

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00344.html>

- *From:* "Lee Olsen" <paleocity@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 12 Dec 2006 07:08:51 -0800
-

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

There is no such thing as negative evidence retard.

Having an especially bad day aren't you? Did you wake up this morning?
If you did, your posts certainly don't reflect it

<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~hist12/writing.html>

3. Begin to frame your thesis. Consider why you have phrased your thesis the way you have. Think carefully about the evidence that will support your thesis. What about negative evidence? Do not simply ignore material that contradicts your thesis. Think about why you were not convinced by negative arguments or evidence. How can you discount them? Do you need to modify your argument to account for some of the negative evidence? (Be careful though, you do not want a wishy-washy argument.)

Lee, you should have read this before you posted it. Your connotation of the phrase, negative evidence, is different than the connotation in your sample here. Read it again.

McGinn: "There is no such thing as negative evidence retard."
You have been refuted, retard.

BTW, you base your assumption that Homo Erectus regularly occupied treeless habitat on zero evidence. Like I said previously,

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

there is no
evidence that the stone tools associated with HE were laid
down in
treeless habitat. None. Zero. Zilch. You might as well get
used to
it. Nothing your gonna say will change this.

Says the retard who just claimed "There is no such thing as negative
evidence..."

There isn't.

You have been refuted retard.

Caldarao is such a polished gentleman. What a guy to actually imply you
had something "worthy of development." If fact, Su called your rag a
"manifesto" which I also thought was more than kind.

Why not quote the whole conversations between myself and these two
idiots. I've got nothing to hide. How about you?

Why, you have proven time and time again you have not read the
liteature.

Do you want to see a small sample of the idiotic statments you have
made that back up their claims?

"Saber-tooth lions"

"There is no such thing as negative evidence retard."

"IOW, it makes about as much sense to emplace human ancestors,
including homo, neanderdudes, and even early humans (before the advent
of jeeps and guns) in treeless savanna habitat..."

"Homo rarely if ever left treed habitat."

Be patient, this list will get a lot longer.

IOW, as I suspected, you don't have a point.

Funny how you always go brain dead and can't understand anything when

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

confronted with a situation that you can't handle.

I'm just wondering why you continue pontificating about things that you, obviously, could not possibly know.

"Saber-tooth lions"

"There is no such thing as negative evidence retard."

"IOW, it makes about as much sense to emplace human ancestors, including homo, neanderdudes, and even early humans (before the advent of jeeps and guns) in treeless savanna habitat..."

"Homo rarely if ever left treed habitat."

I think you need to take a course in archaeology 101. For a hypothetical theorist, you don't seem to be very well grounded in the basics. Your garden idea is very testable. Instead of demanding everyone else do your homework for you, like the lazy oaf you are, start searching for any evidence of a garden, like seeds, pollen, nuts, anything that would demonstrate an abnormal concentration not typical in the normal background scatter of the area in general. Check back if you find anything.

Like you have a clue. This wouldn't work.

Be specific you evasive twit.

I didn't say there was any evidence for aphids dimwit, it was merely hypothetical thinking. Do you have any evidence that there wasn't any apiths or bug spray in these gardens?

Uh, no.