

S.B. Essay Planning / Essay

90

"Senator Sumner's 1856 speech revealed an unbridgeable division between the North & South"

- Charles Sumner - Republican
Speech given in senate on "Crime Against Kansas"

4 * A - Yes - Biased - Emotional - Republican - Northern -

2 Δ B - NO - Newspaper - Factual - Northern

5 0 C ~~Yes~~ - NO - Emotional - Southern - Newspaper

3 0 D - Yes & NO - Biased - Persuasive - opinionated - emotional - doesn't even really talk about the speech

* * E - Yes - Both sides - impartial - time to reflect, Factual

Sources E, A, & C both support the assertion that Senator Sumner's speech revealed an unbridgeable division between the North and the South while source B ~~and~~ disagrees, leaving source D which neither agrees nor disagrees with the assertion. (2)

Source E is the most important and most reliable source because gives both the Northern and Southern viewpoint on the issue of Sumner's speech through fact and direct quotations of senators. Because the historian is impartial to the "Sumner incident" and has the tools necessary to accurately reflect on the event, the source's accuracy and reliability are incomparable to the other sources. The source answers yes to the previously stated question by its use of giving two sides to the event from the North and the South. The South's view is shown through the source's reference to Senator Brooks being a hero and his weapon idolized by the south. The North's view is stated as being those who are reckless and pride in

their manners yet have none. Clearly this shows the division between the North and the South and the hateful views they have of one another. Although Source A also agrees the assertion that Senator Sumners Speech ^{revealed} ~~caused~~ an unbridgeable division between the North and South, it did so in different ways. Firstly it should be noted that this source's reliability is slim to none due to the fact that it is an emotional speech given without factual evidence to the senate to undermine the south, specifically South Carolina, for its "rape of a virgin territory" which is Kansas. Senator Sumner is a Northern Republican who obviously is anti-slavery, thus he will say that the south is wrong in the influx of population because they are trying to sway the vote of whether or not Kansas will be admitted into the Union as a Slave state. However, what the source doesn't mention is that the North is equally reliable for the influx of population that was meant to sway the vote. Sources A and E both answer yes to the question of whether or not Senator Sumners speech revealed unbridgeable divisions between the North and the South, but Source A did so by displaying continuous hostilities between Northerners and Southerners through a speech and first hand emotions of those involved with the topic, while source E did so by reflecting both sides of the debates over Kansas and ultimately over slavery which drove the North and South apart.

Source B ~~refutes~~ ^{refutes} the claim that Senator Sumners speech caused an unbridgeable division between the North and the South, but like sources A and E, for different reasons. Source B, much like source E in the sense that it is highly reliable due to the fact that it is a newspaper that is highly factual, does not discuss exactly the unbridgeable division between the North and the south like

B&E

CR, 2

Sources E and A, but only hints at it. It only discusses the event in which Brooks beats Senator Sumner, it does not however state anything that leads one to believe that the entirety of the North and the South are divided because of it, and it does not state any one-sided remarks against the South. This is notable because it would be surprising if a newspaper in New York right after the beating of a northern senator by a southerner to accuse the whole south of its barbaric ways and highlight the divisions between them, it does not do this however, it only states respectfully and officially that it was "regretted by all". This is ultimately what makes the source second most reliable out of all of the sources. Source C is much like source A in the sense that they are both unreliable sources because they are extremely emotional and attack the opposing side in which they reside. Source C constantly talks on the North right after the beating of Senator Sumner, and not only justifies Brooks' action, but encourages others to treat Northerners in the same manner and solidifies the gap between the North and the South. The fact that this engineer had the audacity to attack the North with belittling judgments and encourage Brooks' beating of Republican Sumner right after the event, and right after source B, a New York Newspaper didn't do just that to the South when they had every reason to should be taken into account. Of course this source believes Kansas should be admitted into the Union as a slave-state. The tensions between the two are clearly shown through the one-sidedness of this source, thus this source along with sources A and E support the claim that Charles

CR

SE
CE

(E)

Sumner's speech revealed an unbridgeable division between the North and the South.

The last source, source D both refutes and supports the claim that Sumner's speech revealed an unbridgeable division between the North and South because firstly, it does not discuss anything about the speech in general, but it obviously states that the North and South are separate bodies, not a whole. The source most likely does not state anything particularly on Sumner's speech because it is two years after the fact, however, it is the year of the Lincoln-Douglas debates in which Douglas is campaigning for the South. Because of this, he separated the two in his speech by saying those in the free states (the North) minded their "own business and left our neighbors (the South) alone. It is obvious the two are at this point in time divided, so yes it supports the half of the assertion that there is an unbridgeable division between the North and South. However, the source does not do this

(F)

(E)

by reflecting entirely upon Senator Sumner's speech, but through popular sovereignty of the states and through separating those pro-slavery from those who are anti-slavery. This is also obvious because one must consider that Stephen Douglas himself was largely responsible for the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 which was meant to allow the states to use popular sovereignty to enter free or slave states. Of course he is going to sacrifice the ideals in which he believes. This makes this source less reliable than sources E and B because it is one-sided, persuasive, and somewhat emotional. It is like source A the most in the sense that whether it be Douglas or Sumner people were strongly and emotionally fighting for their beliefs.

(F)

Source D is also the source A in the sense that they are both pursuing a selected audience, but are opposite on which side of the slavery issue they are on. Ultimately, source D both supported and refuted the assertion that Charles Sumner's speech revealed an unbridgeable division between the North and the South while source B denied this claim, and sources A, C, and E all supported them. The reliability of three fifths of these sources were not so great, while only sources B and E were unemotional and factual. It is clear that much of their sources have similarities, but no two are the same, even if they similarly support or refute the claim.

① - 3