Claim: If someone cannot prove that I am wrong, then they cannot be correct.

Example:

Let’s say I’m solving a problem, and I am told that my solution is wrong. I ask the person who comments on my solution to show me how I am wrong. They cannot, and simply say, “You cannot do it that way. It is wrong.”

Unless the person can describe (“do it that way” is nondescript) my mistake or error in process, or demonstrate their own methodology, they cannot lay claim to the “correct” solution.

This does not mean that I am correct, just that I have not been disproven.

This is the premise of the null hypothesis. To prove one’s position, they must first be capable of disproving (nullifying) another.

One way to think about it:

Imagine if I had assumed that because I couldn’t be disproven, that I am correct.

This is not a scientific way of thinking and is fallacious via the Argument from Ignorance – presenting a false dichotomy and attempting to shift the burden of proof.

A proposition is true because it has not yet been proven false or a proposition is false because it has not yet been proven true. “Absence of Evidence is not Evidence of Absence” – Carl Sagan

Instead, it is that I am not wrong because I couldn’t be disproven, and if there is no one to disprove me, then no one is correct. Just because I am not wrong does not mean that I am correct.

Science progresses most effectively by deduction, the process of eliminating (nullifying) hypothesis.

Not Wrong does not imply Correct. Simply a Null Result. We can use Science to ask Questions, and sometimes the answer is No.

Not Wrong =/= Correct