

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2006-12/msg00358.html>

- *From:* claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* 12 Dec 2006 09:08:20 -0800
-

Lee Olsen wrote:

claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx 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.

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

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

There's no such thing as negative evidence.

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

Re: A More Reasonable Interpretation of the Evidence

liteature.

As you are demonstrating, any idiot can throw accusations. I've got nothing to hide. Why not refer directly to me words? What are you afraid of?

.