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. He Black Republican or not, which 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 Evening Post—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 which side the States’ Rights party 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 declare that when we read the opinions of the judges, which reach us, in regard to the recent decision of the Supreme Court, in regard to Slavery—not because we are inclined to depreciate the importance of the matter, or to quibble in its arguments—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 freely of the tendency of the decision in 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 written in every newspaper, and heard in the public addresses of Mr. Buchanan; that since that event, we have been unable 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 vain, and the result is wasted. 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, for all the arguments in the world will not alter it. If we thought we could persuade the Judges to reverse their own decision, we would gladly attempt it; but we see no special ground to hope for such results.

Some of our correspondents appeal to the Court to the people—denounce its character, its policy, its conduct, and urge them to arouse popular hostility against the supremacy of the chief law-making body. We cannot second these endeavors, for we deem them unwise and unavailing. We see in the decision a humiliation, a degradation, of the tribunal which decides against us. We see a rational on that account to seek the overthrow of its authority. The Supreme Court is

The Times concludes:—Tint.
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COURT DECISIONS AGAINST THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTION

The Supreme Court has, in its recent decisions, struck down several of the provisions of the National Constitution. It is a question whether these decisions are of the highest importance, and whether they point to one of those periods of constitutional drift which, from time to time, shake our Republic to its foundations. The first is a question of the right to vote; the last is a question of the right to recognize a national government. The first is a question of the right to vote; the last is a question of the right to recognize a national government.
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Whatever may have been, or are our own conditions of the country, we are ready to support the Constitution, and to support it, in all its essential features, for we deem them wise and useful. They point to one of those periods of constitutional drift which, from time to time, shake our Republic to its foundations. The first is a question of the right to vote; the last is a question of the right to recognize a national government.