

~~Freeman~~

198 Ann Street,

Montreal

Ap 24/85

Sir

Your letter, dated April 20<sup>th</sup> reached me duly, and I must ask your forbearance in answering it.

You speak of your special study being Geology. I assure you that the theory I would put before you would claim more attention from Geology than Astronomy. I do not wish you to consider that I possess intimate knowledge of each & every branch of Science. I know anyone else) possess in not. Yes I must tell you that the subject has received my attention since the fall of 1880. No matter what Science I look up to

gain an insight into its principles  
I found there was some un-  
satisfactory phenomena con-  
nected with each. I might  
instance "The Northern Lights," "The  
Rings of Saturn," "The apparent  
sensibility of certain plants &  
flowers, and others <sup>to which</sup> might  
refer to. 1

Previous to these studies I  
had, like probably many more,  
been dissatisfied with Newton's  
"Theory," and set myself to con-  
sider if any other method re-  
sulted in the Science of Nature,  
I remember the time when the  
first idea first struck me  
concerning a new method. That is  
now upwards of 3 years ago, &  
nothing has shaken my own  
conviction that Scientists are  
working (however true, apparently,  
are their conclusions) under a  
false system.

I do not say my Theory ac-  
counts for every inexplicable  
phenomenon under the pre-  
sent one. But such as has  
received my closest meditation  
has been brought within the  
circle of my Theory. Such a  
phenomenon as the electric  
current, which has puzzled,  
which is still puzzling many  
minds (for there is still no  
satisfactory conclusion to the  
source of Electricity) will re-  
ceive its elucidation. So mag-  
netism.

I would not have you infer  
that my Theory is in any way  
abstract. No, it is as simple as  
can be imagined; but no doubt,  
its evident simplicity has pre-  
vented anyone from bringing  
it to light. Some may have had  
a slight notion of it; I cannot  
tell. At least no Theory pro-  
mulgated has, in any shape, <sup>assumed</sup> ~~been~~  
<sub>since</sub>

the form of mine.

You say you must be content to take the results of specialists as you find them. To a certain degree this is just and right. Macaulay, who was no mathematician, accepted the latter's results as a necessity; yet I think that where there is, even to one person, apparent discrepancy, it is meet & right to strive to remove it.

I am sure that your aim in advising me not be antagonistic to opinions generally accepted is one of pure disinterestedness, but I have so long laboured, silently, unknowingly laboured in the subject, than I fear I say so most respectfully) it would take a whole army of scientists to dissuade me from my course.

It might seem singular, at first sight, to say mathematical calculations might agree with two distinct Theories. And hence I may say that it is not the

mathematical Laws I am dis-  
puting; I am opposing the Theory.

Observatory facilities, are, to  
my own regret, not mine; yet I  
ask you if Newton had such  
facilities, or if he had, did he  
base his Theory by using them?  
Decidedly not. Whether the in-  
cidents of the apple falling in the  
garden be a myth or not, I could  
take the same incidents and pur-  
sue a totally different course.

Had the ancient philosophers  
facilities? Upon what base did  
they found their opinion that  
the earth had an atmosphere?  
Now here I am touching anti-  
cipation. However, I shall not  
ask you to give credence to any  
"Fact" greater than that the  
Tides are "drawn on a heap  
by the Moon", that is, the Moon's  
attraction for the waters. I  
oppose the attraction Theory.

and all its ~~as~~ explanatory of -  
firmations.

I think there has been too  
much made of the "Pyellic prin-  
ciple of arguing" from the known  
to the unknown.

Greater clearness, more sim-  
plicity will attach to what I  
would offer than under the  
present system.

And now I will state (what  
to me is a confirmed opinion, and <sup>which</sup>  
I would also ask you not <sup>to</sup> de-  
cide against until the full sub-  
ject has been reviewed cautiously  
& critically) that in overthrowing  
the attraction theory, I sub-  
stitute an opposite one, viz. -  
"Repulsion; <sup>the</sup> guiding Prin-  
ciple of the Celestial Me-  
chanism, such including each  
& every branch of modern

Science, Electricity & Magnetism  
is simply repulsion. of dis &  
anticipate. But I ask if you  
not to scout anything at pre-  
sent. Let time reveal her  
own.

The hypothesis of Laplace (of  
which I remarked in my first  
note that I would show its  
fallacy) would receive as sub-  
stitute another far more com-  
prehensive, but I would not ven-  
ture beyond the Incomprehensible.

I will also remark that, tho  
it may appear singular, & my  
hypothesis was conformable to  
the Theory, not my Theory to  
the hypothesis. I did not dis-  
cover a hypothesis until I had  
partially matured the Theory.

Antiquities (for example  
the Egyptian), Sacred history &  
other secondary sciences (if I  
might call the latter a

Science - History will yet, I feel  
sure rank as such will not be  
omitted in my treatment.

I have already trespassed on  
your space, but I cannot refrain  
from saying that about a week  
previous to the departure of the  
members ~~of the members~~ of the  
British Ass. for Montreal last  
year I wrote a note signifying  
my wish to place something before  
the (then) forthcoming meeting. I  
received an answer to say that  
the members left in a day (I  
believe it was the first week in  
August); if I had anything to send I  
should do so at once. I had only  
notes, not prepared M.L.S., so had  
to put it off.

As I hear you are to be the next  
President, I have still a hope that  
my opinions may yet be heard by  
the members of B.A. U.S.

P begging you to excuse any apparent  
want of respect, and asking for an  
answer. I am  
Obediently Yours Robt. Freeman.  
P. M. Dawson, Esq.