THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN, TROUSDALE & DILL. MEMPHIS, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1859 VOLUME X.—NUMBER 223.

Daily Appeal

LINCOLN ON DOUGLAS.

With the view of putting out the tracks of Mr. Douglas in Ohio, the Black-Republicans of that State have invited the redoubtable "Abe Lincoln," of Illinois, over to make a few speeches for them. He delivered his first at Columbus on the 15th inst. With the view of showing how Mr. Douglas is viewed and esteemed by Mr. Lincoln's Black-Republican North, we transfer the remarks of Mr. Lincoln to our columns as we find them reported in the Cincinnati Commercial. They can not fail to interest our Southern readers:

AT DAYTON, yesterday, "Old Abe" Lincoln, as he is called in Illinois, addressed the people assembled from all the countryside at Columbus.

Abram Lincoln is a dark complexioned man, of a very tall figure, and so exceedingly "well preserved" that he would not be taken for more than thirty-nine though he is rising of fifty years of age. His countenance should be called a very good one; his features are strongly marked, and his general bearing reminds one of Gov. Jones, of Tennessee, more, perhaps, than of any other living political celebrity. We don't know his lineage but he is clearly of the "Hanky Panky race" of men, and a fine type of that race.

He commenced by remarking that this was the first time he had spoken in Ohio—and he insisted not forgot that this people were accustomed to the fulsome praise and stately eloquence of Senator Chase, the dramatic century of Corwin, and the eloquence of other of her favorite sons.

He would introduce his speech by reading an introduction prepared for him in advance by the Ohio Statesman of this morning, which said:

"Mr. Lincoln is the man who in the debate with Senator Douglas last year in Illinois, declared himself in favor of negro suffrage."

Mr. Lincoln read from his Ottawa speech—the first pitched battle with Douglas—in which he met the charge, in his own State. The extract read was a felicitously constructed argument in favor of the rights of all men of whatever shade, color, or age, without insisting upon the necessity or the propriety of assigning the precise where inalienable rights he desired. He was now fifty-years of age, and he had never had a black person for a slave, nor yet a wife. When Judge Douglas first insinuated the charge of forming an amalgamation he (Lincoln) had shown that the bleaching process was confined to those States where the institution of slavery was recognized by law, and where the virtue of the female was as much at the disposal of the master as was her baby. He presumed Col. Manypenny, of the Statesman was an honest man, (groans) and he gave him the public retraction of his charge that he might correct it while paper before the lapse of time should induce uncharitable people to pronounce the editor of the Statesman a calumniator (a. (Cheers.)

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

The recent public visit of Douglas to Ohio, and his recitations of his copy-righted speech on popular sovereignty, would render unnecessary any apology for introducing the subject of Account which they have in Ohio—he considered himself specially justified in alluding to the doctrine of "popular sovereignty."

He wished to be distinctly understood as addressing to Douglas' popular sovereignty as a specialty. It was necessary to follow the "Giant" up pretty closely, as that was intended upon as a test of Democracy, and as Judge Douglas himself had great difficulty in explaining the explanations made in previous months and years as to his exact position upon the Kansas subject.

Those of his (Lincoln's) hearers who had read Douglas' copyrighted article in *Harper's Magazine* would remember that near the close of that article he (Douglas) put the opinions of two Republicans—their names are not given, but one is Senator Seward, and the other myself. The quotation is from one of my fifteen speeches, made some months ago, in which I stated that the extension of American slavery is a double element of disturbance in American politics. My language, said Mr. Lincoln, in that speech was this:

"In my opinion it (slavery agitation) will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed—a house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect that the house will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all another. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is on the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

The feature of Judge Douglas' magazine article, as of all his speeches everywhere, is a subtle rhetoric tending to a confusion of ideas of the distinction between a State and a Territory. Is this fair? Is there not a distinction which an honest statesman will always bear in mind, whether he be legislating in halls or addressing the people in their primary assemblies?

Mr. Lincoln then proceeded at length to analyze the popular sovereignty doctrine of Judge Douglas, and to answer his positions one by one in the order observed by Douglas in his magazine article. As Mr. Lincoln repeats his argument in Cincinnati to-morrow, your reporter will only notice some of the more popular points of his Columbus speech.

Mr. Lincoln first proceeded to review the article of Douglas as a professedly historical sketch, and showed that as such it was imperfect, and altogether unreliable. It almost entirely ignored the fact that the fathers of Jefferson, and of the legislation known as the Ordinance of 1787. The effort of the Little Giant was to direct the attention of the conclusion that the founders of the Republic, the men of the revolution, and the framers of the constitution, held opinions substantially the same as those of the author of the Nebraska Bill, making no allowances for the limited advantages of the former. Now, if the men of the early days of the Republic were practically popular sovereignty, and if they had been the acceptation of that term, why did John Randolph, jun, and slaveholder as he was, report against the formal position of the people of the men Territory in the repeal of the ordinance of 1787, and for an act legislating the importation of slaves from other States into the territory of Mississippi? Why were the people of that portion of the northwest Territory told that Congress could not intervene, and why was the question not reminded to the people of Indiana to be by them settled "in their own way?"

This piece of history is familiar to most all within the sound of my voice, and how extraordinary it is that it is for a man who is now serving his third term in the Senate of the United States, and who aspires to the Presidency, to omit the mention of so important a fact, in his historical sketch of the slavery question in American politics. Here, as elsewhere, his doctrine of popular sovereignty is repudiated. In another place, Douglas says: "Our fathers, when they framed this Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better than we do now?" Lincoln agreed to this extent. The "fathers" not only understood the subject of slavery and its extension better than we, but they acted better.

THE DRED SCOTT DECISION.

At the debate in Freeport, during the Illinois campaign, I questioned Judge Douglas, and his answers are now matters of record, and can be quoted against him. I have a right to make to forget them. In reply to those questions, Douglas said the Dred Scott decision was right, and also that the people of a Territory had the right to exclude slavery, when they came to form a State Constitution. That is to say, *a thing may be lawfully driven from a place where it may lawfully remain.*

This recorded admission has, evidently, troubled the Judge sorely. And you will observe that since that Freeport speech Douglas no longer cites the right of Territories to "drive out" slavery. His language now is that "they may control it." Now I beg you (continued Mr. Lincoln) to observe the difference between the force of the word "drive out" and "control." You can understand me when I say you can drive a horse out of the State House lot, for it is clear that I mean to put him to the other side of the fence. (Laughter.) Or you might shoot the horse and let the worms eat him up.

But when I say you can control a horse in this lot you can do a variety of things without necessarily putting him on the other side of the fence. You can saddle him, ride him, drive him (laughter,) and with a big whip, lash him short, you can control him as you pleasure, but it by no means follows that you can drive this species of property outside the specified limits. Here you see one of the leading doctrines of this popular sovereignty. Now, may it please you freemen of Ohio, what more does the slaveholder want in the Territories than the right to control property in them—to ride them, to drive them, and to work them till they die?

I know that Judge Douglas squints at the idea, that under his construction of "popular sovereignty" the people of a Territory may legally control slavery to death, but we all know that if the people of a Territory tax slavery to death, the Supreme Court has promised to interfere and to pronounce such legislation unconstitutional. And thus is the North to be outflanked in any movement for the confinement of slavery to its original limits. Thus is the nation allowed the Supreme Bench to be occupied by Dred Scott decisionists.

Another leading view of the Senator who has caused this trouble in our country by his misrepresentations of his doctrines, is made prominent in the article in *Harper's Magazine* for September. He argues that the Dred Scott decision is sequitur in its position—that it affirms nothing except a total lack of power in Congress to legislate slavery out of a Territory. Here again we are forced to expose a false construction of the Dred Scott decision. The Dred Scott decision states the absence of power in Congress to intervene for the exclusion of slavery from Territories, but it *affirms the right of property in slaves is expressly affirmed in the Constitution of the United States.* This decision does not stop with saying that the Constitution imagines property in slaves, but declares that it expressly affirms the right to hold such property—and this, fellow-citizens of Oh o, by a logical conclusion, carries slavery into all the free States.

THE DECISION IS AN ABOLITIONIST ENCYCLOPEDIA OF DOUGLAS POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

Mr. Lincoln would not weary his audience with following up the tortuous windings of a Presidential aspirant in his struggle to secure electoral votes from both sections, but would call attention to the moral phase of the conflict now going on. Did the fathers of the Republic, the debauching influences of Douglas Democracy upon the popular mind? Did they realize that it was preparing the country to acquiesce in the re-opening of the African slave trade? Douglas says the people of the territories have a right to slave property. By a parity of reasoning, the people of Georgia have a right to slaves, and to buy them in Africa, if it is profitable to adopt that market. The Illinois Senator may shrink, as he has already shrunk, in the application of his doctrine, by stating that the constitutions of the Constitution oppose the repeal of the law prohibiting the foreign slave trade. But tell me—tell me, say Douglas Democrat, if there is in the Constitution any compromise more likely to prevent the re-opening of the slave trade than the same compromises were to confine slavery to the original slave States?

Mr. Lincoln proceeded to portray, with much impressiveness of manner and power of argument, the debauching influences of Douglas Democracy. Do we not all remember, said he, when it was the boast of every Polk and Pierce Democrat that he "was as much opposed to slavery as any body?" Do we not all know that a few years ago that world so much in intimate that the bold enunciation of human rights contained in the Declaration of Independence did not include negroes? I tell you, men of Ohio, when you compromise away any conviction of right, when you permit a wrong for fear of being temporarily inconvenienced by adherence to truth, when you permit the national admission that there is no wrong in slavery, when you treat humanity as a question of property, then will the minor, who happens to be the leading error of the Oligarchy succeed against the bulwarks of freedom. Admit the idea of property in man, and you bind your arms and hands and feet to the chariot wheels of the Juggernaut Dagon, the Moloch and Hammonds of the South. Yield but once to slavery, and the general beating reminds one of Gov. Jones, of Tennessee, more, perhaps, than of any other living political celebrity. We don't know his lineage but he is clearly of the "Hanky Panky race" of men, and a fine type of that race.

He commenced by remarking that this was the first time he had spoken in Ohio—and he insisted not forgot that this people were accustomed to the fulsome praise and stately eloquence of Senator Chase, the dramatic century of Corwin, and the eloquence of other of her favorite sons.

His would introduce his speech by reading an introduction prepared for him in advance by the Ohio Statesman of this morning, which said:

"Mr. Lincoln is the man who in the debate with Senator Douglas last year in Illinois, declared himself in favor of negro suffrage."

Mr. Lincoln read from his Ottawa speech—the first pitched battle with Douglas—in which he met the charge, in his own State. The extract read was a felicitously constructed argument in favor of the rights of all men of whatever shade, color, or age, without insisting upon the necessity or the propriety of assigning the precise where inalienable rights he desired. He was now fifty-years of age, and he had never had a black person for a slave, nor yet a wife. When Judge Douglas first insinuated the charge of forming an amalgamation he (Lincoln) had shown that the bleaching process was confined to those States where the institution of slavery was recognized by law, and where the virtue of the female was as much at the disposal of the master as was her baby. He presumed Col. Manypenny, of the Statesman was an honest man, (groans) and he gave him the public retraction of his charge that he might correct it while paper before the lapse of time should induce uncharitable people to pronounce the editor of the Statesman a calumniator (a. (Cheers.)

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY.

The recent public visit of Douglas to Ohio, and his recitations of his copy-righted speech on popular sovereignty, would render unnecessary any apology for introducing the subject of Account which they have in Ohio—he considered himself specially justified in alluding to the doctrine of "popular sovereignty."

He wished to be distinctly understood as addressing to Douglas' popular sovereignty as a specialty. It was necessary to follow the "Giant" up pretty closely, as that was intended upon as a test of Democracy, and as Judge Douglas himself had great difficulty in explaining the explanations made in previous months and years as to his exact position upon the Kansas subject.

Those of his (Lincoln's) hearers who had read Douglas' copyrighted article in *Harper's Magazine* would remember that near the close of that article he (Douglas) put the opinions of two Republicans—their names are not given, but one is Senator Seward, and the other myself. The quotation is from one of my fifteen speeches, made some months ago, in which I stated that the extension of American slavery is a double element of disturbance in American politics. My language, said Mr. Lincoln, in that speech was this:

"In my opinion it (slavery agitation) will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed—a house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect that the house will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all another. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is on the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push forward until it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

The feature of Judge Douglas' magazine article, as of all his speeches everywhere, is a subtle rhetoric tending to a confusion of ideas of the distinction between a State and a Territory. Is this fair? Is there not a distinction which an honest statesman will always bear in mind, whether he be legislating in halls or addressing the people in their primary assemblies?

Mr. Lincoln then proceeded at length to analyze the popular sovereignty doctrine of Judge Douglas, and to answer his positions one by one in the order observed by Douglas in his magazine article. As Mr. Lincoln repeats his argument in Cincinnati to-morrow, your reporter will only noticesome of the more popular points of his Columbus speech.

Mr. Lincoln first proceeded to review the article of Douglas as a professedly historical sketch, and showed that as such it was imperfect, and altogether unreliable. It almost entirely ignored the fact that the fathers of Jefferson, and of the legislation known as the Ordinance of 1787. The effort of the Little Giant was to direct the attention of the conclusion that the founders of the Republic, the men of the revolution, and the framers of the constitution, held opinions substantially the same as those of the author of the Nebraska Bill, making no allowances for the limited advantages of the former. Now, if the men of the early days of the Republic were practically popular sovereignty, and if they had been the acceptation of that term, why did John Randolph, jun, and slaveholder as he was, report against the formal position of the people of the men Territory in the repeal of the ordinance of 1787, and for an act legislating the importation of slaves from other States into the territory of Mississippi? Why were the people of that portion of the northwest Territory told that Congress could not intervene, and why was the question not reminded to the people of Indiana to be by them settled "in their own way?"

This piece of history is familiar to most all within the sound of my voice, and how extraordinary it is that it is for a man who is now serving his third term in the Senate of the United States, and who aspires to the Presidency, to omit the mention of so important a fact, in his historical sketch of the slavery question in American politics. Here, as elsewhere, his doctrine of popular sovereignty is repudiated. In another place, Douglas says: "Our fathers, when they framed this Government under which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better than we do now?" Lincoln agreed to this extent. The "fathers" not only understood the subject of slavery and its extension better than we, but they acted better.

THE DRED SCOTT DECISION.

At the debate in Freeport, during the Illinois campaign, I questioned Judge Douglas, and his answers are now matters of record, and can be quoted against him. I have a right to make to forget them. In reply to those questions, Douglas said the Dred Scott decision was right, and also that the people of a Territory had the right to exclude slavery, when they came to form a State Constitution. That is to say, *a thing may be lawfully driven from a place where it may lawfully remain.*

This recorded admission has, evidently, troubled the Judge sorely. And you will observe that since that Freeport speech Douglas no longer cites the right of Territories to "drive out" slavery. His language now is that "they may control it." Now I beg you (continued Mr. Lincoln) to observe the difference between the force of the word "drive out" and "control." You can understand me when I say you can drive a horse out of the State House lot, for it is clear that I mean to put him to the other side of the fence. (Laughter.) Or you might shoot the horse and let the worms eat him up.

But when I say you can control a horse in this lot you can do a variety of things without necessarily putting him on the other side of the fence. You can saddle him, ride him, drive him (laughter,) and with a big whip, lash him short, you can control him as you pleasure, but it by no means follows that you can drive this species of property outside the specified limits. Here you see one of the leading doctrines of this popular sovereignty. Now, may it please you freemen of Ohio, what more does the slaveholder want in the Territories than the right to control property in them—to ride them, to drive them, and to work them till they die?

I know that Judge Douglas squints at the idea, that under his construction of "popular sovereignty" the people of a Territory may legally control slavery to death, but we all know that if the people of a Territory tax slavery to death, the Supreme Court has promised to interfere and to pronounce such legislation unconstitutional. And thus is the North to be outflanked in any movement for the confinement of slavery to its original limits. Thus is the nation allowed the Supreme Bench to be occupied by Dred Scott decisionists.

Another leading view of the Senator who has caused this trouble in our country by his misrepresentations of his doctrines, is made prominent in the article in *Harper's Magazine* for September. He argues that the Dred Scott decision is sequitur in its position—that it affirms nothing except a total lack of power in Congress to legislate slavery out of a Territory. Here again we are forced to expose a false construction of the Dred Scott decision. The Dred Scott decision states the absence of power in Congress to intervene for the exclusion of slavery from Territories, but it affirms *