

DESERET NEWS.

Truth and Liberty.

NO. 39.

GREAT SALT LAKE CITY, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1858.

VOL. VIII.

MY LOYALTY.

BY W. G. MILLS.

I flatter not him that fills a throne
Because nations bow at his feet;
If tyranny by his deeds is shown,
I scorn his kingly seat:
A crown to me is a gaudy toy
If the sceptre is cruelly swayed;
And yet no guilty traitor am I,
But am loyal, if rightly weighed.

I praise not him that the people's voice
Has placed on the chair of state,
Because that he is the popular choice,
If his works are not good and great:
If he rules to serve some selfish ends,
Or tramples our nation's laws,
I despise the creature, my good friends,
Yet am loyal to our good cause.

I love to see the proud banner raised
That waves o'er our own great land;
By my humble Muse it shall be praised
When reared by a freeman's hand,
But 'twould have no charm if its folds were dis-
To enforce a tyrant's plan; [played
And yet I would have it distinctly said,
I'm as loyal as any man.

Where the love of truth and virtue reigns,
In President, King, or Czar,
I'd sweep my harp with its noblest strains
And praise them for what they are:
I love the right, and I hate the wrong,
This in my friend or that in my foe;
No station should bribe my honest tongue,
And yet I am loyal, I trow.

The act of the tyrant I despise,
No matter what name he may wear;
For titles are things I little prize,
Unless something good they bear:
If power and authority are used
To crush our fellow men,
I'd firmly stand to defend the abused,
And deem myself loyal then.

'Tis true that the wisest at times may err,
For that is our nature's lot,
But the ruler who aims for the people to care
My heartiest aid has got;
If he help the world in its progress to move,
And justice give low and high,
His faults I'd not name, but warmly prove
That none is more loyal than I.

G. S. L. CITY, Nov. 17, 1853.

[From the North American Review, for October.]

The new Crime of Austria.

We propose, so far as it can be done within the brief limits of this article, to exhibit the proceedings of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary,—proceedings fraught with manifold and far reaching dangers to the cause of liberty and spiritual religion in Eastern Europe.

The fatal blow to Protestantism in Eastern Europe has been struck within the last three years. So quietly has the thrust been dealt, that only a few, comparatively, in this country, are aware that the deed is done. And yet to a reflective mind such acts of legislation are far more terrible than sudden and isolated acts of cruelty.

The travelers in Hungary within the last ten years relate mournful stories of her condition. They describe their journey as saddened by the ruins of blackened homesteads and wasted towns; they visit families, where father and brother have been cut off by the hand of the executioner; they talk in the prisons with the clergymen, patriots and statesmen, whose only crime is that they loved their country too well; they hear everywhere the sigh for deliverance, or the hopeless groan of a conquered people. But even these sad scenes and discouragements make less impression on us than the accounts of this last effort at oppression by Austrian Jesuitism.

The act to which we refer is the Concordat, the new union of the Pope and the Austrian Emperor, formed on the 5th of November, 1855. To this Concordat there were certain introductory acts which should be briefly mentioned. As has already been shown, the superintendents or bishops had always, through the whole existence of the Hungarian Protestant Church, been chosen by the districts. In 1850, Haynau, a man whose name is on the pillory of the world for brutality and cruelty, himself appointed four new bishops. These tools of the ministry are still in power, paid by the government. At the same time all the General Assemblies and Synods of the Protestant Church were abolished. In 1854, District Assemblies were allowed to meet, but under a Romanist moderator, appointed by the court. Those officers found in Hungarian history so useful to the freedom of the Church—the lay moderators of the meetings—were entirely superseded. The district inspectors were suspended. The object was gradually to merge the self-government of the Church into the ecclesiastical government centering in Vienna. How well this has been accomplished the Concordat will show.

But the great step of all was to get possession of the Protestant schools. Accordingly a law was passed "reorganizing" the schools and colleges of Hungary, and placing at a higher standard the salaries of the Professors. It was skillfully framed, and ostensibly prepared for the purpose of reform. The effect was, that the chairs of Divinity and Law had at once to be given up in some of the Protestant colleges, and the students of course were obliged to resort to Vienna, or to the Catholic University of Pesth.

The necessity, too, of reforming within a given time, so many schools, and increasing so many salaries, was, as the ministry well knew, an immense burden to the Protestant congregations. They were all poor after the revolution. The Austrian currency was depreciated some thirty per cent.; and it became almost impossible within many parishes to raise the requisite funds, while neither teachers nor people desired the additional expense. In consequence, many schools have fallen into the hands of the Jesuits, or were suspended as purely private schools, and the danger now is that many more will meet with a like fate. The board of instruction, too, the school inspectors, are now all Catholic. The new teachers, as far as possible, are chosen from among the Romanists. The books are selected from those that will please despotism and Jesuitry. Roman Catholic children are not allowed to enter Protestant schools, and the lectures and lessons must never be such as will plant free ideas, or illustrate Hungarian or Protestant history.

This is the Concordat, the new union of Romish Jesuitism and Austrian tyranny. It seems at first sight a spurious document. We might well suppose it some musty treaty, framed in the palmy days of the Inquisition, just brought out from the dusty archives of Simancas or the library of the Vatican. Not the threats of excommunication and interdict, nor bulls of proud pontiffs, nor the public sentiment of the world, ever degraded a European king in the Middle Age beneath the feet of the Pope, as this young Emperor now voluntarily humbles himself before the clergy of Rome. And to strike such a league and promulgate such principles now!—in this age, when free thought is striding unceasingly forward, when science reigns, when revolutions are thundering at every palace gate, and when independence in religion has become a doctrine, allowed even by tyrants! By this treaty and the orders of council of 1850, the old self-government constitution of the Hungarian Church ceases to exist; the colleges, the seminaries, the schools of Protestant congregations become, in whole or in part, the schools of Jesuits and priests; the literature, the teachers, the ceremonials, of the country become Romanist; the Bible is put under censorship, and its circulation fettered; and, not least significant and appalling, the Catholics of Hungary, who have never been bitterly opposed to the Protestants, who have kept themselves independent of Rome, and who always preferred liberty to bigotry, are placed under the immediate and unrestrained control of the papal ordinances and ministers.

This remarkable effort of the Austrian cabinet is undoubtedly not altogether or principally dictated by religious motives. Count Thun, one of the ministry, is a bigoted Catholic. But with the Emperor and the rest of the cabinet, the object of this extraordinary humiliation before the papal chair, is political. They hope to counterbalance France in Catholic Italy, and to win the Roman Catholic world in their favor. They would strengthen themselves against revolution by appealing to superstition.

It is good that even from Roman Catholic Europe a groan of contempt has arisen at such humiliating meanness before a petty priest, and such gigantic falseness towards a conquered country. Even Austrian Lombardy rejects the Concordat with loathing; the German papers cry out against it; Belgium utters its condemnation; and from spirited little Sardinia and Piedmont we need no words—they are showing by most significant legislation what they think of Concordats, and of dependence on either temporal or spiritual power at Rome.

It is possible that this one act of tyranny of Austria may do more to emancipate Germany, by the reaction it occasions, than all the efforts of the whole Liberal party. But it is a gigantic wrong. The books of judgment in the world's annals are black with the records of the crimes of Austria. As we recall her history, there seems to move before us, coming forth from the night of the past, a long procession of her victims, calling for vengeance upon her. The princes of Poland, with faces noble yet tearful, in inconsolable grief over liberty crushed, and an ancient kingdom destroyed;—the pale reformers and confessors of Bohemia, asking of God, as they asked on the rack and at the stake, "How long?"—the sad and noble men, the poets, the artists, the patriots of Italy, who bled in vain for an emancipated country;—the heroic chieftains, the unknown peasants of Hungary, mourning for a

beloved people blotted out from the list of nations;—the martyrs, the sufferers for liberty and for conscience, without number and without name, from the rack, the gallows, the scaffold; the call, from a thousand battle-fields and dungeons,—a vast cloud of witnesses,—swell the curse of mankind against the old oppressor of liberty. But more than all her crimes, the most terrible of all her accusers, will be this last deed against religious liberty in Hungary.

PRESBYTERIANISM VS. LAW.—After prolonged agitation and frequent debate on the subject, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church has decreed that every marriage, one of the parties which has a former partner living, from whom a divorce has been obtained for any other reason than adultery, is in itself adultery. The act of living in what the church has pronounced a state of adultery, will of course preclude a man or woman from being a church member. This decision is in direct opposition to the laws of almost every State in the Union, and virtually arrays the Presbyterian Church as a distinct antagonistic power to the State. The laws of New York for instance declare that a woman shall be entitled to divorce from a man who deserts or ill-treats her, who has married her under a fraudulent pretext, or whose continual drunkenness shocks, and makes her miserable. Once divorced, she is at liberty to accept another protector by marriage. But if she be a Presbyterian she can only do so by the forfeiture of Church membership, as by her second marriage, before her first husband's death, she would become an adulteress. The law of the Church is less human than the civil law; it would compel a divorced woman to perform perhaps a life-long penance in isolation and poverty, for the misfortune of having been deceived. For our own part we are not able to perceive how it is more criminal for a divorced woman to re-marry during the life-time of the man from whom she is for ever separated, than after his death; though we can imagine that in many cases it might be impossible for her to know whether the man were dead or alive.

But the most significant feature of this decision is the boldness with which it overrides Statute Law by an ecclesiastical ordinance.—It is another proof of the wisdom of our fathers who in framing the constitution were so zealously careful to exclude from it everything that might tend to give to the religious element the least power in secular affairs.—Their descendants cannot too sedulously watch the efforts that are continually being made to obtain a Church status in State affairs, by intriguing and ambitious clergymen of several denominations. Above all evils preserve us from the charity of Puritanism, the tender mercies of Sectarianism!—[N. Y. Dispatch, August 28.]

If you wish to be preserved from such "charity," and "tender mercies," why have you so often aided in urging them on to exterminate fellow citizens?

MARRIAGE, IN ENGLAND, WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.—The inconsistencies of British legislation on the subject are summed up as follows by the European Times:

"1. Up to the time of the Reformation these marriages were allowed by dispensation from Rome.

"2. Henry VIII., of chaste and pious memory, directed a subservient Parliament to declare them to be illegal, that he might get rid of his wife Catherine.

"3. His daughter, Queen Mary, found a Parliament equally ready to order to make them legal and so herself legitimate.

"4. Her half-sister, Queen Elizabeth, not caring much about being re-legitimated, while she had the people at her back, yet directed that they should once more be pronounced to be illegal, that she might, with a better grace, decline the offered hand of Philip of Spain, the widower of her sister. At her command, also, Archbishop Parker coined and tinkered the forbidding canons as they now stand.

"5. Under our Hanoverian princes such marriages were held to be Christian and moral in Hanover, unchristian and immoral in England, and again Christian and moral in the United States while they were still our colonies.

"6. As late as the year 1835 the Lords and Commons legislated that such marriages were good, and valid, and scriptural for a peer of the realm, and all who, under cover of the indulgence to him, were married before a particular date; but that, after that date, they should be looked upon as bad, invalid, and unscriptural for everybody else."

CONVERTS TO CATHOLICISM AMONG THE FF'S IN ENGLAND.—The Paris Union informs us that "not a day passes without information being received of the conversion to Catholicism of a young daughter or son of the British aristocracy. These conversions are particularly frequent in Belgrave street, that immense and magnificent quarter of London inhabited by lords and baronets."

Substitutes for Hay.

A correspondent of the Country Gentleman writes upon the subject of fodder as follows:

Indian corn of the large southern variety, will produce the largest amount of fodder per acre, of any article which I have tried. On the 5th of June I planted one acre of corn.—The soil a warm sandy loam which would have produced fifty bushels shelled corn per acre—plowed and harrowed—then furrowed out eighteen inches between the rows—the corn strewn thickly in the furrows, (three bushels per acre)—harrowed across the rows, and rolled—cleaned out when small with the hoe. It soon covered the ground so thickly as to prevent the weeds from springing up to rob the corn of its food.

Cut it up (Sept. 5th.) with corn cutters, laying it in rows spread evenly, so that the sun may wilt it. Let it lay one or two days; then put it up in stacks; bind them well at the top, spreading the bottoms well apart, so as to permit the air to pass through them. Let them stand until winter sets in. Don't stack or draw them into the barn before cold weather; if you do they will be damaged by mould or rotteness. They may appear perfectly dry, but my experience has taught me their looks will deceive you. When cold weather has fairly set in, you may stack or put them in a barn, and you will have an article of fodder upon which your stock will thrive, if properly protected from the cold and wet.

From the produce of said acre I fed thirty cows for twenty days, giving them all they needed of fodder and a small allowance of roots. As I found from experience that my cows require about twenty-six pounds of fodder each per day, this will show that about seven and a half tons of dry fodder must have been consumed in the twenty days. From the above your correspondent can estimate how to make up his deficiency of hay. I have sown corn broadcast, but it is less productive, not so convenient curing it, and requires more seed.

Oats cut when in the milk is a good fodder, but expensive. Rye, wheat and oat straw answer the purpose of filling up, but a liberal supply of roots or ground feed must be supplied or the stock will become poor very fast.

Millet is next best to corn on good soil.—Sow any time in June, 1 bushel per acre—harvest when the seed is in milk, and it makes good fodder. Produce two to four tons per acre.

Chinese sugar cane may answer for soiling; but is too full of juice to cure for winter fodder. Roots are valuable to feed in conjunction with fodder, but must not be relied on as a substitute.

I have now mentioned all of the substitutes, but where land and labor are high, I might suggest another—that is, exhaust all the resources of the farm to make manure, and if a sufficiency cannot be thus obtained, then sow plaster, ashes, or Peruvian guano, on his mowing grounds, and thus cause two blades of grass to grow where but one grew before, and in many cases the latter will be found the cheapest and most satisfactory plan. Remember, also, that good warm stables, and feeding so that the stock cannot waste any, are also helps to a short hay crop.

By reference to my experiments, I find that rutabaga and sugar beet were worth ten cents per bushel for cows when hay was worth ten dollars per ton, and carrots and parsnips 15 cents.

I give you the result of experiment, hay and feed vs. cut straw and feed. I fed in the winter two milch cows, 28 lbs. good hay and five pounds feed to each cow, weighing the milk of ten cows for ten days. I then changed, giving 26 pounds cut rye and oat straw, and ten pounds of feed, wet and mixed well together, weighing the milk for ten days. Then changed to hay, continuing for three trials of each.—The result was no difference of any amount in each experiment, and the account balances as follows:—

28 pounds hay at \$10 per ton	14c.
25 pounds corn, oats and buckwheat, ground	7 1-2c.
	21 1-2c. per day.
26 pounds cut straw, \$5 per ton.	6 1-2c.
10 lbs. same feed as above, 11-2c.	15c.
Cutting straw, &c., extra	1c.
	22 1-2c. per day.

On a less amount of feed, I found a decrease in the quantity of milk when straw was fed. I have the above, the average of a number of experiments. I have tried cutting and steaming hay, &c. for cows, but could not make it pay for the extra labor and fuel.

BOASTING.—The game of brag is a pitiful one whether played by a nation or an individual. It is better to show what we can do than to tell what we can do. Facts are better endorsers than words.

A Yankee, according to the latest authority, sees aqueducts in bubbling springs, buildings in stones, and cash in everything.