn.			X
Cameron, S.	Pa.			X
Carpenter, M. H.	Wis.			X
Cattell, A. G.	N. J.			X
Chandler, Z.	Mich.	X	X	X
Conness, J.	Calif.	X	X	X
Corbett, H. W.	Ore.			X
Cragin, A. H.	N. H.		X	X
Creswell, J. A. J.	Md.		X	X
Edmunds, G. F.	Vt.		X	X
Ferry, T. W.	Mich.			X
Fogg, G. G.	N. H.			X
Frelinghuysen, F. T.	N. J.			X
Hale, J. P.	N. H.	X		
Hamlin, H.	Me.			X
Harlan, J.	Iowa	X		X
Kirkwood, S. J.	Iowa		X	X
Lane, J. H.	Kan.	X	X	
Morrill, J. S.	Vt.			X
Morton, O. H. P. T.	Ind.			X
Patterson, J. W.	N. H.			X
Poland, L. P.	Vt.		X	X
Pomeroy, S. C.	Kan.	X	X	X
Pratt, D. D.	Ind.			X
Ramsey, A.	Minn.	X	X	X
Sherman, J.	Ohio	X	X	X
Sumner, C.	Mass.	X	X	X
Thayer, J. M.	Neb.			X
Wade, B. F.	Ohio	X	X	X
Wilkinson, M. S.	Minn.	X		
Wilson, H.	Mass.	X	X	X
Windom, W.	Minn.			X
<i>Democrats:</i>				
Brown, B. G.	Mo.	X	X	X

* X indicates the period in which the senator was in office and voted sufficiently to be classified

A list of "Non-Radical" senators was also compiled—those who voted in favor of "Radical" measures on the eighty-two roll-call votes less than 50 per cent of the time during their terms in the Senate from 1861 through 1873. This "Non-Radical" list included the names of twenty-eight senators shown in Table 2.

Those senators whose voting records were neither "Radical" nor "Non-Radical" (as defined above) were classified as "Unaligned." These thirty-nine senators are shown in Table 3.

TABLE 2*

"NON-RADICAL" SENATORS				
State	July 1861- April 1865	May 1865- Nov. 1866	Dec. 1866- March 1873	
<i>Republicans:</i>				
Cowan, E.	Pa.	X	X	X
Dixon, J.	Conn.		X	X
Doolittle, J. R.	Wis.		X	X
Hitchcock, P. W.	Neb.			X
<i>Democrats:</i>				
Bayard, J. A.	Del.			X
Blair, F. P.	Mo.			X
Buckalew, C. R.	Pa.	X	X	X
Casserly, E.	Calif.			X
Davis, G.	Ky.			X
Davis, H. G.	W. Va.			X
Guthrie, J.	Ky.		X	
Hamilton, W. T.	Md.			X
Hendricks, T. A.	Ind.	X	X	X
Johnson, R.	Md.		X	X
Johnston, J. W.	Va.			X
Kelly, J. K.	Ore.			X
Machen, W. B.	Ky.			X
McCreery, T. C.	Ky.			X
McDougall, J. A.	Calif.	X	X	
Nesmith, J. W.	Ore.		X	X
Powell, L. W.	Ky.	X		
Riddle, G. R.	Del.	X		
Saulsbury, W.	Del.	X	X	X
Stevenson, J. W.	Ky.		X	X
Stockton, J. P.	N. J.			X
Thurman, A. G.	Ohio			X
Vickers, G.	Md.			X
Whyte, W. P.	Md.			X

*X indicates the period in which the senator was in office and voted sufficiently to be classified

TABLE 3

"UNALIGNED" SENATORS					
SENATOR	STATE	SENATOR	STATE	SENATOR	STATE
Anthony, H. B.	R. I.	Foster, L. S.	Conn.	Schurz, C.	Mo.
Boreman, A. I.	W. Va.	Grimes, J. W.	Iowa	Scott, J.	Pa.
Browning, O. H.	Ill.	Harris, I.	N. Y.	Sprague, W.	R. I.
Caldwell, A.	Kan.	Howard, J. M.	Mich.	Stewart, W. M.	Nev.
Carlile, J. S.	Va.	Howe, T. O.	Wis.	Ten Eyck, J. C.	N. J.
Clark, D.	N. H.	Howell, J. B.	Iowa	Tipton, T. W.	Neb.
Cole, C.	Calif.	Lane, H. S.	Ind.	Trumbull, L.	Ill.
Conkling, R.	N. Y.	Logan, J. A.	Ill.	Van Winkle, P. G.	W. Va.
Drake, C. D.	Mo.	Morgan, E. D.	N. Y.	Wiley, W. T.	W. Va.
Fenton, R. E.	N. Y.	Morrill, L. M.	Me.	Williams, G. H.	Ore.
Ferry, O. S.	Conn.	Norton, D. S.	Minn.	Wilson, R.	Mo.
Fessenden, W. P.	Me.	Nye, J. W.	Nev.	Wright, G. G.	Iowa
Foot, S.	Vt.	Ross, E. G.	Kan.	Yates, R.	Ill.

Analysis of the voting records thus provides *one* basis for classifying senators. It is not maintained here that this is the only basis on which senators can or should be classified—instead, this classification is seen as a supplement to existing studies—a supplement, it is hoped, which supports efforts for a more specific and a more comprehensive identification of individuals by name as “Radical,” “Non-Radical,” or “Unaligned.”⁸

Once the senators have been identified in the manner described above, it is possible to use the identifications to examine one of the major disagreements in the descriptions and interpretations of “Radicals” by historians—the disagreement concerning the economic policies and programs advocated and supported by “Radicals.”

Historians have presented varied descriptions and interpretations of the economic policies and programs of “Radicals” during the years of Civil War and Reconstruction. Some have pictured the “Radicals” as a group of individuals in general agreement on economic policies, policies which were designed to benefit industrial and business interests (with the implication that most

⁸ An article by Edward L. Gambill, “Who Were the Senate Radicals?” *Civil War History*, XI (September 1965), 237-44, seeks to identify Radicals in the Thirty-ninth Congress, March 4, 1865, to March 3, 1867. His findings are similar to those stated above, though the selection of a shorter period and the establishing of a minimum percentage of 83.3 for “Radicalism” results in some significant differences. He includes parts of moderate and Radical Reconstruction together—December 1865 to November 1866 and December 1866 to March 1867—while the present writer has divided them at the election of 1866. Also he has focused on political Radicalism, whereas the present article is concerned with both political and economic Radicalism. The differences are as follows: (1) Anthony of Rhode Island, Howard of Michigan, and Yates of Illinois appear as “Radical” in Gambill’s findings, whereas this writer considers them “Unaligned,” since their voting records in the July 1861 to April 1865 and December 1866 to March 1873 periods were less than 75 per cent in support of “Radical” measures. (2) Brown of Missouri, Conness of California, Cragin of New Hampshire, and Poland of Vermont are classified as Moderate Republicans by Gambill; this writer classified them as “Radical,” since each supported “Radical” measures in at least 75 per cent of the votes they cast. (The dividing line between “Radicals” and Moderate Republicans is not easy to determine, but 75 per cent seems more realistic than 83.3 per cent.) (3) Creswell of Maryland, Kirkwood of Iowa, Lane of Kansas, and Sherman of Ohio are considered Moderate Republicans by Gambill in his findings; this writer considers them “Radicals” because of their 80 per cent or higher support of “Radical” measures during all of their terms in the Senate from 1861 to 1873. (4) Norton of Minnesota and Van Winkle of West Virginia are classified as Conservative Republicans by Gambill, whereas this writer considers them “Unaligned.” Cowan of Pennsylvania, Dixon of Connecticut, and Doolittle of Wisconsin are also classified as Conservative Republicans by Gambill and as “Non-Radical” by this writer. These differences may be largely semantic and of doubtful importance. It might be mentioned that it is difficult to determine which specific measures Gambill used in his scales and whether they do effectively measure Radicalism.

industrial and business interests favored similar economic policies). Two historians who have made influential interpretations of this sort are Professor T. Harry Williams and the late Howard K. Beale. According to Professor Beale, in a volume published in 1930 and reprinted in 1958, “. . . in general, the Radical Party represented Big Business, railroads, manufacturers, and monopolists . . .”⁹ Professor David Donald, some of his former students, and Professor Robert P. Sharkey have expressed a different conclusion. “The charge,” Professor Donald has written, “that they [the Radicals] were spokesmen for the business interests of the North presupposes a degree of unity among these antislavery leaders which did not, in fact, exist.”¹⁰ Professor Sharkey, referring to his book, *Money, Class, and Party*, has stated, “Among the more important results of this study is the conclusion that among the so-called Radical Republicans there were serious cleavages on financial questions.”¹¹

In analyzing these two contrasting descriptions of the economic policies of “Radicals,” the previous identification of senators as “Radical,” “Non-Radical,” or “Unaligned” can be used. Did, for example, the senators identified in Table 1 as “Radical” vote alike on economic issues in the Senate during the years from 1861 through March 1873? In order to determine which economic issues in the Senate should be considered in answering that question, the writer analyzed ninety-five roll-call votes (nineteen final votes and seventy-six votes on amendments) ranging from the Legal Tender Act of 1862 to the Supplementary National Currency Bill of 1873.¹²

⁹ Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York, 1930), 263; see also Beale, “The Tariff and Reconstruction,” *American Historical Review*, XXXV (January 1930), 276-94, and Williams, *Lincoln and the Radicals*. A possible modification of Williams’ views is presented in his essay, “Lincoln and the Radicals: An Essay in Civil War History and Historiography,” which discusses Radical economic views on pages 99-100 and in note 10, page 115.

¹⁰ Donald, *Lincoln Reconsidered*, 110; Stanley Coben, “Northeastern Business and Radical Reconstruction: A Re-examination,” *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XLVI (June 1959), 67-90; Irwin Unger, “Business and Currency in the Ohio Gubernatorial Campaign of 1875,” *Mid-America*, XLI (January 1959), 27-39, and “Business Men and Specie Resumption,” *Political Science Quarterly*, LXXIV (March 1959), 46-70.

¹¹ Robert P. Sharkey, *Money, Class, and Party: An Economic Study of Civil War and Reconstruction* (Baltimore, 1959), 279.

¹² A list of the measures considered and the issues involved in the ninety-five roll calls may be found in Linden, “Congressmen, ‘Radicalism,’ and Economic Issues,” 142-44, 149, 152-56; charts showing the vote of each senator on each of the roll calls appear on pages 145-48, 150-51, 157-59. Among the measures considered were the following: Legal Tender Act, *Cong. Globe*, 37 Cong., 2 Sess.,

To see if the "Radical" senators voted alike on these ninety-five roll calls on economic issues, the vote of the majority of "Radical" senators on each roll call was computed and designated "yea" or "nay" as the "majority Radical vote" for that particular roll call. Then the voting record of each senator in the ninety-five roll calls was compared with the "majority Radical vote." Earlier, thirty-three "Radical" senators were identified on the basis that on eighty-two roll-call votes they had voted the "Radical" position on at least 75 per cent of the votes they cast and for all the terms they served in the Senate from 1861 through March 1873. Applying the same standard to the ninety-five roll calls on economic issues, only ten of the thirty-three "Radical" senators voted in accord with the "majority Radical vote" on at least 75 per cent of the roll calls and for all the terms they served in the Senate from 1861 through March 1873.¹³ Thus the evidence from the total of 177 roll-call votes seems to indicate that the "Radical" senators who voted together on noneconomic issues did not vote together to any marked extent on economic issues.¹⁴

In order to see if there were some more pronounced pattern in the voting on economic issues, the same ninety-five votes on economic issues were rearranged according to the geographic section represented by the senators. On this basis fifty-seven senators voted in agreement with the other senators from their geographic section on at least 75 per cent of the votes they cast on the ninety-five roll-call votes described above and for all the terms they served in the Senate from 1861 to 1873. In the first period, from 1861 to 1865, thirty-five of fifty-seven senators had a voting position 75 per cent or more in agreement with members of their own geographic section. In the second period, from May 1865 to November 1866, thirty-one out of forty senators, and in the third period, from December 1866 to March 1873, forty-

804 (February 13, 1862); Homestead Bill, *ibid.*, 1951 (May 6, 1862); National Currency Bill, *ibid.*, 3 Sess., 897 (February 13 [12?], 1863); Internal Revenue Bill, *ibid.*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., 2770 (June 6, 1864); Loan Bill, *ibid.*, 39 Cong., 1 Sess., 1854 (April 9, 1866); Contraction Bill, *ibid.*, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 537 (January 15, 1868); Tax on Manufacturers, *ibid.*, 1992 (March 19, 1868); Supplementary Currency Bill, *ibid.*, 3223 (June 17, 1868); Bill to Strengthen Public Credit, *ibid.*, 41 Cong., 1 Sess., 70 (March 15, 1869); Funding Bill, *ibid.*, 2 Sess., 1884 (March 11, 1870); Coinage Bill, *ibid.*, 3 Sess., 399 (January 10, 1871); Tax and Tariff Bill, *ibid.*, 42 Cong., 2 Sess., 4088 (May 30, 1872); Supplementary National Currency Bill, *ibid.*, 3 Sess., 1107 (February 5, 1873).

¹³ The ten senators were Conness of California, Cragin of New Hampshire, Ferry of Michigan, Hale of New Hampshire, Hamlin of Maine, Kirkwood of Iowa, Lane of Kansas, Thayer of Nebraska, Wade of Ohio, and Wilkinson of Minnesota.

¹⁴ Charles Sumner voted in agreement with the "majority Radical vote" 60 per cent of the time from December 1866 to March 1873.

eight out of eighty-two senators possessed this same degree of voting unity. These results are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4*

SENATORS ALIGNED GEOGRAPHICALLY ON ECONOMIC ISSUES		Classi- fication	State	July 1861- April 1865	May 1865- Nov. 1866	Dec. 1866- March 1873
NEW ENGLAND STATES						
<i>Republicans:</i>						
Anthony, H. B.	(U)	R. I.		X	X	X
Arnold, S. G.		R. I.		X		
Buckingham, W. A.	(R)	Conn.				X
Clark, D.	(U)	N. H.		X		
Dixon, J.	(NR)	Conn.		X		X
Edmunds, G. F.	(R)	Vt.			X	X
Ferry, O. S.	(U)	Conn.				X
Hale, J. P.	(R)	N. H.		X		
Hamlin, H.	(R)	Me.				X
Patterson, J. W.	(R)	N. H.				X
Poland, L. P.	(R)	Vt.			X	X
Simmons, J. F.		R. I.		X		
MID-ATLANTIC STATES						
<i>Republicans:</i>						
Cameron, S.	(R)	Pa.				X
Conkling, R.	(U)	N. Y.				X
Cowan, E.	(NR)	Pa.		X	X	
Fenton, R. E.	(U)	N. Y.				X
Frelinghuysen, F. T.	(R)	N. J.				X
King, P.		N. Y.		X		
Scott, J.	(U)	Pa.				X
Ten Eyck, J. C.	(U)	N. J.		X		
MIDDLE WESTERN STATES						
<i>Democrats:</i>						
Norton, D. S.	(U)	Minn.				X
Tipton, T. W.	(U)	Neb.				X
Wright, G. G.	(U)	Iowa.				X
<i>Republicans:</i>						
Harlan, J.	(R)	Iowa		X		X
Hitchcock, P. W.	(NR)	Neb.				X
Howell, J. B.	(U)	Iowa				X
Lane, H. S.	(U)	Ind.		X	X	X
Lane, J. H.	(R)	Kan.		X		
Logan, J. A.	(U)	Ill.				X
Morton, O. H. P. T.	(R)	Ind.				X
Pratt, D. D.	(R)	Ind.				X
Ramsey, A.	(R)	Minn.		X	X	X
Sherman, J.	(R)	Ohio		X	X	X
Thayer, J. M.	(R)	Neb.				X
Wade, B. F.	(R)	Ohio		X	X	X
Windom, W.	(R)	Minn.				X
Yates, R.	(U)	Ill.			X	X

TABLE 4* (Continued)
 SENATORS ALIGNED GEOGRAPHICALLY ON ECONOMIC ISSUES

Classi- fication	State	July 1861- April 1865	May 1865- Nov. 1866	Dec. 1866- March 1873
---------------------	-------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

BORDER STATES

Democrats:

Bayard, J. A.	NR	Del.		X
Davis, H. G.	NR	W. Va.		X
Hammon, W. T.	NR	Md.		X
Henderson, J. B.		Mo.	X	X
Johnson, R.	NR	Md.	X	X
McCreery, T. C.	NR	Ky.		X
Powell, L. W.	NR	Ky.	X	
Robt. G. R.	NR	Del.	X	
Saunders, W.	NR	Del.	X	X
Stevenson, J. W.	NR	Ky.		X
Vickers, G.	NR	Md.		X

Republicans:

Creswell, J. A. J.	(R)	Md.		X
Schurz, C.	U	Mo.		X
Van Winkle, P. C.	U	W. Va.	X	X

Unionists:

Carlin, J. S.	(U)	Va.	X	
Kennedy, A.		Md.	X	

PACIFIC COAST STATES

Democrats:

Latham, M. S.		Calif.	X	
McDonnell, J. A.	(NR)	Calif.	X	

Republicans:

Cole, C.	U	Calif.		X
Williams, G. H.	U	Ore.	X	X

* X indicates the period in which the senator was in office and voted sufficiently to be classified. The letters in parentheses indicate the classification of the senator as "Radical," "Non-Radical," or "Unaligned" in terms of voting on political measures. A few senators did not vote on sufficient political measures to be classified.

Table 4 thus indicates that on the ninety-five roll calls on economic issues, senators from the same geographic region voted together more frequently than did "Radical" senators. Many senators from the same geographic region tended to vote together on the economic issues in question, whether the senators were "Radical," "Non-Radical," or "Unaligned," and whether the senators were Republicans or Democrats. Republican and Democratic senators from the Middle Western and Pacific Coast regions, in particular, voted like their colleagues from their sections on the roll calls on economic measures.

The evidence described above from the 177 roll-call votes in the Senate and the analysis of that evidence provide the basis for the following conclusions:

1. Thirty-three senators have been identified as "Radicals," twenty-eight as "Non-Radical," and thirty-nine as "Unaligned" for the period from July 1861 through March 1873, in terms of their voting records in eighty-two roll-call votes on measures pertaining to the reconstruction of the Southern States and to Negroes.¹⁵ Those eighty-two roll-call votes provide one definition of "Radicalism" in specific terms, with the generalized definition being that "Radicalism" consisted in support for Negroes and for restrictions on former Confederates.

2. "Radical" senators, as defined above, did not vote alike in ninety-five roll-call votes on such economic issues as the tariff, currency, and banking, nor did "Non-Radical" senators vote alike. Instead, when these economic issues came before the Congress for decision, senators ("Radical" or "Non-Radical," Democrat or Republican) tended to vote with other senators from the same geographic section. This suggests that the definition of "Radicalism" in the Civil War and Reconstruction years should not specify a particular stand on economic questions so far as the voting of "Radical" senators is concerned.

The identification of individual "Radicals" by name, and of specific measures as "Radical," may provide a fruitful method for tackling the difficult problem described by Professor Potter at the beginning of this article.

¹⁵ This quantitative voting analysis sustains Professors Donald and Williams in classifying Senators Zachariah Chandler, Charles Sumner, and Benjamin F. Wade as "Radicals," but it does not sustain the classification by Donald of James W. Grimes as a "Radical," since his voting record in the period from December 1866 to March 1873 was only 58 per cent "Radical." See note 3 above.