Dear Howard,

I hope so early an answer to your epistle I this morning can't quite discern. You will be glad to hear that Mackenzie got on with ease; I had a severe orn to have the pleasure of letting him know that for as soon as we have done the country it is "good form" for the representatives to so
with the President into the Page Debating Hall whilst he declares
the results. However I won a
good "shunt" race down the Area
St. Olas to the House & some 10
yards: someone as it was about
10 p.m. the gates were closed so I
had the privilege of getting them
opened whilst my opponents made
up last ground.

With regard to "design" I
am sorry to have mistaken you
but the word "design" to one evolved
is somewhat like a midpoint to a ball.

I dare not follow you as far
as your swig "alot" technically
speaking of course an "alot" could
not be that not I who all they
have been evolved on the fundamental
idea of an axiom that if cannot be
decided up or besides I think we
cannot postulate as much material
substance as now exists as we
cannot imagine matter arising or lay
evolved out of nothing: what evolutionists
deal with is the various evolutions
of matter one of the evolutions
(an extreme evolutionist would say) has
at some genuine period produced what
we call life or has produced a material
-"animal pluraplan- endowed with life;
I come Thompson says that perhaps
just came from some star or some
mysterious way landed upon our earth:
Huxley used to assume one of his firm
belief that life just originated in what
he termed "a lucky thunderstorm"; this is
not really so outlandish on the supposition
that to endure matter with "life" (that is
the home of assimilating, reproductive, etc.) it
is necessary to have a combination in a
certain definite proportion of certain elements
which combination has not yet been discovered.
However this is a profitless discussion I'll
stop.
I don't quite see how your argument
concerning the existence of God proves
this at all.
I'm said that the mind could not
conceiv anyhing without there
existing a correspondent external and we may say indeed that there is no such thing as a supreme power in our minds an essential or something to this effect & that a supreme power did exist.

I cannot see the argument in the least. We cannot conceive in our minds of anything existing without there being a correspondent external existence; we cannot conceive of in our minds a supreme power that is the infinite from these two premises though we cannot say indeed that there is no such thing as a supreme power yet I do not quite
The way we can say that we

can exist: it seems to me that
our position is our own or
less asquistic: we are aware of
or religious. You and I, as usual,
will probably fall within
your scope. You and I.

WBS.