Dred Scott Case—the Black Republican papers, with but few exceptions, so far as we have seen, are down upon the Supreme Court, for their decision in the Dred Scott case. The most opprobious epithets, the lowest Billingsgate language, are applied to them. Most conspicuous in this race of blackguardism, as a matter of course, is the New York Tribune, although it is nearly neck and neck, between it, and some of its congenial spirits, hailing from that once worthy city yclept Boston.

Among the exceptions, we are pleased to name the N. Y. Times, the organ of Gov. Seward, from which will be found below, an article worthy the serious consideration of every man, be he Black-Republican or what not, that truly loves his country, and desires to see her institutions preserved. We also give an article on the same subject, from that sterling American paper, the New York Express—one of the few papers, by the by, in that great city, which advocated the election of Mr. Fillmore. This paper has ever been true to the Constitution, and to the laws made under it, and as a consequence, has ever been true to the South. There is a great deal of good food for thought, in both these articles. They speak the language of soberness and truth, and put the issue plainly before the people, pointing out in unmistakable language, the consequences that would follow, should Greely & Co., succeed in carrying out their wishes and designs:

THE NEW YORK TIMES ON THE DRED SCOTT CASE.—The *Times* has the following sensible remarks on the utter futility of opposition to the decision rendered by the Supreme Court, in the Scott case:

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.—We must decline publishing the numerous communications that reach us, in regard to the recent decision of the Supreme Court, in regard to Slavery—not because we are inclined in the least to depreciate its importance, or to acquiesce in its argument—but mainly, because no practical good can follow the discussion. When the various opinions of the several Judges are published, we shall endeavor to ascertain from them what points of law have been actually decided, and what have not, and we shall probably take occasion to speak hereafter as we had done already, of the bearing of this action of the Court upon the future relations of Slavery to the Government and the country.

There are some discussions in which a journalist may profitably engage, and some in which he cannot. Before the late election, it was legitimate and laudable to resist the election of Mr. Buchanan; since that event, we have not been able to perceive the utility of such a line of argument. It is the business of a newspaper to deal with pending issues, and to aim at practical results. But when a point is once established—beyond all chance of being changed—strength is wasted in continuing to assail it. The decision of the Supreme Court, in this instance, as in all others, is the law of the land. What it has decided must stand, all the arguments in the world, to the contrary, notwithstanding. If we thought we could persuade the Judges to reverse their own decision, we would gladly prosecute the endeavor; but we see no special ground to hope for such a result.

Some of our correspondents appeal from the Court to the people—denounce its characters, repudiate its authority, and strive to arouse popular hostility against the supremacy assigned to it by the constitution. We cannot second those endeavors, for we deem them unsound and unsafe. They point to one of two alternatives—nullification or a change in the constitution. The first is treasonable, and the last is Quixotic. It is very natural that we should dislike the tribunal which decides against us, but it is not rational on that account to seek the overthrow of its authority. The Supreme Court is an

those endeavors, for we deem them unsound and unsafe. They point to one of two alternatives—nullification or a change in the constitution. The first is treasonable, and the last is Quixotic. It is very natural that we should dislike the tribunal which decides against us, but it is not rational on that account to seek the overthrow of its authority. The Supreme Court is an essential part of our federal organization. The government could not exist without it, any more than it could exist without the Senate, which is quite as hostile to freedom, but fortunately not quite so long lived as the Supreme Court itself. If any section, or any party, is to seek the annihilation of whatever branch of the government happens to be against it, our political contests will become struggles for national life—attempts to tear away, one after another, the limbs of the body politic.

From the New York Express.

ORGANIZING A PARTY AGAINST THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is very evident—that Kansas having ceased "to bleed"—and thus to furnish aliment for the Northern Geographical Sectional Party—that party is here to be directed against the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States—a rather a tough piece of granite to batter—a good deal tougher than President Pierce or President Buchanan—but, nevertheless, Gibraltar is thus to be battered—and, if possible taken. Nor is this unnatural—for the Supreme Court has taken from this Republican party its very and only foundation, and declared it unconstitutional—and the party to be an unconstitutional party—and hence, we say, its indignation is natural. It is not surprising then for us to hear such organs as the Tribune rave, and rant, and roar—and call the Court "a Washington Bar Room," making decisions dictated by the bowie knife, &c.,—for disappointment and rage naturally give vent to such a vocabulary of slang.

We are, however, a little surprised, and yet not over much to learn, that what calls itself "a Republican party" means to organize itself—as a party—against a legal decision of the highest supreme tribunal of the Republic—surprised, because an organization cannot long carry with it the intelligent and legal minds in that party—and only its hot-heads, fools and fanatics. The discussion of the principles of the Supreme Court decision is one thing—and we have all a right to discuss them, and to scold about them, but under our form of government, we have no right to repudiate or to organize parties to upset decided laws. Law is law, whether we like it or not, and obedience to law is a christian, moral and political duty.

Whatever may have been, or are our own opinions of the decision of the Supreme Court—and what they are our readers well know—we mean to obey it, and to advise the public to obey it, because it is law, and because it comes from the highest tribunal on earth, from which there is no appeal but to arms. We mean to support its processes, its decrees, its officers, and to advise all others to support them—for we know of no appeal from them short of civil war—and we can see no possible good in resisting them, but on the contrary, every possible evil.

When this Government was formed, a Supreme Court of the United States was created to judge and decide, not only between man and man, but between State and State. The wise framers of that instrument foresaw that, in the conflicts of power in the Federal Constitution, cases would arise developing, not only men's passions, but the passions of States and sections, to the utmost—which could be settled on no political area, but must be referred for decision to some high court, made up of men exempt from all party temptations by the tenure of their offices, and likely to exempt from passion or prejudice by their age—and *that*, on earth, must be the court of last resort. This court, thus constituted, has often, from the days when Oliver Ellsworth presided over it, down to our day, run into conflict with popularity and passions, and resisted them, for it was not created to be reponsible to the people, but to be independent of, and above the people—even the master and ruler of the people. Hence the people have no power over this tribunal, when once it is created. The President that named to the Senate the Judges, cannot remove them. The Senate cannot touch them without an impeachment by the House of Representatives, and then two thirds of the Senators must concur in the conviction. The judiciary, thus constituted and thus independent, has the august duty of expounding the laws, the constitution, treaties, all cases affecting ambassadors, cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, &c., and what they decide to be the law, under the constitution, is the SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND; and what is against the constitution, they have a right to nullify and abrogate, or rather to declare not to be law, "*Anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.*" (Art. 6th, Sec. 2).

Now against this Supreme Court—we cannot make—neither "we, the people of the United States," who make the Constitution—nor we, the Northern people. What the Bible is, in the Christian world—the Constitution is, in the political world—with this addition—that the *Supreme Court of the United States is its authorized and rightful expounder.* We can rebel. We can wage civil war. Revolution is an undoubted right of man—with all its consequences. Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God. But let him step forth, who dare unfurl that banner! Let him lead out his party!