



John Muir Correspondence (PDFs)

---

1909-02-22

**Letter from R[obert] U[nderwood] Johnson to John Muir, 1909 Feb 22.**

Robert Underwood Johnson

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

---

**Recommended Citation**

Johnson, Robert Underwood, "Letter from R[obert] U[nderwood] Johnson to John Muir, 1909 Feb 22." (1909). *John Muir Correspondence (PDFs)*. 5703.

<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/muir-correspondence/5703>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 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](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT  
THE CENTURY MAGAZINE  
UNION SQUARE NEW YORK

R. W. GILDER, EDITOR.  
R. U. JOHNSON,  
ASSOCIATE EDITOR.  
C. C. BUEL,  
ASSISTANT EDITOR.



Home.

Feb. 22, 1909

Dear Miss:

I think we must  
now work for a revo-  
lution of the Farfield grant  
by the new Administration.  
I know the new ~~Secretary~~ <sup>Attorney Gen.</sup>  
Mr. Wickersham and shall  
see him tomorrow. The new  
Secy. of the Interior, R. A.  
Ballinger, has just from Seattle.  
The Phelan crowd will of course  
try to capture him. His address  
as given in "Who's Who for 1907" is Alaska  
Building Seattle. It might be well  
to say to him - for you to say to him  
- that the quarter will probably come

04445

before him early in his in-  
cumbency and that we hope to  
~~find~~ present to him such con-  
clusive arguments as to justify  
him in following the precedent of  
Ex-Secretary Hitchcock and ~~to~~ not that  
of Secretary Garfield, <sup>Secretary</sup>  
noble being also on our side.

I shall see Wickerham  
tomorrow, it not today.

Reed Smoot, of the Senate Com-  
mittee on Public Lands, writes me  
that in his judgment the resolution  
will not be reported by the Com-  
mittee at this session. I am  
on good terms with him & with New-  
lands, both able and influential senators.  
A strong point I am making is  
that an Act of Congress with a definite  
purpose cannot be nullified by an adminis-  
trative Act passed later. You see that Whit-  
man elaborated this point admirably before  
the House Com. John Sharp Williams takes  
the view that the Garfield grant is legislation.  
He goes out March 4 but I think Champ Clark  
will take this view. <sup>Truly yours</sup>  
A. U. Johnson