The Ecology of Absence: Toward a Typology of Negative Evidence in Anomalous Biological Research

Daniel H. Kegley

holstonia-investigations.org

Abstract

Absence of physical evidence is frequently treated as decisive in debates over anomalous biological claims. In ecological research, however, non-detection is not a singular outcome but a structured result shaped by detection probability, observer effort, environmental context, and evidentiary modality. This paper develops a typology of absence that distinguishes uninformative, expected, conditional, contradictory, and terminal non-detection states. Drawing on established detection ecology and conservation biology, we argue that negative evidence acquires inferential weight only under specific conditions. By formalizing absence as signal rather than inconvenience, this framework clarifies when uncertainty remains responsible, when hypotheses must be constrained, and when continued inquiry becomes scientifically untenable.

1. Introduction: The Misuse of Absence

In controversies surrounding anomalous biological claims, absence is often invoked as a rhetorical endpoint rather than an analytical variable. Statements such as *"no body has been found," "no clear photographs exist,"* or *"DNA has not been recovered"* are routinely treated as interchangeable indicators of nonexistence. This collapse of distinct non-detection states into a single evidentiary category obscures how absence actually functions in ecological systems.

Conservation biology has long confronted the problem of detecting rare, cryptic, or low-density species. In such contexts, absence is not treated as a binary outcome but as a probabilistic signal whose meaning depends on detection probability, search effort, spatial coverage, and the characteristics of the evidence sought (MacKenzie et al. 2002). Failure to detect under unknown or low detection probability carries little inferential weight; failure to detect under sustained high-probability conditions can be decisive.

This paper applies those principles to anomalous biological research. Rather than asking whether absence *counts* as evidence, we ask a more disciplined question: **under what conditions does absence become informative, constraining, or terminal?** By distinguishing kinds of absence and articulating their implications, we aim to replace polarized debate with structured inference.

2. Absence in Detection Ecology

Detection ecology rests on a foundational distinction between the *state process* (whether a species is present) and the *observation process* (whether it is detected). Detection probability (p) represents the likelihood of observing a species given its presence. When p < 1, non-detection does not imply absence of occupancy (MacKenzie et al. 2002).

Numerous factors depress detection probability in real systems: low population density, nocturnality, wide-ranging behavior, habitat complexity, rapid decomposition, and observer limitations. As a result, extended periods of non-detection routinely occur even when a species is present. This pattern has been documented repeatedly in rare carnivores, remnant populations, and rediscovered taxa (MacKenzie et al. 2003; Brook et al. 2019).

Treating all non-detection as equivalent therefore constitutes a category error. Absence only acquires inferential force when detection probability is sufficiently high and search

effort sufficiently sustained that non-detection meaningfully reduces the likelihood of presence. To formalize this distinction, we propose a typology of absence.

---

3. A Typology of Absence

Type I — Uninformative Absence

Definition:
Non-detection under unknown, minimal, or trivially low detection probability.

Examples:

- No physical remains in unsurveyed or minimally surveyed wilderness
- No photographic evidence where cameras are absent, sparse, or poorly placed
- No genetic material where sampling has not been systematically attempted

Interpretation:
Type I absence carries no inferential weight. It cannot falsify hypotheses and should not be used rhetorically. Treating uninformative absence as decisive is analytically indefensible.

Type II — Expected Absence

Definition:
Non-detection that is predicted by ecological context even if the target exists.

Examples:

- Absence of bodies in scavenger-rich, high-decomposition environments
- Sparse detections of wide-ranging, low-density mammals
- Non-detection in habitats known to depress detection probability

Interpretation:
Type II absence aligns with null expectations. It neither supports nor refutes existence claims. Its misuse often stems from intuitive but incorrect assumptions about detectability.

Type III — Conditional Absence

Definition:
Non-detection that becomes informative only if specific conditions are met.

Conditions include:

- Detection probability reasonably high for the modality deployed
- Sustained and targeted effort across appropriate spatial and temporal scales
- Evidence modality matched to ecological constraints

Examples:

- Long-term camera arrays in optimal habitat
- Repeated genetic sampling in areas of alleged frequent presence

Interpretation:
Type III absence constrains hypotheses. It narrows plausible models and forces refinement of assumptions but does not yet compel abandonment.

Type IV — Contradictory Absence

Definition:
Non-detection that conflicts with strong positive claims.

Examples:

- Frequent close-range visual reports without corresponding tracks or genetic traces
- Claims of high population density in intensively monitored landscapes
- Behavioral claims incompatible with observed absence across multiple modalities

Interpretation:
Type IV absence actively weakens specific explanatory models. It demands revision of population size, behavior, or mechanism assumptions.

Type V — Terminal Absence

Definition:
Non-detection under conditions where detection should be decisive.

Requirements:

- High detection probability
- Sustained, multi-modality effort
- Independent verification channels
- Clear a priori expectations of evidence presence

Interpretation:
Type V absence obligates exit or radical reframing. Continued inquiry beyond this point constitutes a degenerative research program.

---

4. Absence by Modality: Why Non-Detections Are Not Equivalent

A central error in anomalous biological debates is the treatment of all evidentiary absences as interchangeable. In reality, each modality carries distinct null expectations.

- **Body absence** is shaped by taphonomy, scavenging, and decomposition rates.
- **Genetic absence** depends on sampling strategy, environmental degradation, and contamination risk.
- **Photographic absence** reflects camera placement, trigger bias, field of view, and behavioral avoidance.
- **Track absence** is constrained by substrate availability and weather.

Absence gains inferential weight only when the *expected presence of evidence* is defined in advance. Without such specification, absence is uninterpretable.

---

5. Technology Escalation and the Myth of Inevitability

The argument that modern technology should have resolved anomalous biological claims rests on an implicit assumption: that increased sensor density produces linear increases in detection probability. Ecological evidence contradicts this assumption.

Technological escalation increases coverage, not certainty. Detection probability often plateaus well below one, particularly for rare or cryptic taxa. Documented cases demonstrate that advanced monitoring can coexist with prolonged non-detection (Lukacs et al. 2020; Robichaud et al. 2010).

Thus, claims that *"we would have found it by now"* are only meaningful when tied to explicit detection expectations. Without those, such claims remain rhetorical rather than analytical.

---

6. Absence as a Diagnostic Tool

When properly classified, absence performs real scientific work. It can:

- Differentiate between competing explanatory models
- Eliminate biologically implausible population claims
- Constrain behavioral and ecological assumptions
- Guide future survey design toward informative effort

Absence does not merely weaken claims; it shapes inquiry.

---

7. Constraint, Exit, and Responsible Uncertainty

A mature research framework must define not only how to continue, but how to stop. Responsible uncertainty persists under Type I–III absence. Constraint becomes obligatory under Type IV absence. Exit is required under Type V absence.

Failure to articulate these boundaries risks degenerative persistence driven by cultural momentum rather than evidentiary warrant. Formal exit criteria are therefore not concessions to skepticism but safeguards of scientific integrity.

---

8. Conclusion: Naming the Error

The dominant error in anomalous biological debates is not belief or disbelief, but the failure to distinguish kinds of absence. Treating non-detection as a singular condition collapses inference and substitutes intuition for analysis.

By formalizing absence as a structured ecological signal, this paper reframes negative evidence from rhetorical endpoint to diagnostic tool. This reframing does not resolve anomalous claims, but it clarifies how they must be evaluated—and when they must be relinquished. In doing so, it establishes absence not as an embarrassment, but as an essential component of disciplined inquiry.

References (APA style, unlinked)

Brook, B. W., et al. (2019). A fast re-sampling method for using reliability ratings of sightings to estimate extinction and persistence. *Ecology*.

Lukacs, P. M., et al. (2020). Wolverine occupancy and monitoring considerations in the western United States. *USDA Forest Service*.

MacKenzie, D. I., et al. (2002). Estimating site occupancy rates when detection probabilities are less than one. *Ecology, 83*, 2248–2255.

MacKenzie, D. I., et al. (2003). Estimating site occupancy, colonization, and extinction under imperfect detection. *Ecology, 84*, 2200–2207.

Roberts, D. L., & Solow, A. R. (2003). When did the dodo become extinct? *Nature*.

Robichaud, W., et al. (2010). The saola: Conservation status and future prospects. *Oryx*.