

1: The Lincoln-Douglas Debates [www.enganchecubano.com]

Second Debate: Freeport, Illinois It was a cloudy, cool, and damp day. Special trains brought people from Galena, Chicago, Rockford, and other cities in northern Illinois.

The typical though not mandated case is divided into a framework, which outlines the conditions for discussing the resolution, and contentions. The value criterion is a way to attain, achieve and quantify the nebulous value. In most modern NSDA resolutions, a value is often stated in the resolution. Just governments ought to ensure food security for its citizens. Morality is a common value due to its inclusion in many resolutions, followed by justice, social welfare, or other values depending on the topic. A narrow definition can be a spike. The contentions, of which this type of case must have at least one, links the resolution to the value structure. A proper contention necessarily has a claim, which summarizes the argument, at least one warrant, which is a reason the claim is true, and an impact, which explains the importance of the argument—or specifically why this argument meets the value criterion. In addition, contentions often include sub-points. For example, a negative case for the resolution "Resolved: A just society ought not use the death penalty as form of punishment" could have a value of justice, a value criterion of crime deterrence, and then contentions that demonstrate that the death penalty serves as a uniquely powerful deterrent which would require statistical and possibly psychological evidence. An affirmative case could have a value of justice, a criterion of respecting human worth, and contentions arguing that killing human beings is inhumane for any reason regardless of their actions. It could also argue that all presently available methods of execution are inhumane lethal injection is believed to be physically painful and psychologically traumatizing, while hanging, electrocution, and gassing certainly are. The value is not usually contested anymore since both debaters generally share similar ones. For instance, a debater affirming a debate resolution on food security may describe a story about an impoverished, hungry family. Kritik[edit] Although, the kritik originated in policy debate, its use in Lincoln–Douglas debate is becoming increasingly accepted as a legitimate argument in certain debate districts and states. A kritik seeks to challenge an underlying mindset, usually from the perspective of critical theory. There are a few different types of kritiks. For example, In the January–February topic, "Resolved: Developing countries should prioritize environmental protection over resource extraction when the two are in conflict," a kritik of the resolution would be that the resolution uses the words "resource extraction", opening itself to an anthropocentrism kritik by assuming the world to be a resource for human use and degrading the moral character of nature. This kritik would further argue that an anthropocentric mindset would justify major harms, which, in order to avoid, would require the win go to the side presenting the criticism. Another example is if the opponent uses the "F" word in or out of the round, which opens the way to a "bad discourse" kritik. A kritik is generally composed of four parts, the role of the ballot, link, impact, and alternative. In order to make a criticism, there has to be a link, or reason. A link can be a certain phrase in the resolution, something the opponent said, something conceded in cross-examination, etc. The link opens the gate to the criticism. Now that the link to the mindset being criticized has been established, there has to be a significant harm linked to that mindset, or impact. For example, if an opponent links in to statism, a harm or impact of this would be that statism justifies nuclear war or rights violations. An impact explains why the mindset is bad. In general, the alternative provides solvency for the harms proposed. Most alternatives look something like, "reject the negative," "reject statism," or something along those lines. The role of the ballot functions as framework for the kritik. A role of the ballot explains how the judge should view the debate round. If a kritik criticizes the ethics of the round, then an acceptable alternative would propose another type of ethic that should be used for reasons like better discourse. Counterplans[edit] Sometimes negative debaters consider the status quo too hard to defend. A counterplan competes in two ways; mutual exclusivity and net benefits. Mutual exclusivity means the affirmative advocacy and negative advocacy cannot happen together in the hypothetical world. Net benefits argues that the negative advocacy would be better in a hypothetical world than the affirmative advocacy. Theory Shells[edit] A theory shell is all about proposing rules to follow in a debate. The negative can do this by criticizing something the affirmative does that does not

follow your vision of the debate. Shells include arguments such as that of disclosure theory and has become increasing popular in the high school circuits. A theory shell consists of 4 parts: A theory shell most often uses fairness and education to weigh the round, but many other standards and values are used when debating on them. Plans[edit] Sometimes, the affirmative advocates for a plan, which is a certain specified action which falls under the resolution. Just governments ought to require that employers pay a living wage a plan could have been to bring the Asia Floor Wage to a living wage level. These arguments are often countered by theory see below or topicality. Plans originated from policy debate. Despite the growing popularity of affirmative plans, they are unacceptable in certain debate districts. In some states, the ballots used by judges instruct them to disregard affirmative plans. Recently, methods of winning the round have become prominent that cannot be classified as true cases, because they are used as a semi-independent part of or in addition to the case proper, and do not advocate an extensively developed position. Like atypical cases, the merit of these types of arguments is heatedly contested, although both are common on the national circuit. Judging[edit] Judges fall under many categories, the most common of which are: Arguments are usually tracked in a short-hand called "the flow". They will not look highly upon spreading which is the debate term for speed reading, at rates of or more words per minute, during speeches or progressive debate tactics like counterplan and kritik. Policy judges on the other hand look at all forms of arguments including those that come from policy debate ; policy judges tend to be flow judges. Experienced and qualified students are usually allowed to judge in the novice division. There are usually four or five elimination rounds in which the participators are marked by speaker points is the speaker point range, however debaters are rarely assigned beneath a 26 and some states utilized a different points system--out of 40, for instance, in Idaho. Comments tend to be given by the judge to the debaters at the conclusion of the round. Comments are also written on the ballot, which is the document that the judge writes their decision on, as well as the speaker points awarded to each debater. Judges are often told before the tournament whether or not they are allowed to disclose to the participators, who won the round immediately following the decision speaker points are never disclosed. However, that being said, some judges will never disclose and others will regardless of what the instructions were. In some regional or national circuit tournaments with multiple divisions, less inexperienced judges are most commonly placed in the Novice division, while the Junior Varsity and Varsity divisions enjoy more experienced judges. Judges are assigned to a specific division based on their experience and some other criteria, and are only eligible to judge debaters within that division a judge assigned to judge novices cannot judge varsity. This is known as a pool; each division has its own pool of judges. At most national circuit tournaments, the judges within the varsity pool are often ranked beforehand from 1 to 5 by the debaters and their coaches as part of "mutual judge preferences" MJP. A 1 is the best possible ranking, a 5 is a judge with a conflict of interest regarding the debater, and a 6 is a "strike", who may never judge the debater, teams are usually allowed "strikes" per tournament. During the tournament, the tabulation staff will attempt to give each round a mutual judge i. Different debaters "pref" different judges depending on their past experiences and debating styles. The most preferred judges are usually former debaters who are now college students serving as assistant coaches, as they know the modern norms of debate well. Other regional circuits more heavily emphasize the rhetorical skills required in front of inexperienced judges, and recruit "lay" judges from the community. These judges are typically concerned citizens or parents of debaters from the school hosting the tournament or a participating school. Some circuits require all LD judges for rounds above the novice level to meet training requirements. Another option is to use lay judges for the rounds, but offer them a brief training session or tutorial beforehand to prepare and inform them about the nature of the debate. Nevertheless, lay judges tend to incline more towards the side they personally prefer. Tournament organization[edit] Many tournaments offer two or three divisions of competition in LD: Novice is exclusively for new debaters in their first year of competition, intermediate is for talented novices or debaters in their second year of competition, and advanced is for experienced debaters. A typical one-day tournament holds three or four rounds. Each debater advocates each side an equal number of times or one side once more than the other, depending on whether the number of rounds is even or odd. Multi-day tournaments have five to eight preliminary rounds usually abbreviated to "prelims" in which all debaters participate. All debaters present have the hypothetical potential to "hit", or

square off against, any other competitor in their field at the tournament, though if at all possible debaters are prohibited from hitting members of their own team and hitting someone they have previously hit earlier at the same tournament again. Similarly, judges who have already judged a debater are not supposed to judge them again in preliminaries. In contrast, a tournament in which each competitor must debate every other competitor is called a "round robin". These tend to be very small, and specific participants are invited to attend. Most LD tournaments are "power matched" also called "power paired" or just "powered". In this system, after the first two rounds often referred to as presets, as they are randomly paired beforehand, the pairings for the third round are decided on the basis that people with the same record known as being in the same bracket debate. Local tournaments sometimes use randomized brackets throughout their whole duration. Other tournaments use a "power protected" system during prelim rounds, in which a would hit an and a would hit a. In "elimination rounds" after the primary four to six or even eight preliminary rounds, the top "seed" will "hit" the lowest "seed". Seeding is determined first by preliminary round records and then by the amount of speaker points awarded by judges in preliminary rounds, with various tiebreakers total number of opponent wins, speaker points after the highest and lowest given to each debater have been subtracted, judge variance, randomly assigned number, etc. Hundreds of such tournaments are held each weekend at high schools throughout the United States during the debate season. A relatively small subset perhaps a few hundred of high school debaters, mostly from elite public and private schools, travel around the country to tournaments on the "national circuit". There are a few other prestigious national tournaments that cap the number of debaters from each school and total number of schools allowed to enter to preserve competitive integrity, and because there might simply be not enough space available. National circuit tournaments are very large events that typically draw varsity LD competitors, in addition to LDers in the novice and jv divisions, policy debaters, public forum debaters, speech participants, judges, coaches, etc. Some of the biggest attract near a thousand total participants. Regionally significant tournaments often also draw over a hundred participants. However, some debaters have been successful on the national circuit without conforming to these conventions. The national circuit is mostly composed of traditional "power schools" with historically strong programs. The national circuit and its accompanying style of debate are sometimes criticized for being exclusionary. In particular, critics argue that national circuit "power" programs encourage jargon and esoteric norms not as a means of improving discourse, but as a means of deterring competition from the uninitiated.

2: The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of Summary & Significance -

On This Date. HD Daily Report, August 27, The Lincoln Log, August 27, Custom Map. View larger map. How Historians Interpret "An analysis of Lincoln as master politician, by political scientist William H. Riker, similarly rests on rational-philosophical explanation.

In , as the country moved ever closer to disunion, two politicians from Illinois attracted the attention of a nation. The prize they sought was a seat in the Senate. Lincoln challenged Douglas to a war of ideas. Douglas took the challenge. The debates were to be held at 7 locations throughout Illinois. The fight was on and the nation was watching. The spectators came from all over Illinois and nearby states by train, by canal-boat, by wagon, by buggy, and on horseback. They briefly swelled the populations of the towns that hosted the debates. The audiences participated by shouting questions, cheering the participants as if they were prizefighters, applauding and laughing. The debates attracted tens of thousands of voters and newspaper reporters from across the nation. During the debates, Douglas still advocated "popular sovereignty," which maintained the right of the citizens of a territory to permit or prohibit slavery. It was, he said, a sacred right of self-government. Lincoln is, can the people of a Territory in any lawful way, against the wishes of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution? I answer emphatically, as Mr. Lincoln has heard me answer a hundred times from every stump in Illinois, that in my opinion the people of a Territory can, by lawful means, exclude slavery from their limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution. Lincoln knew that I had answered that question over and over again. He heard me argue the Nebraska bill on that principle all over the State in , in , and in , and he has no excuse for pretending to be in doubt as to my position on that question. It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a Territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce it or exclude it as they please, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere, unless it is supported by local police regulations. Those police regulations can only be established by the local legislature, and if the people are opposed to slavery they will elect representatives to that body who will by unfriendly legislation effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still the right of the people to make a slave Territory or a free Territory is perfect and complete under the Nebraska bill. Lincoln deems my answer satisfactory on that point. C-Span sponsored a re-enactment of the Lincoln-Douglas debates in . In what became known as the Freeport Doctrine, Douglas replied that whatever the Supreme Court decided was not as important as the actions of the citizens. If a territory refused to have slavery, no laws, no Supreme Court ruling, would force them to permit it. This sentiment would be taken as betrayal to many southern Democrats and would come back to haunt Douglas in his bid to become President in the election of . Time and time again, Lincoln made that point that "a house divided could not stand. Neither Abraham Lincoln nor Stephen Douglas won a popular election that fall. Under rules governing Senate elections, voters cast their ballots for local legislators, who then choose a Senator. The Democrats won a majority of district contests and returned Douglas to Washington. But the nation saw a rising star in the defeated Lincoln. The entire drama that unfolded in Illinois would be played on the national stage only two years later with the highest of all possible stakes.

3: The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of by Abraham Lincoln

The Lincoln-Douglas debates were a series of formal political debates between the challenger, Abraham Lincoln, and the incumbent, Stephen A. Douglas, in a campaign for one of Illinois' two United States Senate seats. Although Lincoln lost the election, these debates launched him into national.

Ted Sorensen on Abraham Lincoln: He places a hand on the head of the squat, life-size bronze sculpture of Douglas, who was a foot shorter than Lincoln. Douglas is pacing back and forth like a lion. As a schoolboy nearly 40 years ago, he got hooked on Honest Abe when he learned that one of the seven historic Lincoln-Douglas debates had taken place in his hometown. Today, the debates have achieved a mythic dimension, regarded as the ultimate exemplar of homegrown democracy, enacted by two larger-than-life political figures who brilliantly explicated the great issues of the day for gatherings of ordinary citizens. Momentous issues were at stake. Would the vast western territories be opened to slavery? Would slavery insinuate itself into the states where it was now illegal? Had the founding fathers intended the nation to be half slave and half free? Did one group of states possess the right to dictate to another what was right and wrong? These are still the gold standard of public discussion. What is less well-known, however, is that those debates also were characterized by substantial amounts of pandering, baseless accusation, outright racism and what we now call "spin. In our own day, as two dramatically different candidates for president clash across an ideological divide, the oratorical odyssey of Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. In , innovation was turning what would otherwise have been a local contest into one followed from Mississippi to Maine. Guelzo, author of *Lincoln and Douglas: The Debates That Defined America*. Lincoln and Douglas knew they were speaking to the whole nation. It was like JFK in coming to grips with the presence of the vast new television audience. At 49, he was still cleanshaven, with chiseled cheekbones and a faint smile that hinted at his irrepressible wit. And while he affected a backwoods folksiness that put voters at ease, he was actually a prosperous lawyer who enjoyed an upper-middle-class existence in an exclusive section of Springfield, the state capital. He knew that it made him stand out. Senate seat, making way for party regular Lyman Trumbull. In contrast to the moody and cerebral Lincoln, Douglas was gregarious and ingratiating, with a gift for making every voter feel that he was speaking directly to him. Huston, author of *Stephen A. Douglas and the Dilemmas of Democratic Equality*. Four years after that, at 27, he was appointed to the State Supreme Court, and at 33 to the U. Although Douglas professed a dislike of slavery, his first wife, Martha, who died in , had owned some slaves in Mississippi—a fact he did not publicize. During the marriage, the sweat of slaves had provided the natty outfits and luxury travel that he relished. What Lincoln detested about slavery was not only the degradation of African-Americans but also the broader tyranny of social hierarchy and economic stagnation that the practice threatened to extend across America. But like many Northerners, he preferred gradual emancipation and the compensation of slave owners for their lost property to immediate abolition. He finessed the looming slavery question by trumpeting the doctrine of "popular sovereignty," which asserted that settlers in any new territory had the right to decide for themselves whether it should be admitted to the union as a slave or free state. In , Douglas had incensed Yankees by pushing the Kansas-Nebraska Act through Congress as popular sovereignty; it opened those territories to slavery, at least in principle. Nearly four years later, he angered Southerners by opposing the pro-slavery Kansas state constitution that President James Buchanan supported. Although we regard the debates today as a head-to-head contest for votes, in fact neither Lincoln nor Douglas was on the ballot. That meant that the party holding the most seats in the state legislature could choose who to send to the Senate. Even this was not as straightforward as it seemed. In some Republican-leaning districts, for instance, it took almost twice as many votes to elect a legislator as in pro-Democratic districts. The middle section of the state, heavily populated by members of the old Whig Party, was politically fluid. The candidates would address each other directly. The first speaker would deliver an hourlong opening statement; the second would then have the floor for an hour and a half. The first speaker would then return to the podium for a half-hour rebuttal. There were no restrictions on what they could say. Douglas assumed that his renowned oratorical powers would defeat Lincoln handily. Tens of thousands of men, women and children flocked to the

debates, which "in an age before television, national teams or mass entertainment" took on the atmosphere of a championship prizefight and county fair combined. Lincoln, whose campaign funds were limited, traveled modestly by coach. Douglas rolled along in style, ensconced in his own private railway car, trailed by a flatcar fitted with a cannon dubbed "Little Doug," which fired off a round whenever the train approached a town. The two antagonists met first on August 21, , in Ottawa, 50 miles west of Chicago. Douglas sneered that Lincoln was no more than a closet abolitionist "an insult akin to calling a politician soft on terrorism today. Lincoln, he went on, had wanted to allow blacks "to vote on an equality with yourselves, and to make them eligible to [sic] office, to serve on juries, and to adjudge your rights. The pro-Douglas State Register crowed, "The excoriation of Lincoln was so severe that the Republicans hung their heads in shame. But Lincoln set a trap for Douglas. If Douglas answered "no," that settlers had no right to decide against slavery, then it would be obvious that popular sovereignty would be powerless to stop westward expansion of bondage, as Douglas sometimes implied that it could. If Douglas answered "yes," that the doctrine permitted settlers to exclude slavery, then he would further alienate Southern voters. Southerners had suspected Douglas of waffling on the issue. Their fear was now confirmed: The debaters met for the third time on September 15 at Jonesboro, in a part of southern Illinois known as "Egypt" for its proximity to the city of Cairo. Once again, Douglas harangued Lincoln for his alleged abolitionism. He warned that Lincoln would not only grant citizenship and the right to vote to freed slaves but would allow black men to marry white women "the ultimate horror to many voters, North and South. At Charleston, three days later, Lincoln played his own race card. On that September afternoon, Lincoln declared that while he opposed slavery, he was not for unequivocal racial equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. Until that moment, Lincoln had been on the defensive. But a shift in public perception was underway. When Lincoln stepped forward, he seemed a man transformed. His high tenor voice rang out "as clear as a bell," one listener recalled. He can say that, logically, if he says that there is no wrong in slavery; but if you admit that there is a wrong in it, he cannot logically say that anybody has a right to do wrong. The pro-Lincoln Chicago Press and Tribune reported: Douglas, pierced to the very vitals by the barbed harpoons which Lincoln hurls at him, goes around and around, making the water foam, filling the air with roars of rage and pain, spouting torrents of blood, and striking out fiercely but vainly at his assailant. Within sight across the river lay the slave state of Missouri. Although the Negro could not expect absolute social and political equality, he still enjoyed the same right to the freedoms of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness that were promised to all by the Declaration of Independence. Douglas, ill with bronchitis, seemed sluggish and unsteady. He accused Lincoln of promoting mob violence, rebellion and even genocide by confining slavery only to the states where it already existed. Without room for slavery to expand, the natural increase of the slave population would lead to catastrophe, Douglas claimed. Here, Lincoln hoped to administer a coup de grace. His voice was weak; his words came out in barks. Lincoln hammered away at the basic immorality of slavery. Lincoln is speaking to the future, to the better angels of our own nature, while Douglas was speaking in large part to the past, in which slavery still seemed reasonable and defensible. The "Whig Belt" went almost entirely for Douglas and the new legislature would re-elect Douglas 54 percent to 46 percent. Recent research by Guelzo tells a surprising story, however. By analyzing the returns district by district, Guelzo discovered that of the total votes cast for House seats, , were cast for Republicans, against , for Democrats. In other words, had the candidates been competing for the popular vote, Lincoln would have scored a smashing victory. Still, the debates introduced Lincoln to a national audience and set the stage for his dark-horse run for the Republican presidential nomination two years later. Can he lead a party? Now he has the answer: He now begins to see himself as a possible president. In , he would fulfill his ambition of winning the Democratic nomination for president, but in the general election he would win only one state "Missouri. In the debates of , Lincoln had also finally forced the coruscating issue of slavery out into the open. Despite his own remarks at Charleston, he managed to rise above the conventional racism of his time to prod Americans to think more deeply about both race and human rights. He really believed that there was a moral line that no amount of popular sovereignty could cross. The Making of the American Capital. An image of Abraham Lincoln taken in

T.

4: Lincoln Douglas Debates | HistoryNet

The Lincoln-Douglas debates (also known as The Great Debates of) were a series of seven debates between Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate for the United States Senate from Illinois, and incumbent Senator Stephen Douglas, the Democratic Party candidate.

The famous debates revolved around the subject of slavery, and the debates had the format of each candidate being able to speak for 90 minutes. They are generally considered one of the most famous political contests in American History, tackling the issue of the survival of the union and the institution of slavery. Though they were vying for a Senate seat, the debates ended up being very important in determining the future Presidency, which Lincoln won in . Contextualizing the overlapping roles of these complex personalities proves to be a fascinating and challenging litmus test of the political values not only of two iconic individuals but also of the historians interpreting them. Lincoln and Douglass met only three times, so it can be misleading to make too much of their personal ties. Lincoln assumes the language of an itinerant Colonization lecturer, showing his pride of blood, his contempt for Negroes and his canting hypocrisy. All four authors are aware of this conflictual interaction. As this was the century of the self-made man, this parallel is unsurprising, and many of the shared characteristics that Stauffer discusses are somewhat commonplace. Stauffer is at his most incisive, in tandem with the other authors, when discussing the political history of the war. Although Oakes tells us in his preface that Lincoln was radicalized by the war while Douglass became a Republican, his study is essentially dualistic, grounded in his frequently articulated preference for the politician over the reformer. The Kendricks and Stauffer provide more evidence of this set of political influences and interactions. As Stauffer points out, Douglass and Sumner were frequent correspondents and friends. The Kendricks add that William A. And as Douglass later recalled, Salmon Chase invited Douglass to dinner, breaking with racist protocol in a way that was far more dramatic than anything Lincoln ever did. Lincoln was open to the Radicals and the abolitionists because they had a clear strategy. They understood that a war restoring the Union without ending slavery would be at best an inconclusive victory, as it was the overwhelming Southern desire to preserve slavery that had animated secession in the first place. Douglass articulated this understanding right from the moment of secession. Thereafter the Confederacy would be compelled to capitulate to the destruction of slavery as a precondition for reunion. Whatever his fantasies about colonization or his limited views about racial equality, Lincoln had adopted the essence of the radical program for the war. One of the central problems in biographies is the tendency to make the great man, or in this case, two great men more independent as actors than could ever be the case. Even after emancipation, freedom remained incomplete. Black soldiers remained second-class, often-abused soldiers. The tentative racial rapprochement begun during the Civil War and intensified during Reconstruction soon fell apart. Even during the height of radical change there was no consensus among the Republicans that racial justice was an attainable goal. And by , a sizable number of Northern whites, the Democrats and almost the entire white South were able to systematize their political domination in Dixie by destroying Reconstruction, violently repressing black efforts to obtain real freedom, and creating a white supremacist Jim Crow society. For all these reasons, leaders such as Douglass and Lincoln should not be isolated as independent agents of change. Historians and readers also ought to remain wary of the power of their own metaphorical and idealistic desire to abstract this solitary relationship and use it as a symbol of the resolution of the great racial divide in American history. Fighting the rebels with both hands effectively meant that one hand was white and the other black. They met not as friends, but as men able to talk. Yet it was not the start of inevitably developing racial progress, but a loving and hesitant, hopeful and wounded, significant and partial first step up a long and rocky road in the direction of genuine freedom for all. For more information on the life of Abraham Lincoln including pictures, facts, speeches quotes, family life, articles and accomplishments like the Gettysburg Address and Emancipation Proclamation, please see our Abraham Lincoln theme page.

5: Lincoln-Douglas Debates timeline | World History Project

The Lincoln-Douglas Debates The 7th and final debate between Senatorial candidates Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas was held on October 15, 1858, in Alton, Illinois. Today bronze statues of Douglas and Lincoln stand to commemorate the event at Lincoln Douglas Square in Alton.

Contact Us Second Debate: Freeport, Illinois It was a cloudy, cool, and damp day. Special trains brought people from Galena, Chicago, Rockford, and other cities in northern Illinois. Estimates as high as 15, were reported in various newspaper accounts. Lincoln answered the seven questions Douglas posed at Ottawa and then asked four of his own. The Abraham Lincoln Encyclopedia. Da Capo Press, Inc. Full text of the debate follows. Lincoln was introduced by Hon. Turner, and was greeted with loud cheers. When the applause had subsided, he said: He spoke one hour, I an hour and a half, and he replied for half an hour. The order is now reversed. I am to speak an hour, he an hour and a half, and then I am to reply for half an hour. I propose to devote myself during the first hour to the scope of what was brought within the range of his half-hour speech at Ottawa. In the course of that opening argument Judge Douglas proposed to me seven distinct interrogatories. In my speech of an hour and a half, I attended to some other parts of his speech, and incidentally, as I thought, answered one of the interrogatories then. I then distinctly intimated to him that I would answer the rest of his interrogatories on condition only that he should agree to answer as many for me. He made no intimation at the time of the proposition, nor did he in his reply allude at all to that suggestion of mine. I do him no injustice in saying that he occupied at least half of his reply in dealing with me as though I had refused to answer his interrogatories. I now propose that I will answer any of the interrogatories, upon condition that he will answer questions from me not exceeding the same number. I give him an opportunity to respond. The Judge remains silent. I now say that I will answer his interrogatories, whether he answers mine or not; [applause] and that after I have done so, I shall propound mine to him. Lincoln had spoken to this point. The previous remarks were taken by a gentleman in Freeport, who has politely furnished them to us. If in any interrogatories which I shall answer I go beyond the scope of what is within these platforms, it will be perceived that no one is responsible but myself. In order that there may be no mistake about it, I have copied the interrogatories in writing, and also my answers to them. The first one of these interrogatories is in these words: I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law. I do not now, or ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union, with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make. I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave-trade between the different States. I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories. I am not generally opposed to honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate [sic] the slavery question among ourselves. The Judge has not framed his interrogatories to ask me anything more than this, and I have answered in strict accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that I am not pledged at all upon any of the points to which I have answered. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them. As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a Congressional Fugitive Slave law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery. In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be

exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add, that if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union. The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. Yet as a member of Congress, I should not with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: First, that the abolition should be gradual. Second, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District; and third, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions, I confess I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay, "sweep from our Capital that foul blot upon our nation. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it if I had sufficient time, to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject; but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here, and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the constitutional power to abolish the slave-trade among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power unless upon some conservative principle as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. My answer as to whether I desire that slavery should be prohibited in all the Territories of the United States, is full and explicit within itself, and cannot be made clearer by any comments of mine. So I suppose in regard to the question whether I am opposed to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing. Now in all this, the Judge has me, and he has me on the record. I suppose he had flattered himself that I was really entertaining one set of opinions for one place and another set for another place -that I was afraid to say at one place what I uttered at another. What I am saying here I suppose I say to a vast audience as strongly tending to Abolitionism as any audience in the State of Illinois, and I believe I am saying that which, if it would be offensive to any persons and render them enemies to myself, would be offensive to persons in this audience. I now proceed to propound to the Judge the interrogatories, so far as I have framed them. I will bring forward a new installment when I get them ready. The first one is: If the people of Kansas shall, by means entirely unobjectionable in all other respects, adopt a State Constitution, and ask admission into the Union under it, before they have the requisite number of inhabitants according to the English bill-some ninety-three thousand-will you vote to admit them? Can the people of a United States Territory, in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution? If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that States cannot exclude slavery from their limits, are you in favor of acquiescing in, adopting and following such decision as a rule of political action? Are you in favor of acquiring additional territory, in disregard of how such acquisition may affect the nation on the slavery question? He insisted that I and Judge Trumbull, and perhaps the entire Republican party, were responsible for the doctrines contained in the set of resolutions which he read, and I understand that it was from that set of resolutions that he deduced the interrogatories which he propounded to me, using these resolutions as a sort of authority for propounding those questions to me. Now I say here today that I do not answer his interrogatories because of their springing at all from that set of resolutions which he read. I answered them because Judge Douglas thought fit to ask them. When I replied to him on that occasion, I assured him that I never had anything to do with them. I repeat here to-day, that I never in any possible form had anything to do with that set of resolutions. It turns out, I believe, that those resolutions were never passed in any Convention held in Springfield. I believe it turns out in addition to all this, that there was not, in the fall of , any Convention holding a session in Springfield, calling itself a Republican State Convention; yet it is true

there was a Convention, or assemblage of men calling themselves a Convention, at Springfield, that did pass some resolutions. But so little did I really know of the proceedings of that Convention, or what set of resolutions they had passed, though having a general knowledge that there had been such an assemblage of men there, that when Judge Douglas read the resolutions, I really did not know but they had been the resolutions passed then and there. I did not question that they were the resolutions adopted. For I could not bring myself to suppose that Judge Douglas could say what he did upon this subject without knowing that it was true. Now it turns out that he had got hold of some resolutions passed at some Convention or public meeting in Kane county. I had just as much to do with the Convention in Kane county as that at Springfield. I am just as much responsible for the resolutions at Kane county as those at Springfield, the amount of the responsibility being exactly nothing in either case; no more than there would be in regard to a set of resolutions passed in the moon. Judge Douglas did not make his statement upon that occasion as matters that he believed to be true, but he stated them roundly as being true, in such form as to pledge his veracity for their truth. When the whole matter turns out as it does, and when we consider who Judge Douglas is-that he is a distinguished Senator of the United States-that he has served nearly twelve years as such-that his character is not at all limited as an ordinary Senator of the United States, but that his name has become of world-wide renown-it is most extraordinary that he should so far forget all the suggestions of justice to an adversary, or of prudence to himself, as to venture upon the assertion of that which the slightest investigation would have shown him to be wholly false. I now ask whether he is able to find in any thing that Judge Trumbull, for instance, has said, or in any thing that I have said, a justification at all compared with what we have, in this instance, for that sort of vulgarity. I have arranged from time to time the evidence which establishes and proves the truth of this charge. I recurred to this charge at Ottawa. I shall not now have time to dwell upon it at very great length; but, inasmuch as Judge Douglas in his reply of half an hour, made some points upon me in relation to it, I propose noticing a few of them. The Judge insists that, in the first speech I made, in which I very distinctly made that charge, he thought for a good while I was in fun! He says he characterized it as a falsehood as far as I implicated his moral character in that transaction. Well, I did not know, till he presented that view, that I had implicated his moral character. He is very much in the habit, when he argues me up into a position I never thought of occupying, of very cosily saying he has no doubt Lincoln is "conscientious" in saying so. When the Nebraska bill was introduced, or a short time afterward, by an amendment, I believe, it was provided that it must be considered "the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any State or Territory, or to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. Chase, of Ohio, introduced an amendment, in which he made the law-if the amendment were adopted -expressly declare that the people of the Territory should have the power to exclude slavery if they saw fit. I have asked attention also to the fact that Judge Douglas and those who acted with him, voted that amendment down, notwithstanding it expressed exactly the thing they said was the true intent and meaning of the law. I have called attention to the fact that in subsequent times, a decision of the Supreme Court has been made, in which it has been declared that a Territorial Legislature has no constitutional right to exclude slavery. It is a puzzle-a riddle. But I have said that with men who did look forward to such a decision, or who had it in contemplation, that such a decision of the Supreme Court would or might be made, the voting down of that amendment would be perfectly rational and intelligible. It would keep Congress from coming in collision with the decision when it was made. Any body can conceive that if there was an intention or expectation that such a decision was to follow, it would not be a very desirable party attitude to get into for the Supreme Court-all or nearly all its members belonging to the same party-to decide one way, when the party in Congress had decided the other way. Hence it would be very rational for men expecting such a decision, to keep the niche in that law clear for it.

6: Lincoln-Douglas Debates - HISTORY

Lincoln-Douglas debates, series of seven debates between the Democratic senator Stephen A. Douglas and Republican challenger Abraham Lincoln during the Illinois senatorial campaign, largely concerning the issue of slavery extension into the territories.

Senate, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas squared off in a series of seven debates in Find out why Douglas might have won in the short term but Lincoln won in the long term. Stephen Douglas In the mids, America was facing a political crisis. It was time for a new generation of leaders, and the Democrats had a rising star: But more importantly, Douglas had persuaded Americans to accept the idea of popular sovereignty , meaning new states would decide for themselves whether to accept or ban slavery. It all sounded so democratic, until it came time to put that theory into practice in Kansas. Then came a terrible blow to the doctrine of popular sovereignty: Douglas threw himself into his campaign for re-election to the Senate. Thankfully for him or so he thought , he was being opposed by the virtually unknown Republican, Abraham Lincoln. But since was an election year for the Illinois State House, Douglas decided to enhance his own chances of being chosen by campaigning for Democratic legislators. If Democrats held the majority of seats in Illinois, they would choose him as their Senator. So with the help of a friend who ran the railroad, Douglas traveled the state giving speeches. But wherever he went, the annoying Republican candidate would show up two days later, give voters reasons not to trust Douglas and get the last word in. Finally, Douglas agreed to meet Abraham Lincoln face to face in a series of debates in the remaining Congressional districts in the state. The audience turned the debates into a sporting event, shouting out questions, cheering, booing and laughing. Reporters in Chicago transcribed the speeches, and thanks to the telegraph, the Lincoln-Douglas debates were reported by newspapers across the entire nation and followed closely by the American people. Before the first debate even took place, Abraham Lincoln addressed a crowd in Chicago, known famously as the House Divided speech. In it, Lincoln attacked the doctrine of popular sovereignty, saying that it had clearly failed in its goal of ending conflict over slavery. Then, he went on to quote the Bible, saying: I believe this government cannot endure, permanently, half slave and half free Either the opponents of slavery, will arrest the further spread of it You, sir, are a radical abolitionist who wants to turn Illinois into a colony for free blacks! You want to expand slavery across the entire nation! An even bigger crowd came out to watch the second debate. Lincoln spoke first, mostly answering some direct questions that Douglas had asked him at the previous debate. Then, he posed four of his own questions, largely ridiculing Douglas for his continued support for the doctrine of popular sovereignty. In response, Douglas articulated what has become known as the Freeport Doctrine. The Freeport Doctrine was supposed to be a simple means around the Dred Scott decision. But this idea came back to bite Douglas in the presidential election two years later because Southern Democrats felt he had betrayed them. A crowd of just 1, people, most of whom had relocated from slave states, showed up to the third debate to cheer on Douglas and jeer at Lincoln. You say the country cannot exist half slave and half free? Well, it seems to me that the Founding Fathers designed it that way, and that the country has not only survived in this condition, but has grown. I hold that this government was made on the white basis, by white men, for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and should be administered by white men and none others At that time, every one of the 13 colonies was a slaveholding colony, every signer of the Declaration of Independence represented a slaveholding constituency and we know that not one of them emancipated his slaves, much less offered citizenship to them when they signed the Declaration My friends, I am in favor of preserving this government as our fathers made it. When the Declaration of Independence was signed, everyone thought slavery was dying. Remember the Northwest Ordinance? We should go back to that model, and just let it die out on its own. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. You are part of a government conspiracy to expand the institution of slavery! I can prove it. Remember the Missouri Compromise, way back in ? It drew a line across the nation and said nothing above that line could ever have slaves in it. But then you came along and said slaves should

be allowed above that line if the people want it. Before long, Illinois will be a slave state, too! Sir, there is no conspiracy. Lincoln thinks blacks and whites should be equal! More tremendous crowds turned out for the fifth debate, in which Douglas and Lincoln recapped points that they had made before. But in the sixth debate, in Quincy, Illinois, Lincoln and Douglas finally hit upon the big question: The argument sounded very much like the modern debate over abortion. Slavery is a moral, social and political wrong! How do you feel about it? It would be wrong for me - or my state - to impose our beliefs on anyone else and make that decision for them. The citizens of every state have to decide for themselves whether slavery is right or wrong for them. Popular sovereignty was clearly what the founders had intended, since it leaves decision-making in the hands of local and state governments. Lincoln, are trying to increase the power of the federal government. The final debate brought no surprises and a mere 5, attendees. Both candidates hammered the other on what they felt were their strongest points. Douglas attacked Lincoln on the House Divided speech and emphasized his belief in the democracy of popular sovereignty. Lincoln reiterated that slavery was wrong, that the Declaration of Independence applied to all men and that Douglas was undermining the earlier policies of the U. Significance of the Debates On election day, neither Lincoln nor Douglas was technically elected to the Senate. But the voters did choose a Democratic majority for the state of Illinois, which sent Stephen Douglas back to the Senate for another term. And the debates themselves had important consequences for the candidates. While Abraham Lincoln was thrust into the national spotlight and helped generate momentum for the Republican Party, Stephen Douglas actually angered many of his fellow Democrats and helped divide the party, dooming his chances in the presidential election. His Republican challenger was Abraham Lincoln. In an effort to have their party gain a majority in the state legislature, the two men faced off in a series of seven debates throughout the state. Even before they began, Lincoln delivered his famous House Divided speech, in which he claimed that the nation could not continue to be half slave and half free, a point that his opponent continued to ridicule throughout most of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. All of their major topics related to the issue of slavery. Although the Democrats won the state election and sent Douglas back to the Senate, the debates divided the Democrat Party and brought Lincoln into the national spotlight. Powered by Create your own unique website with customizable templates.

7: Great debates? It started with Lincoln and Douglas - National Constitution Center

Historians have traditionally regarded the series of seven debates between Stephen A. Douglas and Abraham Lincoln during the Illinois state election campaign as among the most significant.

Riker, similarly rests on rational-philosophical explanation. Riker focuses on the Freeport question, wherein Lincoln forced Douglas to reassert the doctrine of popular sovereignty against the Dred Scott decision, as the capstone of the Republican strategy of splitting the Democratic majority, thus preparing the way for the electoral triumph of Lincoln was introduced by Hon. Turner, and was greeted with loud cheers. When the applause had subsided, he said: He spoke one hour, I an hour and a half, and he replied for half an hour. The order is now reversed. I am to speak an hour, he an hour and a half, and then I am to reply for half an hour. I propose to devote myself during the first hour to the scope of what was brought within the range of his half-hour speech at Ottawa. In the course of that opening argument Judge Douglas proposed to me seven distinct interrogatories. In my speech of an hour and a half, I attended to some other parts of his speech, and incidentally, as I thought, answered one of the interrogatories then. I then distinctly intimated to him that I would answer the rest of his interrogatories on condition only that he should agree to answer as many for me. He made no intimation at the time of the proposition, nor did he in his reply allude at all to that suggestion of mine. I now propose that I will answer any of the interrogatories, upon condition that he will answer questions from me not exceeding the same number. I give him an opportunity to respond. The Judge remains silent. I now say that I will answer his interrogatories, whether he answers mine or not; [applause] and that after I have done so, I shall propound mine to him. Lincoln had spoken to this point. The previous remarks were taken by a gentleman in Freeport, who has politely furnished them to us. If in any interrogatories which I shall answer I go beyond the scope of what is within these platforms, it will be perceived that no one is responsible but myself. In order that there may be no mistake about it, I have copied the interrogatories in writing, and also my answers to them. The first one of these interrogatories is in these words: I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law. I do not now, or ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union, with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make. I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave-trade between the different States. I am not generally opposed to honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate [sic] the slavery question among ourselves. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them. As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a Congressional Fugitive Slave law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery. In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add, that if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union. The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of

Columbia. First, that the abolition should be gradual. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it if I had sufficient time, to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject; but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here, and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the constitutional power to abolish the slave-trade among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power unless upon some conservative principle as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. My answer as to whether I desire that slavery should be prohibited in all the Territories of the United States, is full and explicit within itself, and cannot be made clearer by any comments of mine. So I suppose in regard to the question whether I am opposed to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing. Now in all this, the Judge has me, and he has me on the record. I suppose he had flattered himself that I was really entertaining one set of opinions for one place and another set for another place -that I was afraid to say at one place what I uttered at another. What I am saying here I suppose I say to a vast audience as strongly tending to Abolitionism as any audience in the State of Illinois, and I believe I am saying that which, if it would be offensive to any persons and render them enemies to myself, would be offensive to persons in this audience. I now proceed to propound to the Judge the interrogatories, so far as I have framed them. I will bring forward a new installment when I get them ready. The first one is: Can the people of a United States Territory, in any lawful way, against the wish of any citizen of the United States, exclude slavery from its limits prior to the formation of a State Constitution? If the Supreme Court of the United States shall decide that States cannot exclude slavery from their limits, are you in favor of acquiescing in, adopting and following such decision as a rule of political action? Are you in favor of acquiring additional territory, in disregard of how such acquisition may affect the nation on the slavery question?

8: www.enganchecubano.com: Customer reviews: The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of

In an effort to secure their own appointments to the U.S. Senate, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas squared off in a series of seven debates in

Visit our other Lehrman Sites: Douglas Historian Stephen B. It was the great event of the day, and attracted an immense concourse of people from all parts of the state. Douglas spoke first for an hour, followed by Lincoln for an hour and a half; upon which the former closed in another half hour. The Democratic spokesman commanded a strong, sonorous voice, a rapid, vigorous utterance, a telling play of countenance, impressive gestures, and all the other arts of the practiced speaker. As far as all external conditions were concerned, there was nothing in favor of Lincoln. He had a lean, lank, indescribably gawky figure, an odd featured, wrinkled, inexpressive, and altogether uncomely face. He used singularly awkward, almost absurd up and down and sidewise movements of his body to give emphasis to his arguments. His voice was naturally good, but he frequently raised it to an unnatural pitch. Yet the unprejudiced mind felt at once that, while there was on the one side a skillful dialectician and debater arguing a wrong and weak cause, there was on the other a thoroughly earnest and truthful man, inspired by sound convictions in consonance with the true spirit of American institutions. When he had finished, two stalwart young farmers rushed on the platform, and, in spite of his remonstrances, seized and put him on their shoulders and carried him in that uncomfortable posture for a considerable distance. It was really a ludicrous sight to see the grotesque figure holding frantically to the heads of his supporters, with his legs dangling from their shoulders, and his pantaloons pulled up so as to expose his underwear almost to his knees. Douglas made dexterous use of this incident in his next speech, expressing sincere regret that, against his wish, he had used up his old friend Lincoln so completely that he had to be carried off the stage. Lincoln retaliated by saying at the first opportunity that he had known Judge Douglas long and well, but there was nevertheless one thing he could not say of him, and that was that the Judge always told the truth. He wanted to know whether Mr. Lincoln stood pledged to the repeal of the fugitive slave law; against the admission of any more slave States; to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; to the prohibition of the slave trade between different States; to prohibit slavery in all the Territories; to oppose the acquisition of any new territory unless slavery were first prohibited therein. His statements in rebutting the opinions of his friends have come to be interpreted as an admission that he would lose the Senate race but win the presidential race. According to William H. The people demand a direct answer. Lincoln here went into a kind of argument to convince his friends that he was right and concluded by saying: The battle of is worth a hundred of this. Lincoln evidently wanted to kill Douglas politically and did it effectively. I say that Judd told me what Lincoln said in the meeting of friends at Dixon or Chicago, I think Chicago, though White says that the meeting was at Dixon. Probably he is correct. Though Peck, Ray, Judd et al, say that Lincoln uttered the above words, still I doubt the exact words. Because, as you well know, Mr. Lincoln was one of the most secretive men that ever lived. That is what I am fighting for. Lincoln ever uttered the words as stated, though he looked at the time for the office. I think at most that the words, as above are inferences, legitimate ones. Lincoln never told mortal man his purposes and plans "never. Beat around the Bush. Lincoln all the questions in the negative; then Mr. Lincoln moved from the defense to the offense. This has often been represented as a master stroke of strategy, designed to force Douglas to alienate the South and to render impossible his nomination for the Presidency in But Douglas had already given his answer several times. The South knew his position, and so did Lincoln. It is doubtful if Lincoln was looking ahead to Probably his purpose in forcing Douglas to restate his position was to widen the breach between Douglas and the Buchanan forces that were working to defeat him. Now that decision had been rendered, and Douglas made the best of a painful necessity, and declared that the people of a state could attain that result by virtue of the police power, which they might exercise through unfriendly legislation. Lincoln knew that this answer would gain Douglas some immediate support, but ultimately would lose him many votes in the South, and very possibly would defeat his hopes for the presidency. Lincoln himself had earlier pressed Senator Douglas on this question. In so far as it was not sheer hypocrisy, it sanctioned the refusal to perform the most solemn of recognized

constitutional obligations. As such, it was subversive of the entire process of moral education in the principles of free republican government. And fidelity to the Constitution is the key to the only rational defense of his entire career that is possible: Those police regulations can only be established by the local legislature, and if the people are opposed to slavery, they will elect representatives to that body who will, by unfriendly legislation, effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Lincoln made a most powerful speech, and charged home upon Douglas with a vengeance which was perfectly overwhelming. There was no escape from the coils which Lincoln wound around him, and his speech in reply was without spirit, without power and labored throughout. At the close, cheer after cheer for Lincoln rent the air in prolonged shouts. Douglas, as reported in the Chicago Times. Lincoln was introduced by Hon. Turner, and was greeted with loud cheers. When the applause had subsided, he said: He spoke one hour, I an hour-and-a-half, and he replied for half an hour. The order is now reversed. I am to speak an hour, he an hour-and-a-half, and then am to reply for half an hour. I propose to devote myself during the first hour to the scope of what was brought within the range of his half hour speech at Ottawa. In the course of that opening argument Judge Douglas proposed to me seven distinct interrogatories. In my speech of an hour and a half, I attended to some other parts of his speech, and incidentally, as I thought, answered one of the interrogatories then. I then distinctly intimated to him that I would answer the rest of his interrogatories on condition only that he should agree to answer as many for me. He made no intimation at the time of the proposition, nor did he in his reply allude at all to that suggestion of mine. I do him no injustice in saying that he occupied at least half of his reply in dealing with me as though I had refused to answer his interrogatories, upon condition that he will answer questions from me not exceeding the same number. I give him an opportunity to respond. The Judge remains silent. I now say to you that I answer his interrogatories, whether he answers mine or not; [applause] and that after I have done so, I shall propound mine to him. Lincoln had spoken to this point. The previous remarks were taken by a gentleman in Freeport, who has politely furnished them to us. If in any interrogatories which I shall answer I go beyond the scope of what is within these platforms it will be perceived that no one is responsible but myself. In order that there may be no mistake about it, I have copied the interrogatories in writing, and also my answers to them. The first one of these interrogatories is in these words: I do not know, or ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the fugitive slave law. I do not now, nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more slave States into the Union. I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union, with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make. I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave trade between the different States. I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in all the United States Territories. I am not generally opposed to honest acquisition of territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate [sic] the slavery question among ourselves. The Judge has not framed his interrogatories to ask me anything more than this, and I have answered in strict accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that I am not pledged at all upon any of the points to which I have answered. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them. As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave Law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a congressional Fugitive Slave Law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave Law further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general questions of slavery. In regard to the other questions of whether I am pledged to admission of any more slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; [applause]; but I must add, that if

slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a Slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union. The fourth one is in regard to abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. Yet as a member of Congress, I should not with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions. First, that the abolition should be gradual. Second, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified votes in the District, and third, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has ever been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the Constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it if I had sufficient time, to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject, but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here, and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the Constitutional power to abolish the slave trade among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power unless upon some conservative principle as I conceive it, asking to what I have said in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. My answer as to whether I desire that slavery should be prohibited in all the Territories of the United States is full and explicit within itself, and cannot be made clearer by any comments of mine. So I suppose in regard to the question whether I am opposed to the acquisition of any more territory unless slavery is first prohibited therein, my answer is such that I could add nothing by way of illustration, or making myself better understood, than the answer which I have placed in writing. Now in all this, the Judge has me and he has me on the record.

9: The Lincoln–Douglas debates of - Wikisource, the free online library

Lincoln - Douglas Debates of The debates between Stephen A. Douglas and Abraham Lincoln were held during the campaign for a US Senate seat from Illinois. The debates were held at 7 sites throughout Illinois, one in each of the 7 Congressional Districts [Map of Congressional Districts].

Douglas and Republican challenger Abraham Lincoln during the Illinois senatorial campaign, largely concerning the issue of slavery extension into the territories. The slavery extension question had seemingly been settled by the Missouri Compromise nearly 40 years earlier. The Mexican War, however, had added new territories, and the issue flared up again in the s. The Compromise of provided a temporary respite from sectional strife, but the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854—a measure Douglas sponsored—brought the slavery extension issue to the fore once again. In place of the ban, Douglas offered popular sovereignty, the doctrine that the actual settlers in the territories and not Congress should decide the fate of slavery in their midst. Library of Congress, Washington, D. The Kansas-Nebraska Act spurred the creation of the Republican Party, formed largely to keep slavery out of the western territories. When Lincoln and Douglas debated the slavery extension issue in 1858, therefore, they were addressing the problem that had divided the nation into two hostile camps and that threatened the continued existence of the Union. Their contest, as a consequence, had repercussions far beyond determining who would win the senatorial seat at stake. Lincoln then challenged Douglas to a series of debates, and the two eventually agreed to hold joint encounters in seven Illinois congressional districts. Abraham Lincoln, from a photograph made at Beardstown, Illinois, during the debates. Douglas repeatedly tried to brand Lincoln as a dangerous radical who advocated racial equality and disruption of the Union. Lincoln emphasized the moral iniquity of slavery and attacked popular sovereignty for the bloody results it had produced in Kansas. Life-size bronze statues of Stephen A. Douglas left and Abraham Lincoln at the site of their debate in Alton, Illinois. Douglas replied that settlers could circumvent the decision by not establishing the local police regulations—i. Without such protection, no one would bring slaves into a territory. Although he retained his seat in the Senate, narrowly defeating Lincoln when the state legislature which then elected U. Lincoln, on the other hand, lost the election but won acclaim as an eloquent spokesman for the Republican cause. In the Lincoln-Douglas debates were printed as a book and used as an important campaign document in the presidential contest that year, which once again pitted Republican Lincoln against Democrat Douglas. This time, however, Douglas was running as the candidate of a divided party and finished a distant second in the popular vote to the triumphant Lincoln. Learn More in these related Britannica articles:

Student Solutions Manual for Concepts in Probability and Stochastic Modeling Not A Creature Was Stirring
103 Statistics and data analysis for financial engineering Introduction to crop production Google calendar to
Think About Editing Eighteenth century Fathers on preservation Phd thesis on customer relationship
management Report on the census of production 1968. Have we ever been normal? Christian Identity Using
the Internet to investigate business Rspb Guide to British Birds (Rspb) A Bill, Making Appropriations for the
Support of Government, During the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred a 65 Transmitter modulator 88 Heart
of the Arctic Endangered cities Main v. Without special title] Housekeeping and writing Instant Happiness
Cards Towards a new definition of property rights Better Homes and Gardens Womans Health and Medical
Guide 9 Sudden Changes and Milestones Whats that smell? : queer temporalities and subcultural lives Judith
Halberstam Introductory psychology reader The warranty of title Lyrics on freedom, love and death Legal
Issues of European Integration, 1983-1:Law Review of the University of Amsterdam (Legal Issues of E The
collectors glossary of antiques and fine arts Childrens views about television 5 Main Group Element and
Transition Metal-Promoted Carboxylation of Organic Substrates The Road Atlas 05 Who moved my cheese
book in marathi What do libraries really do with electronic resources? : the practice in 2003 Jay Shorten The
best of times book The Zenner trophy Urban education in the nineteenth century The yoga directory
Transparency, tarski, and carnap The Initiate Brother Book One