

100'

How far do Sources A to D support the view that, in the debates with Douglas in 1858, Lincoln showed all the talents needed to be a leader of the new Republican party?

As an individual, Lincoln is mainly known for his neutrality during a highly fragile time period in which the slightest remark could set off conflict and bloodshed. The criteria required for the leader of the new Republican party was promptly dignified in the moral roots and nationalist of Abraham Lincoln, but some may point out indignant fallacies seeping in between the lines of numerous speeches and documents, like the debates between Douglas. A

Source A encapsulates very little contextual evidence and appears to describe the physical characteristics of the two candidates instead of actual ability. The source refers to Douglas as "fierce-bulldog look" and to Lincoln as "Long Abe" in an attempt to greatly contrast the aesthetic of the two men when debating in front of a large audience. In relation to Lincoln specifically, the source concurs with "I was convinced... election speaker" to convey the personal belief that Lincoln was an impenetrable delegate for the Republican party. As an additive, it implied that Lincoln wasn't running for the Republican party, but rather the entirety of the United States; a neutral, moral, man of the people. In comparison to Source B, the two sources deeply agree that Lincoln was the better candidate, but Source B fronted much more objective information when dealing on the subject of Douglas; Source B uses figures like "20,000 people" and "at two o'clock" to describe a play-by-play of the debates while Source A merely attacks the physical characteristics of Douglas. In relevance to the statement as to whether or not source A would agree with the sentiment of whether Lincoln showed all the talents needed to be a leader of the new Republican party, it agrees, but it also provides very little information on the basis of its agreeance, therefore denouncing it as an incredibly weak source. A ✓ J ✓ E good good

Source B initiates the formality needed to thwart the wretched fallacies present in Source A by suggesting the debate was an incredibly intense interaction. The play by play foretelling goes with vocabulary such as "replied" and "adapts" to reference a malleability with the two competing Republicans. When further investigating it can be implied that Douglas was not prepared to face the differing opinions (being a doughface) and thus backed down quite easily when battling Lincoln. In relevance to other present sources, Source C is the only source that believes Douglas won the debate fair and square (out of the 4 at least). It argues that "Of Douglas's speech... effort" without supporting the rampant claims. Source A argues the contempt utilized by Douglas failed him while Source C argued that the retorts of Lincoln's were inconclusive and garnered no support in a conceivable way. When gauging the support of Source B as a whole as to whether or not Lincoln was embellished with the criteria needed to lead the Republican Party, it should be known that this source is of incredible strength in legitimizing Lincoln's victory and Douglas's foreshadowed defeat. A ✓ E

Source D consists of a interview-like perspective from the sights of a fourteen year old boy, who concludes that the viviparous energy of Douglas left Lincoln unaffected. In the lines of "aggressive", "defiant", "violence" (directed, in context, towards Douglas) it is obvious as to the emotional and unobjective arguments that Douglas posed at the convention. Additionally, due to his short stature and reverberant vocal cords, much of the public dubbed Douglas "little giant": meaning that while he may be short, his loud voice says otherwise. Source C and source D contrast immensely due to the surface level information present (basic disagree/agree) but bolster information that seemingly strengthens both argument with somewhat valid facts. The figures A ✓



used in source C, like "10,000" and "15,000" show, (while perhaps inaccurate) some sort of attempt at objective operationalization of the subject matter; in complete contrast to Source A, which utilizes none. However, the contents of Source C were proposed in such a way (referring to the weather) that may offer some sort of excuse as to Douglas's loss in the debate. In vehement judgement, there is no other conclusion than to categorize Source D as a proponent for Lincoln's courteous and nearly omnipotent nature as the republican party's new leader/

In contrast to the prior, Source C envisions the idea that Lincoln won rather an unfair war on multiple fronts due to subversive advantages. The lines "high wind which prevailed for a part of the time, many were prevented from hearing the speakers." resemble one of the accused reasons for his loss, while indirectly, in a structured fashion. Source C offers writings that accuse Lincoln of "consumed his time in a vain effort" which essentially paints him as a boring speaker. Nevertheless, the content also includes the idea that "We heard more... 'little giant'" which acts as a beacon of validity to the previously lackluster article, ushering in the totality of the argument of course. Source C heavily contrasts with Source A in a way that separates the truth from factually flaws (that shouldn't exist in the first place.) Source A lacks factual information but proposes the argument that the looks of Lincoln defined him as the champion which differs from the aim of source C, which was to argue that while Lincoln was the winner of the 'battle' the 'little giant' was the winner of the war. When weighing the validity surrounding the pertinence the source as a whole has to offer, it is clear that it disagrees on the basis of the criteria that invokes Lincoln to be the candidate for the Republican party. However, the strength of the article in itself reigns above all else due to its ability to see the objective viewpoints of things and to defend the argument with evidence seldom emotion.

This is it!