



1891-08-15

Letter from John Muir to [Robert Underwood] Johnson, 1891 Aug 15.

John Muir

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/muir-correspondence>

Recommended Citation

Muir, John, "Letter from John Muir to [Robert Underwood] Johnson, 1891 Aug 15." (1891). *John Muir Correspondence (PDFs)*. 101.

<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/muir-correspondence/101>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the John Muir Correspondence 1856-1914 at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in John Muir Correspondence (PDFs) by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

San Francisco

Aug. 15. 1891

My Dear Mr Johnson

about 10000 words

I sent the Kings article, by
registered mail half an hour ago (3 P.M.)
I have just corrected names heights-distances
directions etc of the list of illustrations
which I will forward with this. Robinsons
elevations were ^{nearly} all greatly overestimated & none of
them measured. I made careful measurements
~~at~~ during four visits to the valley with two
good aneroids still I do not claim exactness
as that is impossible by such means.
Therefore I say about so high.

As to the names I am not at all satisfied
with some of my own, but think most of
them decidedly better than Robinsons.

Think of White Woman for a rock a mile high
& two broad. No whiter than any other mass of gray
granite in the valley. Robinson says it looks like a

Woman. When turned ² on edge or upside down.
As to Grant Monument - it is only 2000 ft incline
of 3000 & is not striking enough for Grant.
Voth Tower I think is better. Anyhow it would
hardly do to have two monuments so near
each other. What Rob - calls Mt Hutchings
is a slender point or crest rising above
from the general mass of the wall - not a
Mtn. The top is remarkably sharp like
but too small to be seen in a picture.

If you care to change any of the names
or prefer any of Robinsons make
any changes you may think
best but in such case be careful
to change the MS also.

I fear you will find the article terribly
dry & geographical - I am sorry etc
but I assure you I have worked hard
to cover the ground & keep each part
in proper subordination. Some of the

guide-bookish³ stuff about Mt
Whitney & Mt Tyndall might well
have been spared, but Mountains
so important had to receive some
sort of mention & I had no space
for anything like description.

One way & another throughout the paper
I have tried to show the valley
& the forests below it & the great
Mass of High Sierra above it & if
it has no flavor of the region I will
be disappointed.

As to delay I am sure you will pardon
me when you recall the changes that
have come over our home. I had
my mountain shoes ready last October
for the King's trip to refresh my memory
make measurements etc. When Dr Stuntz
left us. The Alaska papers I shall
work on now. The map especially the

Kings River Portion ⁴ is very incorrect
hope it will not much matter
Even the Geological Survey map is
very faulty. The map of the valley
I sent you is the only one that
at all approximates correctness as
far as I know -

far as I know I am afraid Mr Robinson
has been talking too much about
our scheme & even publishing
My mother wrote me a month ago that
she had been reading what she called
an article on Kings R written by R.
I have not seen it.

I have not
The illustration of the floor of valley & your
view of walls from Mandanite Orchard I
think very fine. Also of Glacier Monument (White Mtns)
I think you should give a picture of the ~~Whispering~~
Dome. from the floor. I sent you a sketch -

Ever cordially yours John Muir