

Rough kee pin Dec 10th 1896

Dear Dr. Dawson,

Your letter of Novem, 10th came duly to hand. I do not desire to bore you with persistent requests. But as your letter published in B. Sacra, threw a web blanket on the claims that I there made, to-wit that certain propositions are in accord with the consensus of Scientists, without in any degree specifying which you referred to, I feel justified in returning to the subject.

I had not intended to trespass again on your time, but to content myself with pointing out from your book the very different views held by yourself - very different!

Varnum 2

Caukan Genesis

I mean from those formulæ
of my paper
propositions, and, as I believe,

Wenny

Reference 19

from them

held by all

specialists in the departments concerned,
at the present day. The pleasant

tone of your letter emboldens me to ask
whether in your opinion the propositions
referring especially to geology, say from the
tenth to the nineteenth inclusive — are
substantially true?

If you have read my Jan & July articles
in Bib. Sacra, you doubtless noticed, what
I presume you knew before, that de la Saporis
says the veget. kingdom culminated in present
species before the animal attained its completion,
; and Le Conte, Dana's & Nicholson's state-
ments as to the appearance of birds & water
vertebrates (of living species) in the Tertiary
^{extant} and of land mammals in post-Tertiary
or present time. You probably also noticed
the letter from Dr. Dana written on the day before his
death. I have believed that this was the

true geological teaching, If your views accord with theirs, Or, if you disagree, I should like to know in either case.

As to the first nine propositions, great changes of belief have occurred since your "Origin of the World," ^{was written,} I presume, however, that as an intelligent head of a college you have kept so far an current with general scientific truth outside of geology, that you have a decided opinion as to what is the consensus of the scientific world on these ~~these~~ subjects.

As your engagements are engrossing, I am loath to take your time. A brief statement of agreement, or disagreement, will convey a sufficiently clear idea of your views, if you will at the same time specify which propositions you do not agree to, if such there be.

I shall take pleasure in sending you anything I may write on this theme.

and shall be very glad to see any ad-
ditional work you may do on this grand
^{subject,} ~~subject,~~ God's own story of the making
of a World.

I have a paper to appear in
the Homiletic Review, on "The Insufficiency
of ^{Physical} Natural Law," which I think might
interest you.

Yours very truly
C. B. Warring

MCGILL UNIVERSITY
ARCHIVES
ACC. NO. 1463
REF. 722

I inadvertently omitted to
enclose this in the letter sent
you yesterday C. B. W.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y., JAN. 30th, 1896.

DEAR SIR:

I send with this an article which has just appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. It contains a number of statements said to be, so far as they go, the teachings of science in reference to the ante-human history of our world.

It is greatly desired that scientists should pass upon their truth, and that the verdict should be given to the public. For this purpose, Professor Wright offers to publish in the next No. (April) a series of brief articles from representatives of physicists and geologists, together forming a symposium on that question. The following note explains itself:

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT,
Editor, *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

OHERLIN, OHIO, JAN. 25th, 1896.

DEAR PROFESSOR WARRING.

I think the best thing is for you to send the "reprints" of your articles to such persons as you may select, saying that the replies are desired for a symposium in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. You have the matter in mind so clearly that it will be less trouble for you to do this than for me. I think a very important end will be secured by such a symposium.

Yours truly,

G. F. WRIGHT."

For convenience of reference I give below an epitome of what is treated in my paper as sufficiently established.

1. A First Cause.
2. The heavens and earth had a beginning.
3. They were at first inchoate. (or incomplete)
4. Our earth then, was an unsegregated part of a great gas-like or nebulous mass, infinitely tenuous, without land or water, plants or animals.
5. That mass was non-solid, most like a fluid.
6. Before motion, there was only darkness.

7. Motion came from the same Cause that produced the matter to which it was communicated.
8. After motion came light.
9. Light, at first poor, became good light before the earth had become opaque, and, in consequence, made a division between light and darkness.
10. That division makes what we call day and night.
11. And then was the first day on our planet.
12. After that the earth was still so hot that the seas were suspended as vapor and clouds of immense thickness.
13. After these had been condensed by farther cooling the air became comparatively clear, but was poisonous from the carbonic acid and other deleterious gases mixed with it.
14. The waters when deposited covered at first the earth, with perhaps here and there a small upraised mass of rock.
15. The land began to rise very slowly, and the waters to be gathered into their present basins.
16. (This was a long process, millions of years, during which lived the now extinct plants and animals of geology.)
17. At last it was completed, say in the latter part of the tertiary, and then, in the pliocene, the vegetable kingdom culminated in the species now living.
18. Still later, air and water life culminated simultaneously in the air and water vertebrates still extant.
19. Yet later, land life reached its finality in the mammals of today.

If you agree that the above so far as they go, are really the teachings of modern science, it will suffice if you sum up your verdict as briefly as does Professor Dana on page 63 of the reprint, adding such remarks as may suggest themselves in elucidation of the whole subject. If you notice errors, you will aid in arriving at the truth by specifically pointing them out.

It is hoped that you will reply as promptly as possible that the Symposium may appear in the April number. To do this, copy must be in the hands of the printers early in March.

This circular will be sent only to men whose acknowledged standing is such that their names will carry weight. Prof. Wright requests that replies be sent to me direct. I enclose an envelope addressed and stamped. A copy of the symposium will be sent you.

Very Respectfully Yours,

C. B. WARRING.