

CORRESPONDENCE.

A WORD IN THE EARS OF UTAH FARMERS.

UTAH COUNTY, Sep. 6th, 1863.

MR. EDITOR:

I wish to say a few words through the *Desert News* to the farmers of Utah, and by inserting the following you will oblige a Utah farmer:

Brother farmers of Utah! I have lived in this Territory since '51, have pursued various employments for a livelihood, latterly in chief, farming. Now, farming would be a more profitable business in Utah if a fair price were given for produce. I think I can see the cause of a great evil which has operated against the interest of the farmer as well as against the progress of our community in the acquisition of wealth.

This evil which I refer to, is the raising of too much wheat and too little of other useful and profitable crops. I am satisfied that no farmer can raise wheat for less than two dollars per bushel; yet he seldom obtains more than one dollar for it.

We are told repeatedly to lay by our wheat. If all the farmers would be united in this, and prepare proper bins to accommodate large quantities of surplus grain, it would partially remedy the evil I speak of; but there are few farmers who have convenience properly to store away one year's crop; hence the old crop must be disposed of to give room for the new, and great quantities of grain are pushed into the market.

The speculator sees this and becomes at once wonderfully insensible. Apparently, he can neither see wheat, hear wheat, smell wheat, taste wheat or feel wheat; yet this curious animal has a kind of instinctive impression that the street is full of wheat and that it is all his own, at his own price, when the proper hour has arrived to purchase.

After the toil-worn, sunburnt, half-naked producer is wearied of waiting and his team has become hungry and restless, the unfeeling speculator walks out of his comfortable office, enveloped in fumes of tobacco and cognac, and, in the magnanimity of his pinched up soul, he considers it a great accommodation to the farmer to buy his wheat at from sixty cents to one dollar per bushel. He really wishes us to understand that he is building up the community, and flatters himself that he should be presented with a silver medal at the end of the year, for his noble and generous efforts; and the poor farmer returns home to his family with a few flimsy rags, which he has received in exchange for his load of good clean grain.

Wheat has been our main crop; but it has proved to be the least productive of wealth and independence of any crop raised in this country. If the farmers would raise less wheat and more forage crops for sheep, cattle, horses, etc., also hemp and flax, the productions of the country would be more equalized, the demand for grain would be increased and the producer would ask his price and get it. As things now are, the great majority of the farmers are mere serfs to toil and make fortunes for a few starched-up, indolent, milk-and-water gentlemen, who happen to be able, by hook or crook, to bring to the Territory a stock of goods from the East or West.

If we did not raise so much grain we should have more time to raise flax, and to dress and prepare it for the spinning-wheel, to be converted into yarn, to make linen for shirts, garments, summer clothing, sheets, tablecloths, towels, sacks, cordage, etc., etc., which would lessen in a great degree our need of store goods. We should then, also, have more time to see to our flocks, that good wool may be produced in abundance for winter clothing, bedding, etc.

It does not seem to strike us that we can do anything for ourselves in the way of manufacturing at home textile material; but it has become usage with us to carry our grain to the merchant and beg of him to take it and receive from him as a favor a rag to cover our nakedness. In this respect the calico-venders have become our masters and we their slaves. Where is our freedom? Where is our independence? Where our liberty? We depend upon importers for our clothing, and for many luxuries which we as well could produce at home, as to traffic away our strength and our wealth to obtain them from those who are not for us, but against us—from men who, whether they make their home with us or not, are here for the purpose of gathering together our wealth to nourish and establish interests directly antagonistic to our own.

Proposals for army supplies are now called for. These supplies can only be obtained from the producers of Utah. I wonder if our past experience has made us wiser. We shall see. Shall we, as formerly, suffer contractors to put their own price upon our wheat, potatoes, hay, wool, etc.—to put fortunes in their pockets—leaving ours empty, our fields impoverished, our barns and granaries cleaned out, and our circumstances in every respect in a dilapidated condition? Or shall we fix our own prices and have them or not sell; and have them, too, in the kind of pay that will be the most benefit us and our new country.

It is true our wives and children want many articles of clothing to make them comfortable; and it is argued that we must supply their wants; but would it not be better to yoke and struggle on a little longer and there-

by secure a good, substantial supply of necessities for our families, than to wantonly and without consideration or forecast, throw our blessings to the dogs for a few husks, or in other words, for a temporary supply of rotten, unsubstantial articles, that will not pass the ordeal of one washing day?

Would not greenbacks look as well in our own pocket-books as in the pocket-books of the white-handed gentry that throng "Whisky Street," seeking whom they may devour? And can we not use greenbacks in the eastern markets, to buy goods at the first cost and have all the benefit of the profits that are now making scores rich, who care not whether we sink or swim?

At present, as formerly, there is money to be made out of us geese, that have laid golden eggs for Babylonish bucksters in times past; but shall we always be geese? Is it not time that we should open our eyes to our own interests and as a unit resist the wholesale, open-day robbery, that we have hitherto made ourselves victims of, and in the future strive to deliver ourselves from this galling yoke?

Is it not a time when we should open our ears to the admonitions of our best and tried friends, in preference to those who have shown themselves alienated from the true weal of Utah and her industrial people, and make an effort to save ourselves from the consequences of our past follies while we can.

Should not every sensible farmer in Utah exercise an influence over his less sensible neighbor, who is willfully casting the children's bread to the dogs? Let him say to him, If needs it press upon you, I will sell you a coat in exchange for grain at a fair price, or a pair of shoes, or anything I can spare. My wife will let you have a dress for your wife and a little dress for your child; but don't throw away your grain.

We must have our price and we must have the greenbacks. Hold on a little longer and we shall conquer and rule the market, which is our right to do. We have the matter in our own hands, for we hold the beef; we hold the bread; we hold the vegetables; and if contractors want them, let them pay us a fair price for them, and that in legal tenders.

Brother farmers! Can we not come to a noble resolution and unite ourselves together in every ward throughout the country for self-protection against the army of sharpers that lie in wait to consume the products of our hard toil, and fatten upon our sweat and blood?

A UTAH FARMER.

FROM THE COTTON COUNTRY.

WASHINGTON, Aug 30th, 1863.

EDITOR OF THE NEWS:

The cotton and tobacco crops in this part of the country look well. They are also good as far as I know in other portions of this country, except in some places where the people have depended upon small streams, or failed to get the water out of the larger ones. It is the opinion of many, if not all of the old settlers, that there will be nearly if not quite three times the amount of cotton raised this season, as there was last or in any previous year.

The cotton bolls have been opening for about three weeks, and there is considerable of the early cotton now ready for the first picking.

The weather continues very warm. The season has been unusually dry, with the exception of a few showers about a month ago. The general health of the people is good. There are, however, a few cases of ague and chills and fever in these lower settlements.

The people in general are full of faith and buoyant in spirit, and should they be called to return, would respond with much more regret, than they did when they were called to come on this southern mission. One strong evidence of content is, every one thinks he is located in the "best place in all of the valleys of the mountains." I said every one, there are a few who can see no place but Salt Lake, but the number is so small that it is hardly worth mentioning.

DANIEL TYLER.

A BLAST FROM MR. LINCOLN'S BUGLE.

President Lincoln has written a letter to the Union Mass Convention, convened at Springfield, Ill., on the 3d inst., the perusal of which, we are assured by some eastern cotemporary, will gladden the heart of every true Union man in the country, vindicate the President's fame and character and be a key-note in the next Presidential campaign. That our readers may realize to the fullest extent the reassurances which this document is thus reputed as having the property of awakening, we publish a synopsis of the address:

Regretting that he could not be in attendance at the Convention, he charges that body with having in it gentlemen dissatisfied with him. To such he says, "You desire peace and you blame me that you do not have it; but how can we attain it? There are but three conceivable ways. First, to suppress the rebellion by force of arms. This I am trying to do. Are you for it? If you are, so far we are agreed.

The second way is to give up the Union. I am against this. If you are, you should say so plainly.

If you are not for force, nor yet for dissolution, there only remains some imaginable compromise. I do not believe any compromise embracing the maintenance of the Union can be possible. All that I learn leads to a directly opposite belief. The strength of the rebellion is its military. That army dominates the country and all the people with its range. Any offer of terms made by any man or set of men within that range in opposition to that army would be simply nothing, for the present, because such man or men would have no power whatever to enforce their side of the compromise, if one were made with them.

A compromise, to be effective, must be made either with those who control the rebel army or with the people first liberated from the domination of that army by success of our army. Allow me to assure you that no word or intimation from the rebel army or from any of the men controlling it in relation to any peace compromise has ever come to my knowledge or belief. All charges or intimations to the contrary are deceptive and groundless, and I promise you that if any such proposition shall hereafter come, it shall not be rejected and be kept secret from you.

You dislike the emancipation proclamation and perhaps would have it retracted. You say it is unconstitutional. I think that the Constitution vests its Commander-in-Chief with the law of war in the time of war.

The most that can be said is that slaves are property. Is there, or has there ever been any question that by the law of war the property both of enemies and friends may be taken when needed?—and is it not needed when our taking it helps us or hurts the enemy?

Armies, the world over, destroy the enemy's property when they cannot use it and even destroy their own to keep it from the enemy. Civilized belligerents do all in their power to help themselves or hurt the enemy, except a few things regarded as barbarous.

The proclamation is law and valid or it is not valid. If it is valid, it cannot be retracted, any more than the dead can be brought to life. Some of you prefer to think that retraction would operate favorably to the Union. Why better after retraction than before the issue?

There was more than a year and a half of trail to suppress the rebellion before the proclamation was issued—the last one hundred days of which passed under an explicit notice that it was coming, unless averted by those in revolt returning to their allegiance. The war has certainly progressed as favorably to us since the issue of the proclamation as before.

I know as fully as one can know the opinions of others, that some of the commanders of the armies in the field who have given us our most important victories believe that the emancipation policy and the aid of colored troops constitute the heaviest blows yet dealt to the rebellion, and that one at least of those important successes could not have been achieved unless it was for the aid of the black soldiers.

Among the commanders holding these views are some who have never had any affinity with what is called Abolitionism or with the Republican party politics, but who hold them purely as military opinion. I submit their opinions as being entitled to some weight, against the objections often urged, that emancipation and the army of the blacks are unwise as military measures, and were not adopted as such in good faith.

You say that you will not fight to free the negroes. Some of them seem to be willing enough to fight for you; but no matter; fight you, then, exclusively to save the Union. I issued the proclamation on purpose to aid in saving the Union. Whenever you shall have conquered all resistance to the Union, if I shall urge you to continue fighting, it will be an apt time then for you to declare that you will not fight to free the negroes.

I thought that, in our struggle for the Union, to whatever extent the negroes should cease helping the enemy, to that extent it weakens the enemy in his resistance to you. Do you think differently?

I thought that whatever number of negroes can be got to be as soldiers, leaves just so much less for white soldiers to do in saving the Union. Does it appear otherwise to you?

But negroes, like other people, act upon motive. Why should they do anything for us, if we will do nothing for them? If they stake their lives for us, they must be protected by the strongest motive—even the promise of freedom—and the promise made must be kept.

The logical and singularly laconic wording of this letter doubtless had an electric effect in strengthening the Lincoln side of the house. The President is evidently heart and soul enlisted in the gigantic work before him, which, it would appear, he is the agent to consummate—no less than the liberation of the black race from their present condition of chattelized servitude—to pay a full equivalent for which he is honestly impressed with the reciprocal duty of the Hamites to use their brawny arms in squelching the imperiousness of their masters—and he is determined to give them a fair show in the fight.

His arguments under the rule of supposition are no less ironical than they are inimitable, if not irresistible. As stated by the President, his plea for acts charged against him as "tyrannical, monstrous, barbarous and infernal" presents a very plausible surface. We

may, however, from a favorable altitude, look calmly down upon the surgings and foamings of the political caldron as into the crater of a boiling volcano, whose smouldering fires may, without a moment's premonition, belch forth a flood of lurid death upon all within its scope.

THE RUMORED PEACE PROPOSITIONS

Our readers will not have forgotten the sensation produced last winter by the story that Fernando Wood, of New York, had received certain proposals from the Southern leaders looking to a settlement of difficulties between the two sections of the country, and the restoration of peace. It was also stated that Mr. Wood had communicated to Mr. Lincoln the import of the proposals said by him to have been received. It was then stated that Mr. Lincoln and his Cabinet received what had been communicated by Mr. Wood with an almost criminal indifference.

The character of this correspondence has remained a secret to the public up to the present time and has been the subject of much speculative comment and invective. To put an end to all this uneasiness and recrimination, the permission to publish the correspondence was at length obtained and the wonderful documents appeared in the New York prints on the 8th inst.

The first letter from Mr. Wood, dated Dec. 8, 1862, to the President, says:

"On the 25th of November I was advised, by authority which I deemed likely to be well informed as well as reliable and truthful, that the Southern States would send Representatives to the next Congress, provided that a full and general amnesty should permit them to do so. No guarantees or terms were asked other than the amnesty referred to. Deeming this information of great value, if well founded, I communicated its substance to George Opdyke, Mayor of New York, who I knew held confidential relations with members of the Administration, and proposed through him that if the Government would permit correspondence under his own inspection, I would undertake to procure something definite and positive from persons connected with the so-called Confederate authorities."

Mayor Opdyke, from reasons not stated, failed to make the proposition, and therefore Mr. Wood as a loyal citizen, deeply impressed with the great necessity of restoring the union of the States, asks the President's immediate attention to the subject, and suggests that a gentleman with former intimate political and social relations with the leaders of the Southern revolt be allowed to hold correspondence with them on the subject—the correspondence to be submitted to the President. He quotes the following language from the President's inaugural, in support of his proposition:

"Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always, and when after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical question as to terms and intercourse are again upon you."

Mr. Lincoln's reply to Wood's letter, dated Dec. 12, says:

"I strangely suspect your information will prove groundless, understanding the phrase that the Southern States would send representatives to the next Congress, to be substantially the same as that the people of the Southern States would cease to make resistance and submit to national authority within the limit of such States as are under the Federal Constitution. I say that in such case war would cease, and that if within a reasonable time a full and general amnesty were necessary to such an end it would not be withheld."

The President does not think it would be proper now to communicate this formally or informally to the people of the Southern States; nor does he think it proper now to suspend military operations to try the experiment of negotiation. He would nevertheless receive with great pleasure, the exact information you may now have, and also such other as you may in any way obtain."

Mr. Wood, under date of Dec. 17, regrets that the President declines what he had conceived to be an innocent effort to ascertain the foundation of the information in his possession of the desire of the South to return to the Union. He does not, however, give a sentence of his information.

We have only room for extracts sufficient to show the character of this mysterious and long-suppressed specimen of diplomacy, of which our readers may now form their own opinions.