Humans, we are set apart from other species because our brain is much more

 efficient at recognizing patterns. Everything we see in our everyday lives, we subconsciously analyze to find patterns or some kind of trend; even when we don't

 notice that we are. For example, let's say that an individual has had a series of bad experience involving a pool or heights; that person will at times develop a sort of defense mechanism in the form of a phobia. This is probably because statistically speaking,

this person might have recognized that their chances of a poor outcome given the

first input being a pool or heights are higher than accepted. I personally do agree with the article on most cases; however I do think that the future is unpredictable at times and

can have spikes or distortions in pattern without notice.

 The chaos theory is based on this, it basically states that at any given time in any experiment, even those involving numbers can be completely unpredictable. We humans like to relate the unknown to chaos. We like to predict anything and everything and we do so by creating statistical data that highlights to us the trend. I enjoyed Brooks’s comment on the 2012 election campaign tactics by the Obama administration. Although I couldn’t care less about either Romney or Obama , It is irrefutable that vilification and elections go

hand in hand. The reason as to why the strawman attempt by the administration did

not work, in my opinion is because Romney was doing a good enough job isolating

 *himself* from the voters. Ron Paul was basically an unknown entity in respect to
 politics, not because he was new; but because he had no exposure by
media, because of the focus on the so called red and blue party.

Since we’re speaking about trends here, it would be likely for me to mention
that data suggests that mostly all of our presidents have been related
to one another in some way. It shocks people when I tell them that Obama
 and Bush are actually cousins. Bottom line to me is this: data can help
 us, but only to a certain degree. A company can be having a great year
and could be bankrupt the next due to some unpredictable events. Humans
obsessions with keeping records of everything and decoding it
meticulously in attempts of finding a pattern is an old one. It is unarguably

solid but subject to spikes and distortions just as anything else is. Brooks

 second article was particularly enjoyable. He speaks of how data cannot

take into account the human factor of emotion and he is right. Emotions

themselves are unpredictable thus making results produced by emotions ultimately...unpredictable. He writes about a struggling company who in all

good sense should have probably pulled out while they had the chance, but

due to whatever reason chose to stay in and ride out the storm. In this case

 it worked out favorably to the company, but that’s not to say that if this

experiment was repeated that it would have the same result.

 Collecting data and analyzing it has worked wonders for the medicine field and

 big businesses I however stay true to my belief that on any given day
anything can happen.

 Such was the case of the 2012 elections as was mentioned

earlier in this paper. Statistics and politics are both very closely related. Every politician

who runs for office, doe it to win; not to lose. What better way to find out if people are

going to vote for you than just asking everyone who they’re voting for right? Wrong.

 That would prove costly and still has chances of uncertainty . Any smart candidate

 has a team of staticians that will sample wisely and precisely as possible to indicate

 which candidate has an edge in which state, city or town. With these numbers, they

 must now ultimately make assumptions that on election day how many people

 will be voting for their party on the ballot.