

FREE SOIL BANNER.



FOR PRESIDENT,
MARTIN VAN BUREN,
OF NEW YORK.
FOR VICE PRESIDENT.
CHARLES F. ADAMS,
OF MASSACHUSETTS.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 25, 1848.

PUBLICATION OFFICE OF THE
BANNER IS ON
PENNSYLVANIA STREET,
Three doors north of Washington Street.

TO THE PUBLIC!

Fellow citizens! we issue to-day the first No. of "THE FREE SOIL BANNER." The flag you observe at the head of our columns is the banner of True Democracy. Its elevation has certainly required the exercise of courage; we have gathered more than was requisite, however, from the truth, the justice, and patriotism of our cause.

In thus unfurling a flag, which will probably draw down upon us the double anger of the Old Hunkers of both parties in Indiana, we depend in the contest it will provoke, upon the justness and truth of the cause whose *holy cross* we assume.

We are believers in the people. We know their power, their sense of justness, their capacity to perceive truth, and their readiness to punish corruption. We know their common sense will triumph over every prejudice; passion, or political dogma.

We have but to expose delusion and they will vanish. Hence we depend upon the strong **COMMON SENSE OF THE PEOPLE** in the battle we have thus voluntarily braved, as upon the arm of a giant. There are a few by whom that support is deemed weak—who consider that common sense but a withered reed. Not so we. The mystery of self government, the real sceptre of the people, we believe it has no old age.

It may sleep temporarily beneath the shadow of clouds; but it has no death. Upon it, therefore, we lean—in it we confide; to it we will address every effort, every argument, every patriotic appeal, and every exposition of fact.

The creed we advocate is that dear to the heart of every virtuous and intelligent northern man. Freedom of the north from southern dictation, and the non-extension of slavery are its grand objects. Our platform is broad; it covers the whole continent. Whigs, Democrats, and Anti-Slavery men—the whole nation can stand on it. Its principles need no concealment. We proclaim them with pride, and dare the opposition to their controversy.

We believe our Constitution was established to maintain justice, promote general welfare, and preserve the liberties of the people.

We believe Congress has a right to legislate for the Territories of the United States, and that the introduction of slavery into them is a violation of the principles of our Constitution.

We believe that slavery, as it now exists in the Southern States of our Union, is dependant upon State laws alone, and wholly independant of the Federal Government; and that, therefore, all interference on the part of Congress, with Slavery within the limits of those States, is an illegal and unjustifiable assumption of authority.

We believe that the only method for the effectual prevention of the extension of slavery, is by an act of Congress absolutely prohibiting its introduction into all Territories now free.

We believe that for near fifty years the South have been laboring by intrigue and strategic measures to extend the area of slavery and acquire the balance of power.

We believe that the demand for new slave states and territories on the part of the slave power has compelled us to join issue upon that great question

—a question greater than any ever agitated since the formation of our federal government; and that now, or never, is the period for the action and decision of the people upon it.

We believe that the expenses and patronage of the government should be retrenched; that all unnecessary offices and salaries should be abolished; and that civil offices should as far as practicable be within the people's gift by election, not the presidents by appointment.

We believe that grants of the public lands should be free to all actual settlers, making settlements in the wilderness; but that the quantity of those grants should be restrained and suitably limited.

We believe that River and Harbor improvements are subjects of national legislation; and that it is the duty of Congress, in the exercise of its constitutional powers, to provide therfor."

We believe that the exigencies of our country demand the immediate establishment of such a tariff as will provide revenue sufficient to defray governmental expenses, and liquidate, by annual instalments, our national debt and the interest thereon.

We believe that the nomination of General Zachary Taylor, by the Whig Convention at Philadelphia, was a base repudiation of their great principles, an ungenerous abandonment of their greatest leaders, and a virtual dissolution of their organization and existence as a party.

We believe that Gen. Cass, the nominee of the Democratic Convention, and the exponent of Democratic principles, has proven false to his constituency and the interest of the north, that he has sacrificed the north for the sake of southern support, and by such conduct has rendered himself unworthy public confidence and elevation to the American Presidency.

We believe that the southern divisions of both the old parties are earnestly desirous of the extension of slavery; that the old abolitionist faction will be satisfied with nothing but its absolute abolition throughout the Union; while the new Free Soil party, throwing themselves back upon the proviso of Jefferson, to prohibit the extension of slavery after 1800 in all territories of the United States, northern and southern, forms the only true conservative party at this day in America.

We believe, finally, that the sentiments contained in the resolutions adopted by the Buffalo Convention are right in every particular—right morally, religiously, and constitutionally—right in the sight of God, and sanctioned by the consciences of men.

The above are our articles of faith. We publish them in order to convince the public that we battle for *principles*, and principles alone.

A single remark is sufficient as to the manner in which we will conduct our paper. We pledge ourselves to studiously avoid every thing related to fanaticism, vindictiveness, assertions without authority, profitless abuse of past Administrations, misstatements and intentional misconstructions of the doctrines and opinions of the great "wise men" of our republic. As fiery words but kindle passion, abuse excites partisan ire, and ill-natured witticisms strengthen prejudices, we will strive to address ourselves to the common sense of the people calmly, soberly, and as if it were a living intelligence open to reason and conviction.

The Ball rolls on.

We have cheering news from every portion of our State. Daily acquisitions are being made to our strength. The resolutions of the Buffalo convention, containing our political creed, are of so patriotic a character, so full of noble and manly sentiment, that even our enemies can find no fault with them. With such principles, armed with the invincible panoply of truth we go forth into the contest, anticipating certain triumph.

— The Whig and Democratic candidates for the Presidency were selected on account of their military deeds and reputation. Both understand the science of *charging* to perfection. Still there is a wide difference between the charging talents of the two. One charged Ampudia in Monterey, and after taking the city most gallantly, with equal humanity saved thousands of his *yellow hordes*; the other made equally terrible charges upon the United States Treasury, but how many *yellow boys* he saved after the contest, God only knows.

— HORACE GREELEY subscribed five hundred dollars in aid of the Irish rebellion.

The Issue.

There has never, perhaps, since the formation of our Union, been a time so interesting to American freemen as the present. A crisis, that statesmen have long seen upon the verge of the political horizon, is upon us, with all its stirring events; and the time has arrived in the history of our country, when sober appeals to our reason and intelligence are to be the effective engines in political reformation, rather than violent invective or public declamation. The public mind, by which is meant the aggregation of millions of free intellects, is prepared for the reciprocity of political knowledge. There is throughout our country a feeling among the masses, prompting them to think and act more for themselves, as men having the ability for, and right to, self-government.

A spirit of examination and inquiry into the present and past measures of dominant parties is awakened, and an investigation of the results of their measures and action on the future, considered a sacred and solemn duty required of us by our country. Party ties and political claims, are being loosened before the power of reason. Thought is taking the place of blind enthusiasm and dogged adherence to parties which present nothing but names as issues, and prejudices as reasons for their support. This is as it should be.

If the views we have entertained, and the principles we have hitherto cherished, are founded in right, it is our duty still to cherish and defend them. If, on the contrary, they are wrong, or by the lapse of time, or force of circumstances, have become obsolete or impracticable, are we so much greater slaves to party than lovers of truth and country, that though we clearly see their ruinous tendency we still cling to them with stubborn pertinacity? Never. Such is not the action of freemen.

The spirit of inquiry relative to tendencies is not, however, confined to the action of political parties, or the boundaries of our own country. It is the spirit and feature of the age in which we live, and finds its way into and through all the ramifications of society. A feeling of liberality, the natural consequence of increased intelligence, also characterizes the present time, and changes and revolutions having for their object the elevation of the masses, is the order of the day. Even Europe, so long enslaved by political and religious dogmas, is beginning to think and to act. Old views are being forsaken, and the people, actuated by the spirit of freedom, are giving utterance to sentiments and feelings heretofore considered as rank political heresy and traitorism.

These are some of the few indications of the times, and whither do they tend? To the permanent foundation of parties of enlarged and liberal views in regard to government and human rights.

While these are the feelings of the age, and while the cry of millions is given to the breeze for free speech, free labor, and free men, is it consistent with our position among the nations of the earth that we should, in this universal movement for freedom, be behind all others?

Let us look at our position. Within the last four months we have acquired nearly 300,000 square miles of territory—every foot of which is now a home for a freeman. But a clamor for the admission of the institution of slavery over this territory, has already been heard in our legislative halls, and the question is before us for our final decision. How shall we act? There is no evading the question; it must be answered and acted upon. To meet the issue, the friends of free soil have organized as a distinct party. Their reason for so doing is their firm belief that in the contest which approaches, on this question of questions, they cannot look for succor and aid from either of the great parties of the day, acting as such. From individuals from each party they do expect much in the contest, for they are with us—a part of us.

We thus present the first instance, in the history of our country, of a party, powerful in numbers and resources, formed almost instantaneously from elements formerly most discordant, having for its objects the preservation of freedom in domain now threatened, and reform in the abuses of various departments of government.

We claim to be the conservatives on the question of slavery, for we say to those who have now vested interests, that we make no war on rights heretofore granted. Your rights shall not be interfered with. On the other hand we say, no portion of territory hereafter attached to our glorious Union shall be other than free soil, where free men shall enjoy the free gifts of Heaven. This we conceive to be the great issue of the day, presented to us, the people, for our action.

On which side will you be found? Let every one answer for himself! As for us, we should feel as if we were a fit mark for the slow and unerring finger of scorn to point at, did we hesitate where to be found. We go for free soil, free speech, free labor, and for free men. With this motto on our banner, we fling it to the breeze, saying to the people, come and let us reason together, and anticipate a glorious triumph.

— How can a Whig, professing *Whig principles*, consent to vote for Gen. Taylor in the face of his assertion, that he never would be the exponent of the *principles* of any party?

How can a Northern Democrat, who has the interest of the North at heart, vote for General Cass in the face of his pledge to the South, that he will veto any bill tainted with the principles of the Wilmot proviso?

Mr. Corwin's Speech on the Compromise Bill.

We have read with feelings of admiration for the general sentiments, and arguments set forth therein, the speech of Senator Corwin. We have long been his ardent admirers, and for some time past have watched his course with anxious solicitude. Whatever his own position may be, his arguments are conclusive, both, as we conceive, against the extension of slavery and the election of Gen. Taylor. The last argument we propose to notice, and lay before our readers. We believe, coming from the Senator, it will have its influence for good, and will add to the numbers of the *Free Soil party*. Mr. Corwin says:

"It is a sad commentary upon the perfection of human reason that, with but very few exceptions, gentlemen coming from a Slave State—and I think I have one behind me who ought always to be before me, [Mr. Badger]—with a very few exceptions, all eminent lawyers on this floor from that section of the country have agreed that you have no right to prohibit the introduction of Slavery into Oregon, California and New Mexico; while, on the other hand, there is not a man in the Free States, learned or unlearned, clerical or lay who has any pretension to legal knowledge, but believes in his conscience that you have a right to prohibit slavery. Is not that a curious commentary upon that wonderful thing called human reason.

Mr. Underwood—it is regulated by a line.

Mr. Corwin—Yes, by 36 deg. 30 min., and what is black on one side of the line and white on the other, turning to jet black again when restored to its original locality. How is that? Can I have confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States when my confidence fails in Senators around me here? Do I expect that the members of that body will be less careful than the Senators from South Carolina and Georgia to form the opinions without any regard to selfish considerations? Can I suppose that either of these gentlemen, or the gentleman from Georgia on the other side of the Chamber, (Mr. Johnson,) or the learned Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Davis) who thought it exceedingly infamous that we should attempt to restrain the Almighty in the execution of His purpose as revealed to us by Moses—can I suppose that these Senators, with all the terrible responsibilities which press upon us when engaged in legislating for a whole Empire, came to their conclusions without the most anxious deliberations? And yet, on one side of the line, in the Slave states, the Constitution reads *yea*, while on the other, after the exercise of an equal degree of intelligence, calmness and deliberation, the Constitution is found to read *nay*."

Mr. Corwin has no confidence in Southern Senators, Southern Judges, and Southern Lawyers. They all have the same views of the constitution. He believes they have anxiously deliberated on the matter before they came to their conclusions, and those conclusions were diametrically opposed to the opinions formed by men north of 36 deg. 30 m. The constitution north of that remarkable line, reads *yea*, south of it *nay*.

Gen. Taylor reserves the right to veto, where there is clear violation of the constitution? What is Gen. Taylor's position? Does he live in the north, or in the south? In the region where men's honest convictions are, that Congress has power to prohibit the extension of Slavery, or south of the line, where there is no sudden somerset on constitutional questions! Does the constitution read *yea*, or *nay*? Mr. Corwin has no confidence in the constitutional opinions of southern Lawyers and Statesmen. Can you, Free Soil Taylor men, have any more confidence in a Southern General, open to the same objections, from precisely the same cause? Is he any better versed in constitutional law, or questions of State? Certainly not. We think the editor of the Macon Republican, a Whig paper of Alabama, precisely right when he says, a report that Gen. Taylor was a free negro, would be equally worthy of credit as the report that he would not veto a bill containing the provisions of the Wilmot proviso.

Buffalo Convention.
Believing that a full report of the regular proceedings of the Buffalo Convention would be interesting to most of our readers, we take up a large portion of our paper in publishing a full report.

We shall hereafter, from time to time, publish some of the speeches made during the recesses of the Convention. They are patriotic appeals, and breathe a spirit that can never be quelled until at length triumphant—the spirit of *freemen* aroused to a resistance of continued aggression.

— How can a Whig, professing *Whig principles*, consent to vote for Gen. Taylor in the face of his assertion, that he never would be the exponent of the *principles* of any party?

How can a Northern Democrat, who has the interest of the North at heart, vote for General Cass in the face of his pledge to the South, that he will veto any bill tainted with the principles of the Wilmot proviso?

Let them lay their hands on their hearts, and answer as honest men and christians!

— Gen. JOSEPH LANE, has been appointed Governor, and WILLIAM P. BRYANT, Chief Justice of Oregon. They are both from Hosierdom.

Free Soil Men in Sentiment.

We are met every day by men of both political parties, who tell us that they are with us in feeling. That *our* views, are *their* views on the subject of the non-extension of Slavery, but that the movement is premature. Wait a little, say they, and we will go with you. Are they honest and in earnest in their declarations? If they are, they will joyfully hail a movement in favor of what they hold to be a vital measure of national policy, even although *they*, under the circumstances, felt constrained to keep aloof from acting fully with us. They certainly would not object to the promulgation of doctrines they hold good, and worthy of all acceptance! But is this the course they pursue?—these furious free soil men in sentiment. Do they regard with favor, or deprecate free soil meetings? Do they encourage or discourage the sentiments there uttered? Do they honestly state their object, or attempt to turn these sentiments into ridicule? Let their acts speak for them.

They say that we are right, but there is no prospect of success at the present time. This is the language of eight out of every ten Whigs and Democrats we meet. They want us to succeed, and at the same time, use every effort in their power to prevent our success. Is this the jewel of consistency? Again, they tell us that the President has nothing to do with making the laws—he is a mere cipher. Congress is the place to look to. See to it that your Congress is right, and all is safe.

Brother Democrat, are you forgetting that there is a veto power in the hands of the President? Whig friends, do you remember when you told us that there was danger of our liberties being destroyed by the strength of this very power? And now you, forsooth, tell us that the President can do nothing—we must look to Congress. Such inconsistencies wont do. It is important that we have a President with us—one that we can vote for understandingly—one who is with us in sentiment and will be with us in *action*. We have every assurance that Cass and Taylor are not with us. Believing that the issue presented by the Free Soil party, relative to the extension of slavery, is one of deep interest to our country and posterity—that it brings up the great principles upon which our government is founded, and our independence avowed; are we not right in wishing to be upon safe ground? Should we, as men professing to act from the highest and purest motives of patriotism, vote blindly on this question, and for the sake of a mere party triumph, involving no important issues, jeopardize the interests of our country, of posterity and humanity?—Never. We would not thus risk our private interests. Is our country to be held in a less sacred light? Patriots may answer.

Let every man who is with us in sentiment on this question, deposit his vote for a man for the chief executive office of our Union, who openly avows his position. They cannot with consistency do otherwise. Let them stand firm, with stout heart and strong arm, with the motto, no further extension of slavery upon which to take issue, and victory must and will crown their efforts in behalf of their country and human rights.

Sympathy for Ireland.

There has been a tremendous demonstration in favor of the struggling Irish, at Vauxhall Garden, New York. Never, perhaps, since the incorporation of the city, was there a more perfect abandonment on the part of the citizens, to excitement.

Donations most liberal and munificent, were freely tendered to the committee who asked them. Poor men gave their whole wages to the cause, even to their own deprivation. The clergy, in the person of Bishop Hughes, who was present and made a most eloquent appeal, gave their approbation to the proceedings.

This sympathetic feeling is by no means confined to the city of New York; it is abroad all over the Union. Meetings have been held in Philadelphia and Cincinnati. Stirring appeals are issuing from every press. The heart of the whole nation seems to be throbbing for the brave, yet almost defenceless Irishman.

Where is Indiana on this subject? Why is she not moving to their relief? It will be a burning shame if she do not something.

We hope the good people of our city will look to this matter. No time is to be lost. Why cannot a meeting be appointed for Saturday or Monday evening?

Union.

Perfect harmony, unanimity, and enthusiasm, pervade the ranks of the Free Soil party.

The Buffalo Courier, a Cass paper, says of our nominating convention: "There has been no voting down of resolutions; no hissing of Speakers; and scarcely any perceptible difference of opinion." All seems to go on smoothly as water."

That was right. Union in feeling and action will make any party strong, and it is because of this feeling, I pervading our ranks, that we look to final victory.

Consistency.

The whig party, before its dissolution at the late Philadelphia convention, had ever held as one of the vital questions of their political creed, the provisions of the Wilmot proviso.—The other questions upon which there has been a division between the whig and democratic parties, have, by the conjunction of circumstances, become no longer issues before the people, with perhaps the exception of the single question relating to the restriction of the veto power. The whig platform asserts that the veto should not be exercised "except in cases of clear violation of the constitution or manifest haste and want of consideration by Congress." Both parties agree that in case of violation of the constitution the veto should be exercised. Who is to judge of this matter? The President, of course. So far there is no difference. Again, haste and want of consideration, is a relative term. What would be so in one case would not be so in another, and the President is the person to whom such want of consideration is to be made manifest. He looks at a bill that has been passed by Congress—finds something wrong, and comes to the conclusion that the matter has not received proper consideration, from the simple fact of its being, in his opinion, wrong, and deleterious to the interests of the country. He tells them so in a message—the thing is done—the veto is consummated. The difference seems to us, to be simply whether the matter shall be made manifest to Taylor or to Cass—the difference between shade and shadow. What doctrine of whig creed is left then to the old fashioned whig? The Wilmot proviso? No, even that was struck from the rolls by the Philadelphia mob. A resolution declaring the principles of that proviso to be whig doctrine was introduced before that body, and amid groanings and hissing, was laid