THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL.

BY M'CLANAHAN & DILL. MEMPHIS, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1861. VOLUME XII.—NUMBER 70.

Daily Appeal.

"The South the True Philanthropist of the Nineteenth Century."

EDITOR APPEAL: There has been in circulation throughout the South (copied of course from Yankee journals,) a sweeping assertion that "the moral sentiment of the world was against slavery." The time has arrived when we must "examine ourselves" and prove what there is of worth or truth in us, and our institutions. We should endeavor to do so in a calm, conscientious, philosophic spirit. We must neither side with the fanatic of the North or the extremist of the South. Either argument is impious. The abolitionist declares his will forever abolish an institution which God has sanctioned. The southern extremist says he will eternally perpetuate it, thereby indirectly disavowing his belief in human progress, or the final efficacy of the "atonement." Of course, in the declaration to which we referred in setting out, the very existence of Asia and Africa is ignored; and yet, nearly all that is great and good, had its origin in those countries. From them we derived our ideas of morality and government, as well as art and science. Africa was the birthplace of Moses, whom we benighted southerners will persist in thinking the greatest of lawgivers; and Asia has produced a David, Solomon and Paul, to say nothing of Mohammed, whose proselytes comprise one-fourth the inhabitants of the globe. Even China has given the world a Confucius, whose maxims the Yankees would do well to consider, since they have discarded much of the doctrine of Moses and Christ. I suppose it would be vain to deduce from any one of these time-honored, heaven-sent authorities, any argument in favor of slavery at all conclusive to these note-finding New Englanders, or apply the test of Holy Writ to the devotees of "higherlawism." But let us see if there is not some other test by which we can prove, a part at least, of this sweeping denunciation to be false—by which we are to judge of the moral sentiment of a nation? Of course, by its laws and institutions. With this clue to guide us, we will apply it to Christendom and see how the matter stands. Russia, whose empire extends over half of Europe, and whose population consists of about seventy or eighty millions, not only tolerates slavery, but still adheres to its serfdom. So with Spain and Portugal. In France it is an open question, and there is a warm controversy going on now between some of her best writers for and against. Fifteen of the "United States," as Punch calls them, adhere to it. It exists in its worst form in Mexico, that of slavery for debt. Brazil, whose limits stretch over well nigh half of South America, imports Africans for slaves, besides other South American States. Then there are the fertile islands of Cuba, and Porto Rico; the Azores, Canaries, and some others of less importance. This reduces "the moral sentiment of the world" to Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and New England; and all these last named petty States will, in their huge effort to enlarge themselves, and, like the frog in the fable, puff in their own dimpuplina. It cannot be denied that the English press, in this question of slavery, is referring to the Americans, (to use a trite and common expression,) "whose both hand and cash." The British lion lays his huge paw on the lank shoulder of "Brother Jonathan," and says: "Our moral sentiment is with you, my friend, but the cotton, we must have that; more sentiment will not feed our starving paupers or hungry operatives; and than your border States, what if they should join their southern brethren and become a manufacturing people? Ah! you wince at this, have I struck home?" To which Jonathan replies: "You have touched the very key-note of our present policy. Hist! a sound in your ear. Do you know, that the South can grow silk as well as cotton. I tell you twenty years will not elapse, before the golden flakes of silk will be stacked side by side with the snowy bales of cotton in her ports and harbors. Nay, more—the half is not yet told, (and the whisper grows hoarse and fierce,) southern flour is of superior quality to ours, and commands a higher price in foreign ports; they can easily grow tea, wine, wool, cotton, sugar, rice, tobacco, silk, besides grain of all kinds. Give them territory, let expansion and their institution of slavery, let the border States become manufacturing and commercial, and work up the raw material which the gulf States supply, and fifty years hence you will tremble for your supremacy. In short, it is to the interest of Great Britain to dissolve the Union, and it is the "Seward-Lincoln" policy to weaken the South by division. But as a little leaven makes light a huge loaf, so does the abolitionist, to effect his object, blend a little philanthropy in his seditious schemes to delude the people. But the "vaulting ambition" of the Yankee nation has "o'erleaped itself." They mistook the unparalleled forbearance and generosity of the South, for tameness and passivity. She is at length aroused to her great danger, and the firm, proud stand she has at last taken, must command the admiration and respect of mankind. Let but the Southern States unite, and they need fear no more of this hypocritical cant about "moral sentiment." Until they will possess strength, strength will lead to success; and too often—though this time rightly applied—"success is virtue." The Lord of Providence as surely points to the formation of a Southern Republic as He did to the formation of the United States. And why? Because only in this way can be developed our vast, unparalleled resources; only in this way can we become self-reliant and independent. The world has need of us, and our products; to supply them, we must retain our system of African slavery. Were any candid, sensible, enlightened Englishman to ride over our fields and bottom lands, he would readily admit this. Could he do this, were he to cast his eye above to the towering, back and broad, look beneath at the rich alluvial deposit of centuries, go thence to the clearing, see the hearty, cheerful slave, beguiling his work with song and joke, under the calm of the mellow, one the palsied and sickly children breathe the deadly miasma, so harmless to the sooty African—and here he then told, "This is the land, this the soil which supplies the cotton for your looms and spindles." He won'd say, "If this be so you cannot, and should not, dispense with your slaves." Let the South, then, enter into no compromise or agreement with the North, nor make illadvised or hasty legislation. Let her boldly, firmly say: "So long as good comes from our peculiar institutions, we will foster and cherish it." We must decide for ourselves in this matter; we will not be dictated to. So long as we maintain, in comfort and in plenty, our own mentals, and, by their labor, feed and clothe millions of Europeans, supply our own homes with elegance and luxuries, we will maintain it. But could we dispense them, they are not fit for freedom. Many centuries must elapse ere the savage can become the civilized man, and many cycles must be added before the civilization will merge into enlightenment. Trace the history of any nation, and this will be found to be true, and paradoxical as it seems, war and slavery have been the great civilizers of the human race. And here it is that the South has been the true benefactress of the negro. She it is who has changed him from the barbarian to the civilized being, and from the cannibal to the responsible, moral agent. Another, too, the abolitionist, wilfully and designedly misstates the true issue of this question. He ever speaks as if we had degraded the negro from a state of freedom to that of bondage, instead of elevating him by exchanging his home despot for the humane, Christian master. Charitable one had literally to beat Christianity into the hearts and minds of our Saxon forefathers. And part of the product of "the African scaffold" to-day is to source the African colonist, and prevent their people from Fetish worship. [By the bye, perhaps the Yankee spiritualists got their belief from some poor free nigger who had been a fetish worshipper, in his own land. They are very similar. One believes that the spirit of God enters blocks and stones, and refined Yankees insist that the immortal soul of man revisits earth to thump on tables and chairs, and talk the veriest nonsense mortals ever listened to.] But to return to our argument. Let us admit that the "moral sentiment of the world is against slavery." What then? Is it the first time that it has been perverted? By no means, as we can prove from history. The moral sentiment of Pharaoh and his world opposed the departure of the Israelites. Again and again were they warned, but they would not heed, and ruined their own delusion. "So moral sentiment of the world," opposed Christianity. Did that render it less or more? "The moral sentiment" of Europeans was outraged when they reflected that "the holy land" was in possession of the "infidel." Cloud and treasure were freely given to redeem it, yet the Mohammedan money will glitter where once stood the Jewish altar, and the "mutin" called the "faithful" to prayer, from the spot where once the blessed feet of the Redeemer trod, and the sacrificial incense of David, and Solomon goes. "The moral sentiment" of Christendom was averse to the reformation. Did that make the object vain, or the attempt fatile? But let us bring the matter nearer home. Was not the "moral sentiment" of Britain opposed to the first revolutions and our independence? Yet, we conquered, though more potent arguments were used than mortaling sentimentalities. It is generally supposed, in certain quarters, that the "moral sentiment" of New England did not enthusiastically favor the war of 1812. We do not vouch for the truth of this, but we know, we see this that moral sentiment is a very sometimes. And now let us see if we cannot find some precedent to justify us in our present position. Let us go back to the time when Christianity first invoked the aid of the Roman Legions. To whom, let us ask, can he trace nearly every Southerner, black crime and hatred vice that disgraced the first three centuries of Christian empire; that is from the time of Julius Cesar, to the invasion of the Germanic tribes? In nearly every instance the Freedmen were the abettors and participators. Their ability and avarice robbed many of the most flourishing colonies and provinces of Rome; and more it was that the wise Augustus ordered the Roman legions to leave the Jews their own. He saw that instead of elevating and purifying the slavery, that it corrupted and ruined the master. If this was the moral sentiment of a race, were the equals of antiquity and nearer true is it of us, the degenerate and inferior of the present? We will not dogmatize upon the degradation, upon the degradation, upon the degradation,