

Instructions: Do the reading, then go through the questions, think about them, referring back to the reading when necessary, and write short answers (ranging between 1-2 sentences and couple paragraphs) for each. (If you feel you addressed one question in an answer to another, feel free just to refer to that.) Turn in your answers on the day the reading is due. You may discuss these questions with others but all answers should be written in your words (though you may use occasional quotes).

To be turned in:

1. What are your overall thoughts?
2. Does Figure 12-1 appear to suggest a link between calories and obesity or not? How might you evaluate whether the relationship is “statistically significant”?
3. How can you distinguish between Rood’s three types of skepticism: self-interest, contrarian or scientific?
4. How does the footnote *Armstrong is an expert at the Heartland Institute, a conservative think tank that has opposed efforts to curb greenhouse conditions* affect how you view Armstrong’s critiques of IPCC forecasts?
5. In Figure 12-7, do either of the lines appear to represent the true trend? (Also, what is one problem with Figure 12-7?)
6. Do you think it is always important to understand the science to make forecasts? Why or why not?
7. Does Silver’s model from Figure 12-9 indicate that the IPCC’s 1990 or 1995 forecasts were poorly made?

Not be turned in: (you don’t need to write up, but think about if you have time, and we may discuss in class)

8. In Figure 12-6, 5 out of the 12 figures fit into Hansen’s 55-70% prediction. Do you agree with Silver’s statement that these predictions were “reasonably good”?
9. Evaluate Silver’s statement, *And under Bayes’s theorem, no theory is perfect.*