THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 1859. VOLUME X.—NUMBER 140.

Daily Appeal.

GREAT SPEECH OF M. KOSSUTH.

A crowded public meeting was held, May 20, at the London Tavern, to consider the attitude which it became the British nation to assume in relation to the war in Italy. The Chair was taken by the Lord Mayor. Kossuth was the principal speaker. We make room for some passages of his speech, which was truly a great effort. He said:

INTERCEPTION.

My Lord Mayor, I should not be at all surprised if you should call the *[illegible]* which last began to disturb the peace of Europe, and with which it was overtaken so much more than forty years. It is a moment that should begin to become epochal in the history of Europe. What is the position which England ought to take in this critical emergency? Years Lombardy whose opinions carry with them a three-fold authority—that of an impartial spectator, that of a very old friend of Austria, and that of a friend of liberty, and that of the exalted representative of the great commercial interests of the world—never looked into the coming revolution. The position which England ought to take, and from which she could not be apart, is that of honest mediation, and not of active intervention. (Cheers.) I feel greatly moved in being permitted to take part in the proceedings of this evening, though I feel, from my individual capacity, my humble opinions can pretend to no weight with this distinguished assembly. But, though lay the stormy waves of national adversity I suppose a homeless exile on the shores of this country, the happy home of the free and the sanctuary of the oppressed—still, the nationality of this great metropolis deigns to receive in the representative of the downtrodden Hungarian nationality, upwards of ten hundred cities, boroughs and corporations following, as it were, in the wake, and the liberal hearts of the people of England and Scotland, vouchsafed to make me the depository of their sympathy for my native land.

Thus, my Lord Mayor, I fell to my lot prominently to stand identified in public opinion with the cause of the oppressed nationalities, and of Europe. Such being the peculiarity of my individual position, I, for one, cannot help declining corroborative persuasion from the conviction that the conclusions at which your lordship hesitatingly draws from an English point of view is exactly the same at which I have arrived from a European point of view. (Cheers.) Are we, I ask, aggressors, as a member of an oppressed nationality, as a man identified in all his aspirations with the cause of its emancipation, I repeat, as an ardent prayer, when I say that I advanced as the well-meaning wish of an English patriot—that England should deliberately adhere to the policy of honest neutrality and of strict non-interference. (Hear, hear.) If, in consequence of this concurrence of opinions, I were to be asked whether I anticipate that the war which is just commencing may eventually result to the advantage of the cause with which every aspiration of my heart is identified, I should unhesitatingly answer that I do anticipate such an eventual result, provided England does not direct, into a strong channel the natural course of events by interfering with the war.

This anticipation does not flow, my Lord Mayor, from the exuberance which recent events must naturally have caused in my feelings. Adversity is a great teacher, my lord, and the key finger of time is a mighty disenchanter. I have much suffered in the last ten years of my temporal exile, and I trust my endurance I have learned something—I have learned not to clutch with eager impatience the floating firebrick of illusory hopes, but I have learned to calm reflection to trace the law of concatenation between cause and effect which presides over the logic of history. Taking my stand on this law, I feel my anticipations on the ground controvertible axiom that the difficulties of the oppressor may become a chance of deliverance for the oppressed. I see Prussia hoodwinked—the confidence of Austria—Italy rising in her cheering—the Magyar standard-bearer of any country engaged in a great war. Profoundly the relative position of these combatants, political and on the strategical possibilities which must develop themselves in the course of the war, and I come to the conclusion that no distant time conscription will be found to have taken place of some of these nationalities, the emigration of whom by the house of Austria is the great European nuisance, without the removal of which patchwork arrangements will be advised calculated to deprive the nations which longer the dry rot of the political structure of Europe, but both permanent peace and the ideal condition of the European community are inseparable from it.

THE NEUTRALITY OF ENGLAND.

Kossuth here discussed the neutrality question. Neutrality is a general term, which may imply a special meaning, the bearing of which cannot be fully fathomed, unless we have it clearly understood what the intentions of the parties her Majesty's Government would attach if they were not to remain neutral. (Hear, hear.) Now, my lord, I do not remember to have heard of any one single instance of official declaration which has left the impression on my mind, that if her Majesty's Government were not to remain neutral, then they would side with the Austrian Government. But I have heard many declarations tending, by fatally leading to the inference, that different course was to be pursued in the case of Austria. (Loud cries of "No, no!") It was always universally admitted, that in the beginning England was to remain neutral, and it was added, that no one should be heard of in case events would take, and that you are to remain meantime, so as to be prepared to do—what? To repel any aggression of the Continental despotism and democratic? Of course, that should be done, that would be done, and gloriously, too. "Come the three corners of the world in arms, and we shall shock the proud, bold island." But this has nothing to do with neutrality or non-neutrality, this is a question of attack and defence, and the Minister could never have meant to suggest that England will not be attacked in this war, if she does not run into it herself. (Cheers.) No, it was said that England should sum in their to be prepared against the Emperor, if he should come.

Again, I should say in far more, not only that "interest" is a very vague word, it may mean nothing, or it may mean anything to the detriment of the country. (Hear, hear.) But we have been vouchsafed a foretaste of what it might mean. We have been told that if a French fleet of ironclad vessels, it might be the interest of England to oppose it; we have been told, on high authority, too, that if Trieste were to be attacked, it might be the interest of England to defend it; nay, the inspired ministerial candidate for the West Riding of Yorkshire even told the electors that it might be the interest of England to respect Venice. (Cheers.) Of course, it was the great misfortune of getting enamorated from the detested yoke of Austria. (Cheers.) Thus, then it was my wish, that England should not either England remain neutral, or else she will be brought to support Austria. If in the war England were to depart from the principle of strict non-interference, England would be in danger of seeing the colors of England nailed to the mast of Austria—you would have the fair named Britannia coupled to that Belgian of Austria. (Hear, hear.) I rests on a frame of conduct which, as Professor Newman remarks, in his work, upon the crimes of the House of Austria, that the ancient heathen times caused the holders of power thus joined to be regarded as self-outlawed, hateful to gods, and deserving of no defense from men.

THE ITALIAN QUESTION.

The orator proceeded to discuss the nationality of Italy, or the Italian question saying:

Now, it does strike me that in all the transactions preceding the declaration of war by Austria, there was this peculiarity, that the policy of England, that the Italian question was not viewed as a question of nationality, but was viewed as one that might and should be solved on the basis of Austrian rights, the Italian possessions if she would only consent not to interfere with the war of Italy.

I will only remark, that unless it be explicitly understood throughout Europe that the maintenance of Austria in her ill gotten Italian possessions does not enter into the intents and purposes of England, the mere fact of neutrality will preserve your country from, sooner or later, a bloody debut into the war in consequence of entangling alliances, for which it is manifest that mighty influences are at work. (Hear.)

THE ATTITUDE OF GERMANY.

It is a strange sight to see what is going on in Germany. The die Germanicus, which hardly ever was whole, and now divided, should appear ready to sink for once all dissensions in the determination to resist a supposed cloth of the French at the Rhine-side, my Lord, justly commands the approbation of every sensible man. There is, however, much of a false alarm at the bottom of that agitation, as it is perfectly absurd to suppose that the French government, having already one war on hand, could meditate an attack on the Rhine—an attack directed, not against Austria, but against Prussia and the confederation minor German States—an attack which would be sure to put a mighty European coalition in battle order against France. I am sure that there are influences at work to turn the patriotic feelings of the German nation to the profit of the House of Austria, for maintaining their foot planted on the fair fold of other nationalities which have as much right to assert, or to reassert, an independent national existence as Germany has to maintain hers. (Cheers.) But believe me, gentlemen, in spite of the prevailing excitement, the noble instincts of the German nation could never be delayed into the disgraceful part of being made the *salet de lesarres* (hangman's emigrant) of the House of Austria, for enslaving other nationalities, unless it was supposed that England's government brought her entitled to retain her Italian possessions, and was favorable to the idea that the integrity of her dominions should be maintained. (Hear, hear.)

THE CLAIM THAT THE NATIONALITIES AND AUSTRIANS ARE OF ONE BLOOD.

Unfortunately, it has been proclaimed in Parliament, and it has been proclaimed in foreign policy, that Austria has strong claims on your sympathy because she belongs to the race to Anglo-Saxon England. [Laughter.] Well, I am bound to remark, in all humility, that this pitiful appeal to your commiseration happens to be a very unfortunate display of proficiency in ethnographic studies. The unnatural compound of heterogeneous elements, formed by a long series of usurpations, which goes by the name of Austria, is so far from being German, that, (hear,) at the last census of 1851 the government of Austria employed both artifice and terrorism to establish for their dominions the character of German nationality, they found it impossible to raise the number of their German subjects higher than to about seven millions out of a population of thirty-seven millions! (Hear, hear.) In fact, Austria is the only power in Europe which has no national character; it is of no country, of no race—it is just a dynasty, and nothing more; it is simply the house of Hapsburg—no, not even that; everything in the accursed house is usurpation, down to the family name, they are not Hapsburgs, they are Lorrain-Vaudemonts, rebellious crown officers of France, as Napoleon I said to style them—not they, but the Lord Bacon, of the house of Fielding, are the only Hapsburgs on earth. (Cheers.)

THE TREATIES OF 1815.

I now come to the pretended inviolability of the treaties of 1815. It is the most important to have the mist of prejudice cleared away in this regard, as it can admit of no doubt that, should it so happen (which God forbid) that England were to depart from the principles of neutrality, it would be done in favor of Austria, the protect of the inviolability of the treaties of 1815. It is woeful to remember, my lord, that the sovereign who, on pretence of asserting the liberties of Europe, entered the nations to shed their blood in streams for nearly a quarter of a century, and to waste away the prosperity of generations for the preservation of dynasties, at last required the deluded nations, for the Congress of Vienna, by selling and barter of their liberties, and to drain the European nations without the consent of their representatives. (Hear, hear.) Thus it is that Lombardy, thus it is that Venice, the Fairy City, robbed of its glorious independence of thirteen years' standing, were cleared over like a cricket ball into the grasp of the House of Austria. (Hear, hear.) These that forty-four years of Italian life, with their groans, with their ever-growing hatred and discontent, with their ever-recurring conspiracies, with their ever-recurring outbreaks, with their scaffolds soaked in the blood of patriots, with their horrors of Spielberg and Mantua, and with the Austrian Government, and with the words, "Out with the Austrians," tremble on the lips of every Italian, these forty-four years are recorded in history as a standing protest against these inviolable treaties. The nations protested loudly enough against the compact of the robbers. (Cheers.) Yet, forsooth, we are still told that the treaties of 1815 are inviolable! Why, I have been it reported that Kossuth and Hungary, and Poland, and Ireland rang with a merry peal when the news reached Conscience, led the hand of Cassiwarski to Kosciusko and Shall, in 1830, he offered the sight of England plunging into the incalculable calamities of a great war, for no better purpose than to uphold the accursed work of the Castlereagh, and from no better motive than to keep the accursed House of Austria safe? (Cheers.) Inviolable treaties, indeed! Why, my lord, the forty-four years that have elapsed have sufficiently shown these treaties like a sieve. The Bourbons, when they resigned to the throne of France, have violated, and the Bonapartes, whom they proscribed, are restored. (Hear, hear.)

Two changes—the transformation of Switzerland from a confederation of States into a confederation of the Swiss, the emancipation of Belgium, have been accomplished in spite of these treaties, to the profit of liberty! But for the rest, the distinctive feature of the last forty years, has been the fact that, while these treaties have, in the proportion of liberty, been violated, the cause of liberty has been sinking, and the cause of despotism has been rising, and the cause of despotism has been rising, and the cause of despotism has been rising