

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00357.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 12 Dec 2006 11:48:35 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:

Lee Olsen wrote:

There's no such thing as negative evidence.

Circular answer, repeating your ignorance does not make it true.

However, a nice citation stating "There's no such thing" from a peer-reviewed paper would certainly back up your claim :-)

The phrase you are (or should be) looking for is absence of evidence, not negative evidence. Evidence doesn't come with positive or negative signs.

BTW, you
base your
assumption
that Homo
Erectus

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

regularly
occupied
treeless
habitat on
zero
evidence.
Like I said
previously,
there is no
evidence
that the
stone tools
as