

# How Is Inductive Evidence Built?

**Yahya Mohamed**

The theses that invoked the probability theory to explain the construction of inductive evidence were based on the symmetrical mathematical probability as we identified in a previous study, and in this respect, they failed in explaining the structure of this evidence. This ruling applies to theories of Western thought, as it applies to the (العلم الاجمالي) theory of al-Sadr (indefinite knowledge

In terms of detail, the inductive evidence depends on the discovery of symmetry to be applied to it (symmetric probabilities), as it is assumed that symmetry exists between experiments to be applied to the probabilistic (quantitative) calculation.

But it is noted that the symmetry can only be discovered and proven through (the asymmetric probabilities) of the dissimilar clues, just as the experiments in which the inductive evidence grows are different experiments that cannot achieve the probabilistic counting based on the (symmetric probabilities), as they are not the same so that they can be distributed. They have equal shares of probability. So the inductive evidence becomes based on (asymmetric probabilities).

To clarify this, we suppose that our feeling conveys a mental image of a ball that appears in front of us, but we doubt its existence. In this case, we have to mediate with several different clues to prove whether this ball is real or imaginary and whether it is actually a ball or something else.

Although because of the amplification of experiences we exercise in dealing with external things, we will not usually need the test or more of it, but suppose if we were practicing a preliminary deductive act, as is done in the inferential practices of the natural sciences.

Therefore, since it is possible that what we see is an illusion, it was necessary to practice another presumption, as if we move to another angle and look through it if we see something as before, and also go to touch the thing we see, because if it was an optical illusion, it would be from It is unlikely that we will feel his touch, so this feeling increases the suspicion that there is something external that bears qualities that seem to be indicative of the ball. To be more sure, we can hit and roll what we have touched, bring others to tell us about something they see and touch, and take photographs of it showing the reality of its existence and its features, etc.

Thus, most of what we have done of inductive reasoning on the existence of the ball was due to the various qualitatively different clues, and if it were not for this evidence, the inductive evidence would not exist. And when we do the same kind of successful inference about the existence of another ball, It would mean that we keep two identical mental images that have a real existence, so they are the same. The image symmetry is directly perceived, while the existential symmetry, even if it is based on image similarity, is not sufficient without inferring the existence of each individual through contrast induction. And this induction is the basis for analogous induction.

Symmetry is inferred by contrast, and the contrast is basically perceptible directly by sensation, such as our visual perception of the mental image of the sphere compared to our tactile perception of it, as both are directly perceptible even though they are two different parameters that work to strengthen and develop probability. For this reason, contrast, not symmetry, was the basis for the inductive evidence, without it needing - in terms of origin - to indicate it as direct perception.

The reference

<https://www.fahmaldin.net/index.php?id=2585>