

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1867.

JUDGES AND THEIR DECISION.
The New York Tribune makes strictures on the management of the extraterritorial political canvas in Pennsylvania, on the Republican side, to which we do not consent, and which suggest the following:

Every man who has made himself familiar with System, either in the realm of abstract thought or of practical affairs, underestimates how few elementary principles are involved in the conduct of investigation or action. This is as peculiar with particular distinctions in theology, physics, law, philosophy, and political economy. In this particular department, it is as difficult to determine what to what conclusions a man will arrive, provided you know what primal ideas he cherishes, and what his mind is organized and educated to work logically and harmoniously with itself.

Take as an illustration of this, the discussions which have been held and are still being had respecting the National Constitution, and the responsibilities of the different departments of the government under it. Great and tremendous diversities of judgment are to be found in the minds of these thinking men; but nevertheless, though many of the disputants would not be inclined to make a final presentation of their views, the volume is handily illustrated by the writings of the Dostor, and the Doctor has supplemented the text with notes indicating the extent to which his discoveries restated his original theory.

The Horace of our Times is Moby, the author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin,"

John Greenleaf Whittier, and others.

Miss Larson is unquestionably am-

dowed with poetical abilities of a high order. Except Mrs. Browning, who is a most interesting woman, who has been animated by a spirit of poetry.

In opposition to the prevailing taste, she adheres to the natural and the old-fashioned, and displays a sub-

dued and refined taste, imbued with intense thoughtfulness.

Hence, she belongs rather to the intel-

lectual than the emotional school.

The democratic, with varying degrees of clearness, have adopted certain views of the nature of the national government; the scope of its author-

ity and its relations thereto, the rights of the individual and the state; of the essential and inalienable rights of citizens and of the duties which are the necessary corollaries therefrom; of the numerous and different classes of rights shall have been accepted, while securities compassed about; and under what circumstances and to what extent they modify or strengthen each other. It seems to us that they have easily comprehended; but they rarely throw light on the whole political system, analo-

gously to the artistic and veins of the

metropolis, or, rather, like the nerves, which intricately make their presence felt and immediately assert their prerogatives.

Now is the identification observable only in the political sympathies of the people. It was

equally apparent among the Judges.

When the question of the Constitu-

tionality of the Slave was before the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-

posed, tends rather to prove that

Judges are not uncooperative in their

decisions, and when the question of the

constitutionality of the Slave was before

the Supreme Court, the judges, with one exception, di-

vided in judgment according to their re-

spective political affiliations. This excep-

tion to the rule is the only one we have pro-