St. Louis, Mo. Feb. 29, 1868.

Prof. J. D. Dana.

My Dear Sir,

Your note of the 17th. Inst. is at hand. I am surprised that my paper is rejected for the reasons assigned.

If my article is too sweeping for the Journal, it, nevertheless, touches no topic, which is not distinctly introduced into the Journal by Dr. Hayden's article. You say the temper of my paper is not suited to the Journal. I submitted it to four of our mutual friends and requested each to strike out everything objectionable. They did so and it was sent as revised. Nor do I see the futility of admitting several articles full of speculations and dogmatical assertions and misrepresentations from one party, and at the same time refusing to admit
not enter into their controversies and sanction their conclusions.

If it was good that Dr. Hayden's article, full as it was of egregious error, should appear, it would seem that science would not suffer much by having those errors corrected. Long as my article was, it was not long enough to refer to one tenth part of the errors of their papers on those subjects.

Ten years since Maj. Hawn handsomely rebuked Mr. Muck for his misstatements regarding the discovery; and its god effects were manifest - for several years. But ten years of impunity have rendered them reckless. I thought it time to correct the evil. As you do not think so, very well. When you shall have permitted these gentlemen to misrepresent the facts of Western geology and misquote my views of the same for the next decade, as you have for the last, your sense of fair-play and love of science, may admit...
a reply. And once in ten years is as often as I have any inclination to undertake the disagreeable labor of correcting their misrepresentations.

I am obliged for your offer to admit a complete statement that I had regarded the question of priority as long since settled. But I must decline the privilege; as such an article would virtually admit the truth of the many false representations made on that subject in several papers (two of which appeared in the Journal) in which they have endeavored to set aside the settlement to which they ascribed in 1858. And all this notwithstanding I gave them more credit than they deserve; as they themselves have since proved.

Yours respectfully,

G. C. Swallow