

## Re: New subjectline: Valid and invalid arguments; former: Cocaine in ancient Egypt?

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-01/1483.html>

---

**From:** Alan Crozier (*name1.name2\_at\_telia.com*)

**Date:** 01/21/05

Date: Fri, 21 Jan 2005 07:27:18 GMT

"I.E\_Johansson" <inger\_e.xjohansson@telia.xcom> wrote in message  
news:7jXHd.14853\$d5.124050@newsb.telia.net...

> Alan,

> *what you wrote in your former post isn't exactly what you expressed in the  
> latest one. With the later I can agree with the former as the sentences  
were*

> *I can't.*

> *OK Thanks for clearing it out that an absence of evidence can't be treated  
> as an evidence of absence. That's important. That it can be used as an  
> indicator one or both ways is a totally different thing.*

But indications \*can\* also be used as evidence. Remember that the Swedish  
legal term "indiciebevis" is called "circumstantial evidence" in English. In  
other words, it is evidence of a kind, although not proof.

So it is not a "totally different thing" in English. In other words, when  
you say that "absence of evidence can be used as an indicator", you are in  
effect saying that "absence of evidence can be evidence of absence".

Once again, in English, evidence is not proof. It can be used to argue a  
proposition, it may help to establish proof. When you see the English word  
"evidence" don't think Swedish "bevis", think "belägg, stöd, vittnesbörd,  
tecken, spår, indicier" and all the other relevant words in my  
English-Swedish dictionary.

Alan

--

Alan Crozier  
Lund  
Sweden