

Re: Meaning of Zero and All, Application to archaeology

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2005-01/2105.html>

From: Eric Stevens (*eric.stevens_at_sum.co.nz*)

Date: 01/28/05

Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 10:08:45 +1300

On Thu, 27 Jan 2005 05:51:35 -0500, "Steve Marcus"

<smarcus_spamout_@cox.net> wrote:

>> *No. Nor could you find any refrence to it in Google and, for that*

>> *matter, neither could I.*

>

>*So, Eric, I thought that you believe that absence of evidence (that neither
>you nor I could discover in Google) is not evidence of absence. Didn't work
>out to well for you in this instance, did it? Of course, as I recall the
>thing being a beta, for all I know it circulated to maybe ten people. So
>what?*

This is not a syllogism. Its a good example of a probablistic world. You know, the one that Philip has been promoting and I have have long accepted. Its not an example of the Aristotlian logic which misguided people misuse when they argue 'absence of evidence is evidence of absence'.

I will spell it out:

WHEN: you claim to have killfiled me

BUT:

- (1) you are using a browser with no kill file capability, and
- (2) you claim you are using a plugin for that purpose except that

(a)you can't remember its name.

(b)you are not quite sure where you got it

(c)you can't identify it with Google (or whatever)

AND

I couldn't:

(a)identify it with Google (or whatever)

(b)find anyone who had ever heard of such a plug in

THEN; it probably is that you had no such plugin to give Netscape 4 killfile capabilities.

sci.archaeology: Re: Meaning of Zero and All, Application to archaeology

Notice I don't say that you didn't have it. In this context I say that you probably didn't have it.

Eric Stevens