The Crisis Of Evidence

In Which PM2.5 Is Used To Expose Critical Errors in Thinking About Uncertainty;

Or, Why Probability & Statistics Cannot Discover Cause

William M. Briggs

Let's play: Who Said It!

- 1. "We have no reason to believe any proposition about the unobserved even after experience!"
- 2. "There *are* no such things as good positive reasons to believe any scientific theory."
- 3. "The truth of any scientific theory is exactly as improbable, both *a priori* and in relation to any possible evidence, as the truth of a self-contradictory proposition" (i.e. It is impossible.)
- 4. "Belief, of course, is never rational: it is rational to *suspend* belief."

$$RR = \frac{\Pr(\text{Disease}|\text{Exposed})}{\Pr(\text{Disease}|\text{Not Exposed})} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-7}}{1 \times 10^{-7}} = 2$$

$$\mathsf{RR}_{\mathsf{LA}} = \frac{\mathsf{Pr}(\geq 1\mathsf{Person}|\mathsf{Exposed})}{\mathsf{Pr}(\geq 1\mathsf{Person}|\mathsf{Not}|\mathsf{Exposed})} = \frac{0.33}{0.18} = 1.8$$



$$RR = \frac{\Pr(\text{Disease}|\text{Exposed})}{\Pr(\text{Disease}|\text{Not Exposed})} = \frac{2 \times 10^{-4}}{1.89 \times 10^{-4}} = 1.06$$







Contact

Eye: *Hey, you!*

Email: matt@wmbriggs.com

Web: wmbriggs.com

Phone: 917-392-0691

Paper: Arxiv.org :: Search Briggs