UNIT 6: SECONDARY INDUCTION

UNIT STRUCTURE

6.1 Learning objectives

6.2 Introduction

6.3 Definition and nature of Secondary Induction

6.4 Key aspects of Secondary Induction

6.5 Characteristics of Secondary Induction

6.6 Value of Secondary Induction

6.7 Let Us sum Up

6.8 Further Readings

6.9 Answers to Check Your Progress

6.10 Model Questions

6.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain secondary induction with examples
- Discuss how inductions blend into daily thinking
- Discuss the concept of uniformity of nature and its role in inductions
- Give a comprehensive view of Mill's philosophical stance on induction and reasoning
- Explain key aspects of secondary induction

- Discuss the characteristics of secondary induction
- Explain the importance or value of secondary induction, and so on.

6.2 INTRODUCTION:

Secondary induction is a type of inductive argument that uses the conclusion of a previous induction (primary induction) as one of its own premises, building a hierarchical structure of knowledge. Unlike primary induction, which directly generalizes from empirical observations, secondary induction layers arguments to build more complex conclusions. For instance, a primary induction might conclude that all observed swans are white, while a secondary induction could use this conclusion as a premise to infer that since all swans are white, they likely share other characteristics, like being part of a specific biological group. This multi-stage reasoning allows for more sophisticated theories and confirms knowledge based on earlier inductive results, contrasting with simple primary induction by chaining arguments to build broader conclusions.

This unit is primarily concerned with Secondary Induction, its basic features, key aspects, and so on. Let’s explain each of these in turn.

6.3 DEFINITION AND NATURE OF SECONDARY INDUCTION

Modern logicians categorize induction into two types: primary and secondary induction. Primary induction involves generalizing a

fact or event based on a limited number of observations, whereas secondary induction takes this process further by generalizing to an unlimited scope using the results of primary induction. In effect, secondary induction systematizes and builds upon the generalizations established through primary induction, creating a more comprehensive framework of knowledge. This two-tiered approach enables a more structured understanding, where primary induction lays the groundwork and secondary induction expands and organizes these findings into broader, more inclusive conclusions, facilitating a deeper insight into the subject matter through a systematic and layered process of reasoning and inference.

Secondary induction brings order to scientific generalizations, evident in major theories like Maxwell's electromagnetism and Newton's universal gravitation. In his *Inductive Logic*, Ballantine states, “A Secondary Induction is the conclusion of a syllogism of which one premise is a primary induction, and the other premise is the statement of an observed fact.” This process systematizes and explains generalizations from primary induction. For instance, knowing specific gravities are constant (primary induction), a single Rubidium experiment determines its specific gravity: All specific gravities are constant; Rubidium's specific gravity is 1.5; therefore, Rubidium's specific gravity is always 1.5. This blends induction and deduction, with premises recording observational discoveries, making the syllogism inductive. The process faces objections that it lacks real knowledge advancement, but the counterargument is that reasoning displays implicit knowledge explicitly. Observational discoveries drive progress, like concluding Socrates' mortality from “all men are mortal” and observing that he is a man. The premise

“Socrates is a man” is a discovery of observation. This is how secondary induction facilitates near-discoveries by combining observations with established generalizations.

It is to be noted that in daily thinking, primary and secondary inductions often blend together, with most generalizations exhibiting characteristics of both or being validated through both processes. For example, our experiences continually accumulate, showing us that lead is heavy and aluminum is light. We can make primary inductions about each metal independently, but simultaneously, we are also confirming the broader principle that specific gravities are constant. This dual process means each new experience with a metal like lead or aluminum supports both a specific conclusion about that metal and a broader secondary induction covering all instances of the metal.

Again, it can be said that after noticing a thousand uniform patterns, it becomes clear that things and events in the world follow similar lines; this creates a strong likelihood that any given object belongs to a larger category. When we spot several similar things, we combine this observation with our existing understanding that similarities often indicate a broader pattern, and we make an induction based on this. This approach, described by Dr. Fowler as typical of “immature and uninstructed minds,” is actually a fundamental process used by all rational thinkers. The difference lies in how carefully we define the scope and boundaries of these patterns – it is here that experience and maturity play a role.

Archbishop Whately considered nature's uniformity the fundamental basis for all inductions, essentially sidelining primary inductions. However, nature's uniformity is too broad and vague for

direct application, even in secondary inductions. This principle doesn't imply uniform objects or events, but rather that specific patterns emerge from accumulated observations and generalizations. Particular uniformities must be established before inferring broader natural uniformity. Mill states: “But though it is a condition of the validity of every induction that there be uniformity in the course of nature, it is not a necessary condition that the uniformity should pervade all nature. It is enough that it pervades the particular class of phenomena to which induction relates. An induction concerning the motions of the planets, or the properties of the magnet, would not be vitiated though we suppose that wind and weather are the sport of chance, provided it be assumed that astronomical and magnetic phenomena are under the dominion of general laws. Otherwise, the early experience of mankind would have rested on a very weak foundation; for in the infancy of science, it could not be known that all phenomena are regular in their course.”

It is striking that writers on inductive science haven't clearly distinguished between three fundamental types of inductions, instead trying to fit them into a single definition. For example, Whitley focused on secondary inductions, Bain on primary ones, and others on specific subsets like causation-based secondary inductions. Even Mill, who greatly advanced the field, didn't fully differentiate these types. Mill says, “Whatever be the most proper mode of expressing it, the proposition that the course of nature is uniform, is the fundamental principle, or general axiom of induction.” He clarifies that this principle isn't an explanation for induction, but an instance of it – one that is complex and built on prior

generalizations. We understand specific laws of nature before conceiving this broad uniformity principle, which acts as an ultimate major premise in inductions. Mill explains that this principle is necessary for proving conclusions but doesn't directly contribute to their proof, stating, “every induction may be thrown into the form of a syllogism by supplying a major premise.” This highlights the principle's role in validating inductions, rather than being a direct warrant for them. Thus, the uniformity principle is foundational but was grasped late in our intellectual development, relying on earlier inductions about specific phenomena.

Mill's thoughts reveal a striking paradox: he presents truths clearly, yet simultaneously contradicts and muddles them. The uniformity of nature, being an inductive discovery, can't serve as induction's fundamental principle – it is a classic case of bootstrapping. Primary inductions are self-contained generalizations, resistant to syllogistic framing, and thus require no major premise. In contrast, secondary inductions rely on specific, proximate uniformities as major premises. Attempting to shortcut this process by invoking nature's uniformity as a premise leads nowhere, as it can't transform a single observation into a broad conclusion. Instead, specifics must be accumulated to establish a uniformity. The principle of uniformity is useful only when applied to reason that a newly discovered uniformity will persist, given that uniformities tend to persist – specifically, "All uniformities persist; this is a uniformity; therefore, it will persist." The only inference that can be drawn from nature's uniformity is the persistence of a newly discovered uniformity. Thus, nature's uniformity mainly tells us that new

uniformities are likely to endure, rather than being a magic key unlocking broad truths from isolated facts.

Professor Minto says, “In his antagonism to a supposed doctrine that all reasoning is from general to particular, Mill maintained, *simpliciter*, that all reasoning is from particulars to particulars. Now, this is true only *secundum quid*, and although, in the course of his argument, Mill introduced the necessary qualifications, the unqualified thesis was confusing. It is perfectly true that we may infer – we can hardly be said to reason – from observed particulars to unobserved. We may infer, and infer correctly, from a single case. The village matron, called in to prescribe for a neighbour's sick child, infers that what cured her own child will cure the neighbour's, and prescribes accordingly. And she may be right. But it is also true that she may be wrong, and that no fallacy is more common than reasoning from particulars to particulars without the requisite precautions.”

We can't acknowledge that reasoning from one particular to another is valid. The village matron doesn't randomly pick particulars, like her child and the neighbour's *grindstone* or *barn-door*. Her thought process is actually: these two children belong to the same natural kind; things of the same kind are affected similarly; this medicine worked for my child; so, it'll work for this one. Her reasoning is syllogistic; errors occur in observing facts, like whether the medicine worked or if the children are similarly affected. The matron uses primary inductions to inform secondary ones, needing careful observation at each step.

Mill's early work on induction reveals a notable inconsistency. In the first edition of his *Logic*, he stated, “The induction by which

they (the mathematical axioms and the law of causation) are established is of that kind which can establish nothing but empirical laws; an empirical view, however, of which the truth is exemplified at every moment of time and in every variety of place or circumstance, has an evidence which surpasses that of the most rigid induction, even if the foundation of scientific induction were not itself laid in a generalization of this very description." Here, Mill assumed only secondary inductions are scientific, yet claimed they are based on primary inductions, which are firmer. Although this passage was omitted in later editions, the confusion persists in Mill's doctrine and derivative works. Thus, in a nutshell, Mill argued that combining a clear case with a broad primary induction (like the law of causation) yields a more trustworthy secondary induction than a new, independent primary induction about a limited phenomenon class. This assertion is true, highlighting the strength of using established uniformities in reasoning.

It is worth noting that in modern times, science aims not only at establishing generalizations or laws of nature (through primary induction) but also at systematizing these generalizations (through secondary induction). Therefore, induction shouldn't be limited to either primary or secondary induction; it should encompass both.

ACTIVITY – 6.1

- Examine the significance of nature's uniformity as the underlying principle of all inductive inferences.

  ……

  ……

  ……

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q.1: Secondary induction is a type of inductive argument that uses the conclusion of a previous induction (primary induction) as one of its own premises. (True/False)

Q.2: Both primary and secondary inductions often blend together. (True/False)

Q.3: "Nature is uniform" is the general axiom of induction. (True/False)

Q.4: Induction should be limited to secondary induction only. (True/False)

Q.5: Who is the author of the book *Inductive Logic*?

6.4 KEY ASPECTS OF SECONDARY INDUCTION

We know that in logic, secondary induction refers to an inductive inference that uses the conclusion of a previous, different induction as one of its premises. This definition of secondary induction hinges on the following key aspects of secondary induction.

(i) Reliance of Background Knowledge (Premises): Secondary induction relies heavily on existing knowledge and broader principles, like the law of causality, which serve as premises for the argument. This reliance on established generalizations sets it apart from primary induction, making secondary induction a

process that builds upon prior understanding to draw new conclusions.

(ii) Scientific Induction (causal Analysis): Scientific induction involves analyzing causal relationships to uncover underlying principles, rather than just tallying instances. This approach seeks to identify the causes or mechanisms behind phenomena, aiming to understand the fundamental nature of things.

(iii) Method of Elimination: Secondary induction uses methods to eliminate possibilities, like Mills' methods of agreement and difference, to isolate the cause of a phenomenon. This helps narrow down options and identify the specific factor responsible.

(iv) Hypothetical Reasoning (Hypothetico-deductive): Secondary induction often involves hypothetical reasoning, where a hypothesis is generated to explain observed phenomena and subsequently tested for its predictive power. This process entails creating a tentative explanation that accounts for the available data, and then evaluating its ability to forecast future observations, effectively using the hypothesis to make sense of the world and make predictions about it.

(v) Probabilistic Nature: The conclusions drawn from secondary induction are probabilistic, meaning they are likely true but not guaranteed. The reliability of these conclusions' hinges on the accuracy and trustworthiness of the existing knowledge they are built upon, making the strength of the inference dependent on the solidity of its foundation.

(vi) Not Purely Empirical: Secondary induction goes beyond mere data collection, interpreting observations through the framework of existing knowledge and previously established principles, making it a more sophisticated and informed process than simple empirical observation.

6.5 CHARACTERISTICS OF SECONDARY INDUCTION

The following are the main characteristics of secondary induction:

1. Secondary induction involves formulating a broader, overarching hypothesis that encompasses lower-level generalizations derived from primary induction. This process unifies disparate laws and principles under a more comprehensive framework, as exemplified by the Law of Universal Gravitation, which systematizes laws governing planetary motion, tides, and other phenomena, revealing underlying connections and imposing order on diverse observations.
2. The broader hypothesis formed through secondary induction is considered valid if it adequately explains and accommodates all the lower-level generalizations it encompasses.
3. The validity of secondary induction is indirectly established by deducing specific lower-level generalizations from the broader hypothesis and testing these against empirical evidence. Confirmation of these deduced generalizations serves as indirect support for the original conclusion.
4. Inductive conclusions, including those from secondary induction, are inherently probabilistic. Since induction relies on

empirical observations, its generalizations are contingent on the consistency of future experiences. As there is no certainty that past patterns will persist, even well-established generalizations remain open to revision or refutation based on new evidence, rendering induction probabilistic in nature.

6.6 VALUE OF SECONDARY INDUCTION

Secondary induction is a fundamental aspect of scientific inquiry, playing a crucial role in transforming preliminary observations into robust, scientifically validated knowledge. In contrast to primary induction, which focuses on collecting instances, secondary induction constructs frameworks that infuse those instances with significance. Thus, secondary induction is important in logic and philosophy. A key advantage of secondary induction lies in its capacity to establish scientific legitimacy. By moving beyond mere enumeration, it reveals causal relationships and underlying principles, rendering past observations reliable and laying the groundwork for future predictions. This process is essential to the hypothetico-deductive model, where secondary induction enables the development of theoretical frameworks from empirical data, effectively bridging the divide between epistemology and science.

Furthermore, secondary induction tackles the problem of inductive uncertainty, an inherent challenge in scientific research. By recognizing a hierarchy of inductions, it offers a mechanism for revising conclusions, thereby reducing uncertainty and enhancing the reliability of scientific findings. This ability to revise and refine underscores the self-correcting nature of scientific knowledge. In

addition to its role in validating and refining knowledge, secondary induction is a potent catalyst for expanding our understanding. Unlike deduction, it introduces innovative ideas and broadens conceptual comprehension by linking disparate categories and properties through experience. This capacity to forge novel connections and illuminate previously unseen patterns testifies to the generative power of secondary induction.

Accordingly, it can be said that the value of secondary induction is undeniable. It transforms raw experience into structured scientific laws, providing a pragmatic framework for knowledge expansion and effectively managing inductive uncertainty. As such, secondary induction is an essential component of scientific inquiry, driving progress and deepening our understanding of the world. Thus, nobody can evade the utility of secondary induction.

ACTIVITY- 6.2

- Critically examine the statement that secondary induction is a fundamental aspect of scientific inquiry.

  ……

  ……

  ……..….

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q.6: The conclusions drawn from secondary induction are probabilistic in nature. (True/False)

Q.7: The significance of secondary induction lies in its capacity to establish scientific legitimacy. (True/False)

Q.8: Secondary induction has no value. (True/False)

Q.9: Secondary induction tackles the problem of inductive uncertainty, an inherent challenge in scientific research. (True/False)

Q.10: Secondary induction often involves hypothetical reasoning. (True/False)

6.7 LET US SUM UP

- Modern logicians categorize induction into two types: primary and secondary induction.
- Primary induction involves generalizing a fact or event based on a limited number of observations, whereas secondary induction takes this process further by generalizing to an unlimited scope using the results of primary induction.
- Secondary induction brings order to scientific generalizations, evident in major theories like Maxwell's electromagnetism and Newton's universal gravitation.
- According to Ballantine, “A Secondary Induction is the conclusion of a syllogism of which one premise is a primary induction, and the other premise is the statement of an observed fact.”
- Archbishop Whately considered nature's uniformity the fundamental basis for all inductions.
- In modern times, science aims not only at establishing generalizations or laws of nature (through primary induction) but also at systematizing these generalizations (through secondary induction). Therefore, induction shouldn't be limited

to either primary or secondary induction; it should encompass both.

- Secondary induction relies heavily on existing knowledge and broader principles, like the law of causality, which serve as premises for the argument.
- Secondary induction uses methods to eliminate possibilities, like Mills' methods of agreement and difference, to isolate the cause of a phenomenon.
- Secondary induction often involves hypothetical reasoning, where a hypothesis is generated to explain observed phenomena and subsequently tested for its predictive power.
- The conclusions drawn from secondary induction are probabilistic, meaning they are likely true but not guaranteed.
- Secondary induction is a fundamental aspect of scientific inquiry, playing a crucial role in transforming preliminary observations into robust, scientifically validated knowledge. In contrast to primary induction, which focuses on collecting instances, secondary induction constructs frameworks that infuse those instances with significance. Thus, secondary induction is important in logic and philosophy.

6.8 FURTHER READINGS

Ballantine, W. G., *Inductive Logic,* Ginn& Company, London, 1896.

Kneale, W., *Probability and Induction*, London: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1949.

Popper, K., *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London & New York: Routledge, 1992.

Roy, B. N., *Textbook of Inductive Logic*, Calcutta: S. C. Sarkar & sons Private LTD, 1986.

✓ 6.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Question No. 1: True

Answer to Question No. 2: True

Answer to Question No. 3: True

Answer to Question No. 4: False

Answer to Question No. 5:William Gay Ballantine

Answer to Question No. 6: True

Answer to Question No. 7: True

Answer to Question No. 8: False

Answer to Question No. 9: True

Answer to Question No. 10: True

? 6.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions

Q.1: What is Secondary Induction?

Q.2: Give an example of Secondary Induction.

Q.3: What are the key aspects of Secondary Induction?

Q.4: How does Ballantine define Secondary Induction?

Q.5: What is the importance of secondary induction?

B. Short Question (Answer each question in about 100–150 words)

Q.1: What do you understand by secondary induction? Give an example.

Q.2: According to Mill, is uniformity of nature the fundamental principle or general axiom of induction? Explain.

Q.3: Discuss the nature of secondary induction.

Q.4: How does secondary induction facilitate near-discoveries by combining observations with established generalizations?

Q.5: What is the utility of secondary induction?

C. Long Questions (Answer each question in about 300–500 words)

Q.1: What is secondary induction? Explain its nature.

Q.2: Define secondary induction and explain its key aspects.

Q.3: How does Ballantine define secondary induction? Critically examine his view.

Q.4: What do you understand by secondary induction? What are its basic characteristics?

Q.5: Define secondary induction and discuss its value or utility.

Q.6: Discuss the concept of uniformity of nature and its role in induction.

Q.7: Give a comprehensive view of Mill's philosophical stance on induction and reasoning.

*** ***** ***