

LATEST NEWS

29 November 2007

Full article here: http://forecastingprinciples.com/Public_Policy/PolBears.pdf

Pertinent excerpts (emphasis mine):

“In all, AMD violated 73 of the 90 forecasting principles we were able to rate. They used two un-validated methods and relied on only one polar bear expert to specify variables, relationships, and inputs into their models. **The expert then adjusted the models until the outputs conformed to his expectations** “

“Green and Armstrong (2007) examined long-term climate forecasting efforts and were unable to find a single forecast of global warming that was based on scientific methods. The climate modelers’ procedures violated many forecasting principles and some of the violations were critical. This formal auditing result is consistent with earlier cautions. For example, Soon et al. (2001) found that the current generation of GCMs is unable to meaningfully calculate the climatic effects of added atmospheric carbon dioxide given severe limitations from both the uncertainties and unknowns in representing all relevant physical processes. There appears to be much uncertainty about the direction and extent of global mean temperature changes in the long-term (Soon et al. 2001), **the most plausible forecast is that mean temperatures will remain much the same. In order to produce valid forecasts, it is necessary to use procedures that are consistent with accepted forecasting principles.**”

“Despite the lack of validity of unaided forecasts by experts, many public policy decisions are based on their predictions. Research on persuasion has shown that people have substantial faith in the value of such forecasts and that faith increases when experts agree with one another. **Although they may seem convincing at the time, expert forecasts can, a few years later, serve as important cautionary tales.**”

“Research since 1980 has added support to the Seer-sucker Theory. In particular, Tetlock (2005) recruited 284 people whose professions included, "commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends." He asked them to forecast the probability that various situations would or would not occur, picking areas (geographic and substantive) within and outside their areas of expertise. By 2003, he had accumulated over 82,000 forecasts. **The experts barely if at all outperformed non-experts and neither group did well against simple rules.**”

My comments:

As a policymaker or a news organisation, you can continue to believe in Fairies, but the enclosed information is based on ACTUAL FACTS and this latest report is further proof of the fallacious nature of the all of the AGW scaremongering tactics.

ASK YOURSELVES WHAT YOU STAND TO GAIN BY CONTINUING TO STICK YOUR HEADS IN THE SAND AND IGNORE THE **FACTS** THAT ARE SO **BLATANTLY OBVIOUS**.

PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE RECOGNISE THE FALSEHOOD OF AGW AND THE HIDDEN AGENDA OF THOSE WHO FORCE THESE LIES DOWN THE LINE.