

---

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 01 Nov 2005 13:38:58 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Negative proof

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

Jump to: navigation, search

The fallacy of appealing to lack of proof of the negative is a type of logical fallacy of the following form:

"This exists because there is no proof that it does not exist."

Non-fallacious ways to prove something include the use of logical syllogisms and/or the incorporation of empirical observations. But it is not logical to argue that something exists simply because there is no proof to the contrary; one cannot say, "No one has proven that aliens do not exist. Therefore, based on that alone, they must exist, notwithstanding that I have no evidence that they do exist". Given (as it is above) that it was not proven that aliens do not exist, they might exist, but this alone does not prove them to exist.

Another common example is that, "A supernatural force must exist because there is no proof that it does not exist". However, the converse is also true, according to the Argument from Ignorance: One also cannot say that, "I have not seen proof that something supernatural exists, therefore a supernatural force cannot exist". Also, similar to the aliens in the above example, since no proof is available that this does not exist, it might exist, but this alone does not prove it to exist.

Here's another one for ya:

Quote:Argument from ignorance

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

(Redirected from Argument from Ignorance)

Jump to: navigation, search

The argument from ignorance, also known as argumentum ad ignorantiam or argument by lack of imagination, is the assertion that if something is currently inexplicable to some people, then it did not (or could not) happen, or that if evidence of something has not been scientifically proven to their satisfaction, then it cannot exist. "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence" is an adage used to explain that one's own "ignorance" (or, one's "absence of evidence") does not disprove anything (or, "is not absence of evidence"). In other words, mere personal belief, poor logic, or closed-mindedness masquerading as certainty is not logical.

This is similar to (but not the same as) the Argument from Personal Incredulity (also known as Argument from Personal Belief or Argument from Personal Conviction), where a person asserts that because they personally find a premise unlikely or unbelievable, it can be safely assumed not to be true.

Aside from that, though, let me ask you, what happened a second before the billionth of a billionth of a second after the Big Bang? Did all the matter concentrated at that one point exist, or did it appear out of nothing (which science has proven cannot happen)? What caused it to explode in the first place? What was the cause of that cause? What was the cause of the cause of that cause, and so on infinitely if nothing outside the physical laws of this world exists?

---