Minneapolis
April 11, 1886

My dear Henry, I do not wish you to misunderstand my position upon the arguments of design. Firstly let us lay aside what may be called the presumptive argument, to wit, we know that in our dealing with nature intelligence produces adaptations hence when we meet adaptations extra-human we have a presumption that these are the results of a similar cause. This argument must fail before the slightest evidence that they were caused by other causes than produced such results.
What does the argument from the dice for show?

If it prove anything, it is that the various forces which the dice submit to when shaken are found to follow each other in some kind of an orbit, e.g., special combinations repeat themselves often enough to bring about certain peculiar within certain limits so that we have only to make these limits large enough and we can attain practical certainty with reference to the recurrence of a certain fall as double sizes for multiples. All that this proves to me is that we discover a certain law in the precession of these forces. That organ apply to this precession the term changes which, if it means anything, means
anything denominates a force
without law in its activity
is to me absurd. We had done
nothing but applying the
fact that matter is governed by
laws to a series of causes to in-
culate to be traced out them-
self.

Now the argument from clouts
takes the calculating demon
from their investigations and
applies them to possibility of
the forces of nature producing
any adaptations of similar or
higher degrees of complexity.
Because it is found that the
forces of nature will not the
adaptation known as double
fires, but ones in so often it
is argued that these and other
life forces could not have pro-
duced the adaptation known as the
human life string of vastly
greater complexity and accuracy much more often.

Now what low weight this argument has, is drawn from the evidence not attached as to what nature has done and as applied to other products which are not known to have been natural products alone.

If the forces of nature cannot produce the adaptation of such simple complexity as double ears but infrequently, how could she have produced the human eye—so complex and frequent? This argument does not and cannot apply to chance for no such things exist. As far as it applies at all it applies to the cause.
of nature, drawing evidence as it whatever do not know from whatever do you know. Is not this true? If it is the argument is. [illegible in its wordness.

What the force of nature can pro-
duce depends upon the circum-
stances under which they act.

We set a straggle talk to nature.

And because she do not ac-
complish it, argues that what
is found among her products
of higher simplicity could not
be produced by her alone.

But what vanity does such an
example have upon what na-
ture can accomplish under
the actions of corruptions
by imperceptible changes.

If this analysis of the argument
is not no mere presence of adaptation indicative of design. Design can only come as a second cause attuned to an effect, which naturally, alike have been proved insufficient.

Do I see no escape for the argument from design if constitution can be established as a universal principle in nature. As Remembrer you once said at O, if free acting in accordance with law is all that is needed for the univeres the necessity for design is immediately removed. The statement that the perfection and symmetry of such a universe formed so simply makes the argument all the stronger shows that the
author of the statement does not understand the argument. For symmetry and perfection cannot point to an intellect. Gentlemen cannot claim that they cannot be produced by nature. They can only indicate that which cannot be shown that existing causes are insufficient. Of course the circumstances surrounding the action of the forces of nature and other surrounding the action of the like and such phenomena are not alike. And upon these likenesses must depend all accuracy in the argument. Thus can be no evidence for a final cause until the efficient cause.
has proved insufficient to explain the phenomena. This may be to this aprencement which I do not apprecciate. But unless there is clear see no strength in it. Must go to work.

I will write further upon the other subjects later on in the work in week.

Yours afft. I. To J. Hawthorne esq.
Minneapolis
May 24th 56

My dear Henry,

Just a note today. I ran so much on hard that I cannot send you. I managed to present a paper upon this extension, which the Delegates aged as I do. Could not write anything about it. Can proceed to call agreement from another. I am not sure.

Regarding the certainty that stand under that system law rather accepted it perhaps does not comprehend. What I amount to this as I understand it.

The system presents a perfect system of knowledge as part of what each thinks will affirm.
to the past different to every man. Mind the word at the
perceives it perfectly arranged according to his fundamental
ideas and affects him that the soul must agree with those ideas. But he
know not at all that the seeming eternity of this world is at all in accordance
with the real eternal. By removing a real possibility of knowledge of the eternal
knowing the is presented with what is merely his sensation cast in the mode of the form of
the mind called space and these thoughts cast in the mode of
my is called reason.

Now it seems to me that
an unreal distinction between
this and idealism is impor
able. I do not introduce Kepler’s laws into the system at all, but I say there must be the slightest foundation for the system itself. While the Aristotelian Philosophy claims to have a solid basis which exists apart from any concrete of the mind. As long as I make any real distinction between myself and phenomena, existing without me, I shall not feel that I have any firm basis for a philosophy until I shall find a basis that stands the test of myself and others. I may think it, but I can never satisfy myself by finding a synthesis of abstractions and hypotheses for phenomena which go not beyond me and descend.
Along the other road of mathematics as beyond my reach. Perhaps I can be satisfied if I can get a just estimation of what I can do. Our letters, and studies, and the way they are treated under the new and diverse influences, and the way they are treated under the new and diverse influences. If so, the light and influence of the new thing for I want some active and if you really feel that you have found it will have influence to look for myself for I determine my mind as you will the same makes it easy though talking much in person.

Yours affly.

G. H. Head
1507 49th Horn Arc.
Minneapolis
May 16, 1816

My dear Henry,

I am sorry to say that I kept that letter much longer than I ought to have done. I forgot it and carried it around in my pocket for a week. I trust that your friend will write the postman to do as not to blame you for the delay.

I am glad that you will reap refreshment in the painting of the picture. I am not and there is no possibility of any except in a confidential acquaintance, but there is no confidence to put in me.
A satisfactory philosophy is one which puts rational explanation on all that belongs to our consciousness. But the world of phenomena of our relief and their relations is only hypothesis fuses the laws of cause and effect and substances and attributes an aught but form of the mind is utterly inexplicable and unexplainable from the nature of the case. It affords a tangible arrangement of consciousness but all the facts which those facts suggest and mutually nexus is left untouched. Nothing is more unsatisfactory than a system which allege the possibility of knowledge all outlined myself to obsolete ignorance. Regards result and not definition an
Concerned the system is for us un
satisfactory than Berkellops id
en. The system in any
humeanistic self acts
not give us opportunity of
gaining out. The phenomenon
are real, but the reality is
satisfactory only as it supports
the noumena. To realize you,
e.g., into a non phenomenon
whose absolute sentence
I have no knowledge to make
you simply an aggregate of new
reality. Elicit the role of
my sensibility and all your
thoughts but momentarily my
intelligence entail the role of facts
of the reason is troublesome but to call
it satisfactory is to slap my
nature plastic the face. Upon
decision you will say that you rest
as really as upon the dogmatic
Philosophy that the only difference that I think that would bind in the external world is that which is not known or is not true. Cannot affect any practical difference for either is what makes a thing that which is not true.

If you exist as really and I believe in immediate knowledge that what gives satisfaction is not the idea of external sense but the aggregate of sensations and conceptions that make up what I call you and that the idea of actually a thing the idea of space and the idea of phenomenon...
of the ordinary man. He appears to assume that but for
the religious and ruling pow-
er of government and society,
which have been confided
guarded, and curtailed by
the sentiment of love.

He begins into the world of
life if he could not then
beget in the heart, and
sentiments recurrences
and feel how shallow they
are how utterly dependent
upon the senses, how utterly
unable to grasp and continue
except expressed in flesh and
blood how small a part of
the sum of their usefulness
was in the sentiment of love
how utterly incomplete
She would, nevertheless, wait patiently for another Christmas.
I hope that CB and Billy
will be here for a week
two at least. I would
give you a bigger answer
if I were sure to be here.

Jean Fairchild will
probably be here at the
came time, so we shall
have a happy reunion.

With your sister am
going to Paris through
the same route.

But just how has that gotten
to me I do not think that
the days plan an issue.
They are trying to get
the Indian reduction
in 2 years another year.
But I do not think we
shall have

...
I have not given up hope yet. I thank the charming girls whom I am instructing. I wish you could see them. They are lovely. Our is pretty. We are cultivated but all are natural by nature. This great fear to teach such scholars.

Well Army, good night but not farewell. Blar et the hope that some days we will gather. Do you see me?

Yours truly.

15th February
upper view as not theonga or my thought in
particular, but of thought (thought or unconscious general
of the subject as well as myself, to which exist
independently of myself without the subject being nominal.

The doctrine of the subject with a pure sense of subject

or self reflection is through going to

na resolution is this, that it is a

shallow analysis in my past,

that I am deceiving it what

effectively have, for you exist in

space and and real in that

space and always conform to

the laws of my thought.

But all this fails to meet my

analysis. As long as the possibility

of incriminating exists so long does

the system names a mere fable

if you only produce the

possibility of incrimination. If I

was to state that it was not

neccesary beginning out of

myself then the philosophy was

Utterly absurd. But as long as

it suggests the possibility, none

insidious of myself which

I cannot follow nor try to
reason by any of my beliefs
thought to long use with
utterly, unless... again
in regards to system it seems
to me that Kant system has
brought nothing as we know
it under the absolute rules
of thought, indeed that even
then that nothing can happen
in the world must happen
according to these ideas.
But this could exist only if we and
with us, it does without anyone
that dies and if the mind of
any man should be changed
in its constitution as it might
for all our knowledge all this
would be correct and every thing
would happen exactly contrary
to these rules. Though, arising
as I exist as I am now, the
ticket or long account that
I have these absolute beliefs.

But this is no antidote for skepticism. I am as skeptical as ever in regard to absolute certainty since myself, and

relative truths. I am as ignorant of this as ever. How do I know that

I am knowing? Feeling?

Kant has given me a pretty argument for my belief:

he has built me a perfect and

honest faith in relation.

but I am curiously as

ever go to the foundations

and he tells me that of real

certainties I may be certain

that all this may absolutely

different for those, Quoted,

Certificate.

Now then.

I have got to analyze a good

number distinctly if I am to do


any vagaries or awkwardness in this. Indeed, it is the generous soul with poor striped wrap that is the truly generous.

The bloodiest truth of it was that with my dark start if you had any for my way.

Have you read anything of Tolstoi’s. I am going to show him “Peace and War.” A very bloody, here.

If, as really much more would have, that I saw quite for the qui vive, it great it and if he is a great long tried and cleaned for him. A curious thing.