

Nicole Blanchard
Dr. Crihfield
AICE US History
30/1/14
Essay B

96⁰

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

In 1856, Charles Sumner gave a speech to the US Senate that would eventually cause discussion about the division of the North and South. Sources A confirms that slave power is arrogantly corrupting life and is furthering the differences between the North and the South. Sources B and C confirm that the speech of Sumner and abolitionists have been criticized by the South. Source E confirmed that the speech was supported the widening of the gap between the North and the South. However, Source D does not believe the North and South are unbridgeable, but are rather able to patch things up with a compromise.

Source A supports the claim that Senator Sumner's 1856 speech did in fact reveal that there was an unbridgeable division between the North and the South. This source comes from Sumner himself, a well-known abolitionist, giving the precise document which means that the information is straight from his speech, nothing else impedes his speech, increasing the legitimacy of the powerful orator's speech. However, this academic's lawyer's speech is purposely written to give hype to the subject that is the topic, and in this case, the treatment of Kansas and how Sumner believes that it is unreasonable to bring slavery into a virgin territory. This speech was given during the "Bleeding Kansas" crisis, in which there was a confrontation between anti-slavery and pro-slavery people, thus confirming that this speech was supposed to keep the bond of the North in one piece and create hype over for the North over the tragedy. The information presented is a clear representation of how a Republican views the treatment of Kansas, and how popular sovereignty has not been recognized between the North and South, interfering the decision of whether or not to introduce slavery into Kansas, further dividing the North and South. As a Republican, Sumner devoted his time trying to demolish the Confederacy and free all the slaves, thus promoting his critical view of Senator Brooks and the Kansas Nebraska Act, passed before his speech. Source A is supported by B, C, and E, all supporting the same concept that there is an unbridgeable gap between the North and South, yet use different voices to express this. Source D refutes the claims from Source A, in which D presents there is a possibility to delete the gap and prevent it from widening. Source A is one of the few that are less important to answering the question. It was Sumner's speech that began to uncover the unbridgeable division between the North and the South, making it visible to all that listened.

Source B supports and refutes the claim that Senator Sumner's 1856 speech did in fact reveal that there was an unbridgeable division between the North and the South. Four days after Sumner's initial speech to the US Senate, the local newspaper printed that the controversy of Sumner's speech and anti-slavery views resulted in the caning of Sumner himself, displaying the hatred of Sumner from Brook's point of view. New York published this piece because it was a prime example of how the North and South could not get along, but unexpectedly did not input their own response, barely even supporting Sumner. The information presented the interference that the Southern states appeared in, and in this case with a brutal attack. The role that the South played in after Sumner's speech was crucial. This speech was before the Kansas Admission and after the Kansas Nebraska Act, meaning that not everything had been completely solved over the Kansas issue. However, towards the end the source, "This affair is regretted by all." could have

several different meanings. One obvious that they were sorry that this event happened but also, that they were sorry that nothing could have been done to prevent this attack and that there was nothing that they could do about. The opposing view had to defend their side and their people. This is also another clear example that there was gap between the North and the South, that there was nothing the political parties could do to help each other. If Brook's had believed Sumner was a gentleman, he might have challenged him to a duel. Compared to Source B, Sources A and C are other agreeing sources but are less balanced because it is from a one-sided speech and a one-sided newspaper. Compared to Source D, D showed that the affair did not divide North and South, but Source E did due to the reactions of each Senator. Source B is the most important Source because it supported the question from the beginning but it was one small statement that questioned their motives. This source made the division prominent; however, it made no attempt in recovering the lost ground between the North and the South.

Source C supports the claim that Senator Sumner's 1856 speech did in fact reveal that there was an unbridgeable division between the North and the South. Six days after Sumner's speech to the US Senate, the Richmond Enquirer posted the controversial aspect of what had happened to Sumner and why he deserved it, this means that with only a one sided opinion and the absence of any factual detail, the Enquirer published their thoughts about the cowardly actions of Sumner and how they believed he was wrong, bringing forth the unbridgeable division. During this time "Bleeding Kansas" had begun, creating hostility between anti and pro slavery citizen, aka the North and South. The quick response of the South newspaper displays the support that they had for Brooks, even wishing he were more brutal towards Sumner, who represented the North, displaying the hostility and brutality that they both shared with each other. During this time, President Franklin Pierce has claimed that slavery was constitutional, one of the very view Northerners who expressed this opinion. This was also another area that the South was able support, in which also further divided the North and South, like political opponents always seem to do. Source A confirms Source C and is proof of a Southern state that is very critical of the North, Sumner, and the abolitionists. Source E was able to provide support and confirm the support that the South had for Brooks and their distaste against Sumner. Sources B and D both give less support and have a different opinion, especially Source D. Source C is one of the few that are less important in answering the question because it rather adds on and confirms statements rather than it is important. The division was visible without any logical reasoning, but rather wanted the North to feel pain.

Source D refutes the claim that Senator Sumner's 1856 speech revealed that there was an unbridgeable division between the North and the South. Two years after the speech, Stephen Douglas, who was pro-slavery and helped pass the Kansas Nebraska Act, presented a speech counteracting Sumner's, allowing to express his point of view only and to rally up the Northerners in order to keep the bond they had. This speech by Douglas is also given after the Dred Scott controversial topic, especially since the government would no longer have power in controlling slavery. This is important because it could have added fuel to the fire for the South and give them the encouragement they needed in order to fight back. The information presented was a historical argument that slavery can be abolished peacefully and quietly. As a Northern Democrat, Douglas has been fighting for mediation between the North and South, even famously in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, in which he won the election after. After agreeing with the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, Douglas is trying to promote popular sovereignty and confirm that the bridge has not burned and that there was never a gap between the North and the South. This source is different from Sources A-C, varying in purpose and views, setting up opposing sources

and contrasting the differences between the Northern Democratic view and the Southerner's view. Source E is completely different than source D, rather questioning Sumner's motives unlike Source D, which was trying to prove that the bridge is still there. Source D is a rather important Source because it is the only Source that completely refutes the question. Source D is the opposite of all the other sources, provided the basis of a possible compromise to end and repair the division that was possible.

Source E supports the claim that Senator Sumner's 1856 speech revealed that there was an unbridgeable division between the North and the South. It does this by describing the matter, its result, and the additional result of the gap between the North and the South. The source comes from a modern historian, which has had time to reflect on the speech, but doesn't give a two-sided view about it, which is unusual. The one sided view complemented the speech by accentuating the fact that the speech did widen the gap. The information presented is factual, consistent, and accurate, and also suggests that we continue peacefully, as it was meant to be, and let popular sovereignty rule whether states should allow slaves or not. Source E had support from source A, the legitimacy of the speech and reflection in source E, and C, displaying the widening of the gap. However, B doesn't really match up because it is more about the aftermath of the speech, rather than the widening of the gap and D does not even support Source E. Source E is one of the fewer less important sources mainly because it is a modern historian view that is supposed to give both sides but doesn't and rather gives a perspective and the effects. Giving perspective and opinion, Source E was able to make the division visible, between the North and South.

In summation, all the Sources provided were able to either support or refute the claims that there was an unbridgeable division between the North and South due to Sumner's speech.

