THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN & DILL. MEMPHIS, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1860. VOLUME XI—NUMBER 210.

Daily Appeal.

Secession Inconsistency—Breckinridge's Prospects.

EDITORS APPEAL: It is said by the Breckinridge faction that Douglas and his friends are responsible for the disruption of the Democratic party. Seeing and knowing the opposition to Douglas, his name should have been withdrawn, they say, from before the convention at Charleston. Now suppose any prominent southern Democrat had received the vote Douglas did in the convention, though equally obnoxious to a portion of the northern delegation as Douglas was to the South, would the southern delegates have withdrawn his name, merely to gratify or conciliate the minority opposition against the wishes of the majority? I think I can answer they would not. They further charge the national Douglas Democrats with a disposition to coalesce with or assist in the election of John Bell in those Southern States where the Breckinridge wing of Democracy is the strongest, and united Democracy could triumph, but with a Douglas ticket in the field the chances are in favor of Bell, without the least prospect of Douglas gaining the State or being benefited in any way consequently they cannot see any other motive in placing a Douglas ticket before the people in such Southern States, than that of defeat to Breckinridge and the promotion of Bell. Well really there seems to be some plausibility in such reasoning; and bad you, gentlemen, practiced what you preach, Democracy would have continued to be a unit. But what right have you to expect the Democratic party—national Democracy—to coalesce with or even sympathise with a seceding faction, that had for its object the destruction of the party and the severance of the Union? But, according to your reasoning, you are assisting to elect a Black-Republican, for you are bound to admit that you are running a Breckinridge ticket in some States where the election undoubtedly lies between Douglas and Lincoln; Breckinridge having no sort of probable prospect of success in any way, except to defeat Douglas and elect Lincoln. How do you reconcile such conduct and such practice with your former advice? You first take the beam out of your own eye and cease to try to cipher and defeat Douglas in such States as are known to prefer Douglas to Breckinridge, will you? Until you do this, make no more complaint about a division with Bell. Such unfounded charges, and the abuse heaped on Douglas, and the many misrepresentations, and unwarrantable epithets, and insulting newspaper slang, in reference to the political character and Democratic record and orthodoxy of the men who are supporting Douglas, is only calculated to widen the breach and place an impassable gulf between the two wings of Democracy South.

True, purer and more orthodox Democrats never lived than thousands who are now Douglas' warmest supporters. True, there are some men now supporting Douglas who have but if He claims as to their former Democracy, and in his case will in all practice. Political changes are constantly being made, but such being the case does not justify the abuse of all who remain firm and unshaken. What would think of a shepherd who would abandon his flock of sheep because a few goats had taken up with them. I leave you to answer and make the application. And now let me ask a newspaper editor and a stump orator, many of you will have to answer for the breach now made in the Democratic ranks, and the course you are pursuing in the South in making Douglas Black-Republicans and Breckinridge. I speak what I know. You say the supporters of Douglas in the Southern generally week minded, or they are such as never voted always been conservative, servile, and of no blind character as to Democracy, or you brand them as traitor-tool, or as submissionists, etc., and by such epithets, and a kind and kind of bragadocio, dogmatical dictation, you think to frighten or drive men from the support of Douglas to that of Breckinridge. Do you think you are recovering? Do you think Douglas is losing ground and Breckinridge is gaining by your boasting, bragging and bullying. It has the contrary effect on me, and I am not alone in this. I strongly the our eleventh hour Democrat. I defy any Breckinridgeite to show a clearer Democratic record than I can from 1824 up to 1860. I would make no comparison in any way or boasting; occupying the humble position that I do, I cannot claim any great superiority as unconsistency or wisdom, but I have no fears as to Douglas' soundness as a Democrat, nor do I believe his Democracy is doubted by those who are the most prolific in his abuse; and as to Breckinridge, I cannot believe a friend believes that any considerable number of men North or South, who have an opportunity of examining the signs of the times, and possess a reasonable portion of political information, and discrimination enough to judge of men and measures, if honest in their opinions, would venture to assert that Breckinridge had even the shadow of a prospect of receiving votes from the people. I have talked with honest, intelligent Breckinridge men, and not one has had the presumption to tell me that they thought his prospect even good. Then why, O! why keep him in the field, if it is not to defeat Douglas and elect Lincoln? You know such must be the result, unless Bell can come in or Douglas can defeat him in the North. Bell will get several Southern States, and Breckinridge not more, probably, than two or three in the Union; but what can a few Southern States do in electing B. in Breckinridge? In case they divide, he election must be between Douglas and Lincoln. HORN LAKE.

DeSoto County, Aug. 1860.

EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH OF HON. A DIXON,

Delivered July 21, 1860, to a mass meeting of the people of Henderson county, at Cobb's Springs, in vindication of Stephen A. Douglas to opposition to secessionism.

Now, it was upon these very questions that the Democratic convention was divided at Charleston and again at Baltimore. The Breckinridge and Yancey party contend that Judge Douglas because he would not give up the principles maintained in the Nebraska bill and the Cincinnati platform, they demanded of him to take back the people of the territories the power which that bill and platform had conferred on them, of regulating their own domestic affairs (slavery included) in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. This he could not do, and his refusal to do so caused a portion of the delegates from the Southern States to secede from the convention. After doing so, they formed themselves into a separate convention, but declared that they had no power to nominate candidates for the offices of President and Vice-President of the United States. The remaining members of the Democratic convention, after failing to nominate candidates for President and Vice-President, adjourned to meet at Baltimore, and the seceding convention adjourned also to meet at Richmond. Both conventions did meet, in pursuance to adjournment, the Democratic convention meeting at Baltimore filling the vacancies occasioned by the absence of the seceders by delegates appointed by the several States to supply the place. The demand, which had been made upon Judge Douglas at the Charleston convention, that he with them take back from the people of the