

Joshua King B

1/30/14

Period 6

98  
Excellent  
essay

### Source Based essay

"Senator Sumner's 1856 speech revealed an unbridgeable division between North and South."

In the wake of the Kansas Nebraska act being passed these speeches begin first with Sumner ending with Stephen Douglas people from both sides of the slavery issue have differing opinions on the issue of the act. Lincoln pro abolitionist was very against the Kansas Nebraska Act thinking that it was destroying the earlier compromises on the way to slavery. The Kansas Nebraska Act allowing people to vote on whether or not new territories would be allowed into the union with or without slavery (namely the people inside the territory.) This act was very controversial within both parties ~~Lincoln was not a supporter~~ for instance. This caused many issues which are helped to be described by the speeches and articles that follow. The main issue, one specific speech by Senator Sumner in 1856 and whether or not it revealed an unbridgeable division between the North and the South. Sources A, C, and E seem to agree on the fact that the speech and even the reactions to the speech made it quite clear that there were unbridgeable gaps between North and South. While sources D and B support a different point of view Source D being more towards the point of view not that there was no division but that the division given time would be gapped or that the conflicts between North and South would erode over time allowing the Union to grow into being one stronger nation once again. While Source B is neutral on the event showing a two sided account of what happen even calling it regrettable.

Source E provides the most reliable and useable version of the account of what happened from the speech to the reactions of the speech, making it the most useful source in evaluating whether or not the gaps between North and South were unbridgeable. The idea of it being a modern American historian makes it a more reliable source and this is shown as it fully tries to show both sides of the issue. On the other hand it being a modern historian does have a tendency to be more sympathetic towards the north on issues of Slavery this is because slavery has become thought of as a horrible thing in modern times and one of the most regretted things in American history but in these times it was an accepted institution. This leaning can be shown when his description of the cane and its pieces as sacred relics comes off almost

sarcastic and showing the South as being in full support of the attack on Sumner. The content is two sided showing both North points of view and South points of view this makes it a very useful content wise because it gives balanced points of view and allows for less exaggeration. This along with added strong analysis of other senators is saying that maybe the reactions of the people were the Senators true intention. This is further showing the idea of a well-balanced source. This is the most reliable source as it is the most well balanced overall. It relates to source A as it shows excerpts from it and it supports the idea of what the speech revealed similar to source A, relates to source C because it describes the reaction of the south being positive towards the assault on Sumner. The relation to Sources D and B is mostly in referring to them as partially untrue it seems to support that the gap between the North and South was too wide to go over.

SE  
CE

CR

Source B is a very interesting source that neither supports or denies the claim that Sumner's speech showed an unbridgeable gap, the passage starts out with them describing the events in a way that sounds as if they do support the idea that the gap is unbridgeable but then goes to say "This affair is regretted by all." Which the regret shows the fact that maybe the gap between them could be bridged. The source of this is a New York Herald reporting the events right after they had happened, this would lead to the suggestion that they are more pro-north but they give a very factual account of what happened with only one neutral opinion saying that it is regrettable. Overall the source is only slightly unreliable because of the quickness that it was published after the event and the fact that it is from a northern point of view. On the other hand the content is complete factual information for the most part very reliable just a description of Sumner being assaulted, the only drawback to pure facts is the facts that are left out can slant the story in one direction or the other although this does not appear to happen we do not know what has been left unmentioned. The source relates to Source A strongly as it is a direct recountance of the reaction to the speech that is expressed in source A. While its relation to Source C is also clear showing another Southern point of view being expressed just as one quote in this article clearly is in the same mindset as the writer of source C. Source E it gives more information to the topic of what happened in order for this to happen and what the consequences after the fact were this helps to give the full idea of the event. Source D is somewhat supported by this source it saying that that act is regrettable showing that it can be peaceful and that people can agree if they just calm down and think about things, extreme action on either side leads to extreme reaction.

CE

CE

CR

Source A has the express purpose of setting the scene and is largely in support of the idea that the North and South had unbridgeable gaps between them. It is a speech to the senate made by Senator Charles Sumner who is an extreme abolitionist of his time and has always tried to abolish slavery. The fact that he's an extreme abolitionist makes him somewhat unreliable but he has some creditability due to the fact that he is a Senator who made the

speech himself and is very aware of the issues of the time period. The content of the article is emotionally charged making the speech mostly mudslinging at a particular Senator Andrew Butler, the speech also discrediting slavery as an institution as whole like and disgusting this speech is made to enrage the South there could be no other motive. The content is somewhat lacking in actual facts and support for his arguments the scene setting and relevance to the question make this source very useful in answering the question. Sources B and C both relate to this as direct replies to the message that the senator has put forth one unbiased and neutral from the North and one strongly emotional and one sided from the South. While Source D suggests that the issue can be resolved unlike what the speech suggests they seems to be at odds with each other. Source E on the other hand largely relates to it as it is the description of what happened with foresight and how that it showed the gap between peoples and helped to spark conflicts.

SE

CE

CR

Source D is a speech by Stephen Douglas with the most unique point of view. Stephen Douglas a man who debated Lincoln on similar issues is discussing the issue of slavery. The fact that it is a Senator makes it a relatively important point of view and the fact that he is against slavery and wishes there to abolishment of it. He is reliable because he is a trusted senator with credibility as a source. The content on the other hand is questionable saying that slavery will die off as an institution over time even if we do nothing, supporting the idea of idling waiting for slavery to end. This would be an unlikely occurrence the South was very displeased with the Kansas Nebraska act which allows states to vote on whether they will be admitted with or without slavery. It would be likely along with the John browns raid of Bloody Kansas that the South would be unlikely to stay still and accept further reform and murders to happen without sparking war. The content is unreliable and unlikely to be trusted as events unfolding seem to disprove this idea. The date of this two years after Sumner the speech almost seems to be a late opportunity to rebuild some ties and tell people that maybe the gap isn't as large or unbridgeable as it seems. It relates with sources A, C, and E in that it supports almost the opposite point of view them all saying that the problem is too deep to be solved with the mental that "A house divided will not stand" -Lincoln without conflict while Stephen Douglas says that time will heal all wounds. This source shows Higher laws opinions on slavery and shows why he becomes influential throughout his career. A total denial of the speech made earlier from southern sides by Calhoun

SE

CE

CR

Source C is article from a Southern newspaper and it supports that the gaps between North and South were unbridgeable. It comes out of Richmond soon after the event the enquirer not being a known source leaves it ambiguous to the source other than it is probably leaning more towards the South as that is where the article originates. The source is the least important of the sources it is the South's reaction to Sumner incident. The source is from the south and spouts there propaganda like media loudly. Emotionally charged along with lacking in

SE

factual information are reasons why this source is the least reliable the only thing it does useful is to further support the idea that the anger between North and South was extreme and cause for problems. His insults and vulgar attitude to the event show the South's point of view on the issue and that it is you should be punished for speaking out against our senator. This source is most fully explained in Source E where it gives points of view from both sides this is an expansion of the point of view from the Southern side. It relates to the Northern news article in that they are both news articles written within two days of one another on the same topic with radically different points of view. It relates to source D in that it shows the exact inverse of what they are saying that time will heal wounds but in reality it leaves them to fester and that makes relations between North and South even weaker.

CE

CR

In conclusion, the sources provided originally set up a somewhat balanced 3 sources supporting thesis, 1 neutral, and 1 against argument on whether or not the gap between North and South is bridgeable or not. But as the articles are read the clear point of view supported by the articles is that the gaps between North and South were expanding fast and no action would seem to bring them back together. Neither side is willing to make concessions the North wants slavery gone as there is mounting support for the abolitionists and Republican Party which are both against slavery. The Whigs have been abolished leaving two parties Republicans and Democrats. The Republicans and Democrats become so divided that the gaps seem unbridgeable and this idea is further supported by the sources. On the other hand Douglas' speech does make an argument against it but is overwhelmed by inverse evidence.

①-2