

The New York Times Reprints

This copy is for your personal, noncommercial use only. You can order presentation-ready copies for distribution to your colleagues, clients or customers [here](#) or use the "Reprints" tool that appears next to any article. Visit www.nytreprints.com for samples and additional information. [Order a reprint of this article now.](#)



April 10, 2011

A Forecasting Expert Testifies About Climate Change

To the Editor:

In "[The Truth, Still Inconvenient](#)" (column, April 4), Paul Krugman begins with a "joke" about "an economist, a lawyer and a professor of marketing" walking into a room, in this case to testify at a Congressional hearing on climate science.

I am the marketing professor, and I was invited to testify because I am a forecasting expert.

With Dr. Kesten C. Green and Dr. Willie Soon, I found that the global warming alarm is based on improper forecasting procedures. We developed a [simple model](#) that provides forecasts that are 12 times more accurate than warming-alarm forecasts for 90 to 100 years ahead.

We identified 26 analogous situations, such as the alarm over mercury in fish. Government actions were demanded in 25 situations and carried out in 23. None of the alarming forecasts were correct, none of the interventions were useful, and harm was caused in 20.

Mr. Krugman challenged 2 of the 26 analogies, "acid rain and the ozone hole," which he said "have been contained precisely thanks to environmental regulation." We are waiting for his evidence.

"What's the punch line?" he asked. I recommended an end to government financing for climate change research and to associated programs and regulations. And that's no joke.

J. SCOTT ARMSTRONG
Philadelphia, April 6, 2011

The writer is a professor at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.