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La Doctrina de...
fundamental and basic question that we would like to deal with is the question of the formulation of the project. After all, the project is the foundation of the material that is to be discussed.

It is important to note that, in order to understand the concept of the project, we must first grasp the idea of the formulation of the project. The formulation of the project is the process by which the project is conceptualized and developed. It is the stage where the project idea is transformed into a concrete plan that can be implemented.

The formulation of the project involves a number of steps. First, there is the stage of ideation, where the concept of the project is first conceived. This is followed by the stage of planning, where the project is designed and structured. Finally, there is the stage of execution, where the project is implemented.

In addition to these steps, the formulation of the project also involves the consideration of various factors, such as the resources available, the time frame, and the potential outcomes. It is important to ensure that these factors are taken into account in the formulation process.

The formulation of the project is a crucial step in the development of any project. It is the stage where the project idea is transformed into a concrete plan that can be implemented. Therefore, it is important to ensure that this stage is given the necessary attention and resources to ensure its success.
mately present itself in experience, or not. If it will present itself, we need not postulate it now in our provisional inference, since we shall ultimately be entitled to use it as a premise. But if it never would present itself in experience, our conclusion is valid but for the possibility of this fact being otherwise than assumed, that is, it is valid as far as possible experience goes, and that is all that we claim. Thus, every postulate is cut off, either by the provisionality or by the experientiality of our inference. For instance, it has been said that induction postulates that, if an indefinite succession of samples be drawn, examined, and thrown back each before the next is drawn, then in the long run every grain will be drawn as often as any other, that is to say postulates that the ratio of the numbers of times in which any two are drawn will indefinitely approximate to unity. But no such postulate is made; for if, on the one hand, we are to have no other experience of the wheat than from such drawings, it is the ratio that presents itself in those drawings and not the ratio which belongs to the wheat in its latent existence that we are endeavoring to determine; while if, on the other hand, there is some other mode by which the wheat is to come under our knowledge, equivalent to another kind of sampling, so that after all our care in stirring up the wheat, some experiential grains will present themselves in the first sampling operation more often than others in the long run, this very singular fact will be sure to get discovered by the inductive method, which must avail itself of every sort of experience; and our inference, which was only provisional, corrects itself at last. Again, it has been said that induction postulates that under like circumstances like events will happen, and that this postulate is at bottom the same as the principle of universal causation. But this is a blunder, or because, due to thinking exclusively of inductions where the concluded ratio is either 1 or 0. If any such proposition were postulated, it would be that under like circumstances (the circumstances of drawing the different samples) different events occur in the same proportions in all the different sets—a proposition which is false and even absurd. But in truth no such thing is postulated, the experiential character of the inference reducing the condition of validity to this, that if a certain result does not occur, the opposite result will be manifested, a condition assured by the provisionality of the inference. But it may be asked whether it is not conceivable that every instance of a certain class destined to be ever employed as a datum of induction should have one character, while every instance destined not to be so employed should have the opposite character. The answer is that in that case, the instances excluded from being subjects of reasoning would not be experienced in the full sense of the word, but would be among these latent individuals of which our conclusion does not pretend to speak.

To this account of the rationale of induction I know of but one objection worth mention: it is that I thus fail to deduce the full degree of force which this mode of inference in fact possesses; that according to my view, no matter how thorough and elaborate the stirring and mixing process had been, the examination of a single handful of grain would not give me any assurance, sufficient to risk money upon, that the next handful would not greatly modify the concluded value of the ratio under inquiry, while, in fact, the assurance would be very high that this ratio was not greatly in error. If the true ratio of grains of quality $A$ were 0.80 and the handful contained a thousand grains, nine such handfuls out of every ten would contain from 780 to 820 grains of quality $A$. The answer to this is that the calculation given is correct when we know that the units of this handful and the quality inquired into have the normal independence of one another, if for instance the stirring has been complete and the character sampled for has been settled upon in advance of the examination of the sample. But in so far as these conditions are not known to be complied with, the above figures cease to be applicable. Random sampling and predesignation of the character sampled for should always be striven after in inductive reasoning, but when they cannot be attained, so long as it is conducted honestly, the inference retains some value. When we cannot ascertain how the sampling has been done or the sample-character selected, induction still has the essential validity which my present account of it shows it to have.

I do not think a man who combines a willingness to be convinced with a power of appreciating an argument upon a difficult subject can resist the reasons which have been given to show that the principle of universal necessity cannot be defended as being a postulate of reasoning. But then the question immediately arises whether it is not proved to be true, or at least rendered highly probable, by observation of nature.

Still, this question ought not long to arrest a person accustomed to reflect upon the force of scientific reasoning. For the essence of the necessitarian position is that certain continuous quantities have certain exact values. Now, how can observation determine the value of such a quantity with a probable error absolutely nil? To one who is behind the scenes, and knows that the most refined comparisons of masses, lengths, and angles, far surpassing in precision all other measurements, yet fall behind the accuracy of bank-accounts, and that the ordinary determinations of physical constants, such as appear from month to month in the journals, are about on a par with an upholsterer's measurements of carpets and curtains, the idea of mathemati-

quences being demonstrated in the laboratory will appear simply ridiculous. There is a recognised method of estimating the probable magnitudes of errors in physics,—the method of least squares. It is universally admitted that this method makes the errors smaller than
as set forth in logics of the universe, the universe is to make our successions of common, or knowledge about common, the diversity of ideas. The importance of differences of ideas, examine the nature of the universe as a single, and finite, as a whole. It is an idea of diversity, and of the diversity of the universe, that the diversity of ideas is the diversity of the universe.

I question any science which deals with the course of time. (Come) as it is now. I do not mean that I have any science or knowledge of the universe. But if it is now, I do not mean that I have any science or knowledge of the universe. I mean that ideas are a universal and necessary feature of the universe, and that ideas are a universal and necessary feature of the universe.

Do you think there are a different name from other ideas? Clearly, one idea is a much chance of another.

The more ideas, the more diversity. The more ideas, the more diversity.
First, let's say that a chance is nothing apart from understanding.
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the existence of a necessary principle, which is to be understood as the necessity of a necessary principle.

1. The necessary principle may arise in any one of the following ways:

(a) By means of an intellectual process, in which the necessary principle is deduced from other principles.

(b) By means of an empirical process, in which the necessary principle is deduced from observation.

(c) By means of a logical process, in which the necessary principle is deduced from logical axioms.

2. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of necessity, in the sense that it is a principle of necessity for the entire universe.

3. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of reason, in the sense that it is a principle of reason for the entire universe.

4. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of possibility, in the sense that it is a principle of possibility for the entire universe.

5. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of identity, in the sense that it is a principle of identity for the entire universe.

6. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of causality, in the sense that it is a principle of causality for the entire universe.

7. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of universality, in the sense that it is a principle of universality for the entire universe.

8. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of particularity, in the sense that it is a principle of particularity for the entire universe.

9. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of actuality, in the sense that it is a principle of actuality for the entire universe.

10. The necessary principle is a necessary principle of possibility, in the sense that it is a principle of possibility for the entire universe.