

The Canons of Empirical Method

165

norance nor with the indeterminist view that classical laws represent macroscopic approximations to microscopic but random occurrences. Behind the determinist position is the Galilean assumption that classical laws refer, if not to visible, then at least to imaginable primary qualities of matter in motion; in other words, imaginative synthesis is always possible and, even in the last analysis, there is not a non-systematic aggregate of diverging series of conditions. Again, behind the indeterminist view there seems a mistaken diagnosis of the error of determinism: instead of affirming a lack of complete system in relations between data, or between images, it has taken the opposite course of denying complete determinacy in the data to be systematized.

Our middle course transposes the issue from determinacy and indeterminacy to the systematic and the non-systematic. Because the non-systematic is verifiable, it is objective in the scientific sense. Because it is objective, statistical laws are not a mere cloak for ignorance. They represent a grasp of what intelligibility there is to be grasped in appropriate domains of data. On the other hand, indeterminacy is merely an indeterminacy of conclusions. It arises because deductions suppose systematic relations and such relations are not the only relations. It implies no indeterminacy in things or events or data and by that implication it has the favor of the canon of parsimony. For it seems impossible to distinguish between the