History of Statistics Paper IV

Yingke(Kiki) He

July 2nd 2025

Week 7

How Visualization Emerged as a Language of Evidence and Explanation

I. Introduction

Data visualization is often treated as a final step in analysis, something added after the statistics are done to make results more accessible. But its history reveals a different story: visualization has long been central to how people understand, reason with, and communicate about data. From the earliest charts and maps to modern interactive graphics, visual methods have allowed people to make sense of complexity, identify patterns, and argue from evidence. Far from being a recent development, data visualization has deep historical roots and has shaped the very structure of statistical reasoning.

As Friendly and Wainer (2021) show, visual thinking precedes many formal statistical tools. Long before regression coefficients or confidence intervals, people used graphs, maps, and diagrams to make comparisons, express uncertainty, and explain variation. Whether it was van Langren's graph of longitudinal estimates in the seventeenth century, Guerry's shaded maps of social statistics in France, or Playfair's commercial charts, these innovations were developed not as accessories to data, but as essential means of insight.

For centuries, visualization has become a form of argumentation, discovery, and communication. The emergence of social maps and mortality charts, as well as the invention of scatter plots and time series visualization, indicate that graphical methods are not only tools for simplifying data, but often tools for creating new knowledge.

II. The Origins of Visual Reasoning

Long before modern statistical analysis, people found ways to represent quantities and relationships visually. Friendly and Wainer (2021) begin their account with prehistoric and ancient examples: tally marks etched into bones, Incan quipus made of knotted cords, and Babylonian star charts. These early systems may not have used spatial axes or standardized scales, but they reveal a basic human tendency to externalize thought through visual representation.

The transition from symbolic to spatial visualization becomes clearer with early maps and astronomical diagrams. In these, space and geometry were used not just to locate things but to reason about relationships. This laid the groundwork for later statistical graphics, where position, length, area, and shading would carry meaning.

A crucial turning point came in the 1600s with Michael Florent van Langren's 1644 graph showing estimates of the longitudinal distance between Toledo and Rome. This was not just a table or list of values but a visual argument. By plotting the divergent estimates from different authorities along a horizontal line, van Langren made the uncertainty itself visible (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, pp. 14–15). His graphic did not resolve the dispute, but it reframed it: rather than privileging one authority, it invited viewers to compare judgments visually. In this sense, it was the first known statistical graphic to be used for epistemological clarity rather than ornament.

The authors argue that such visualizations were acts of reasoning, not just illustration. In a time when printing was expensive and literacy uneven, the decision to represent uncertainty spatially was a deliberate rhetorical choice. Van Langren's graph demonstrated that visualization could be a way of managing disagreement and making complex information more accessible. It marked the beginning of what Friendly and Wainer call "graphic communication", the use of visual formats to make data both interpretable and persuasive.

III. Social and Scientific Need Drives Innovation

Some of the most important advances in data visualization came not from abstract theorizing, but from practical needs in governance and public health. As Friendly and Wainer (2021) emphasize, the 19th century saw an explosion in government data collection: on births, deaths, crime, literacy, and disease. With this increase in quantitative information came a need for ways to interpret and communicate it. The innovations of this period were driven by real-world problems and a desire to see patterns that might inform policy.

One early pioneer was André-Michel Guerry, a French lawyer and bureaucrat who, in the 1830s, used shaded maps to visualize social statistics across different départements of France. He compared variables such as literacy, crime, and suicide by shading regions darker or lighter depending on their rates. Guerry's work is now recognized as one of the first examples of thematic cartography: mapping data not just geographically, but analytically (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, pp. 39–41). These shaded maps revealed unexpected regularities, such as the persistence of certain crime rates across decades, and raised new questions about the relationship between education and morality.

Similarly, William Farr, a British epidemiologist, developed tools to analyze mortality data, including age-adjusted death rates and classification systems for causes of death. He used these techniques to study urban health conditions and to advocate for sanitation reforms. His work demonstrated how numerical abstraction could guide public health interventions. Visualization, for Farr, was not just about understanding but about acting.

Perhaps the most famous case from this era is John Snow's cholera map. During the 1854 outbreak in London, Snow plotted the locations of deaths alongside the city's water pumps. The resulting cluster around the Broad Street pump provided compelling visual evidence that cholera was waterborne. While Snow's reasoning also drew on interviews and medical theory, the map itself played a central role in persuading others, helping to shift opinion away from the miasma theory of disease (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, pp. 54–57).

What links these cases is the role of visualization in turning messy ad contradictory data into coherent, persuasive arguments. The shaded map, the mortality table, and the cholera dot plot were not just ways of showing results, they were the methods by which insight was achieved. As Friendly and Wainer (2021) argue, these innovations demonstrate that visual representation has long been a core part of scientific discovery, especially in contexts where large-scale data demanded clarity, speed, and public accountability.

IV. Playfair and the Public Face of Data

While earlier pioneers like Guerry and Snow used visualization for administrative or medical reasoning, William Playfair saw graphics as a tool for communicating complex economic data to a general audience. His work in the late 18th and early 19th centuries marked a turning point in the history of data visualization: not just in technical innovation, but in rhetorical strategy.

Playfair's goal was not only to analyze but to persuade, and he believed that visual forms were the most effective means of doing so. Playfair invented several of the most enduring graphical forms, including the line graph, bar chart, and pie chart. These were introduced in his Commercial and Political Atlas (1786) and Statistical Breviary (1801), which visualized trade balances, national debt, and imports and exports over time (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, pp. 63–66). One of his signature achievements was to present multivariate economic data in a form that could be understood by non-experts, including policymakers and the general public.

His graphics were also explicitly argumentative. For instance, his bar chart comparing England's and Scotland's exports before and after the 1707 Act of Union was designed to show the benefits of political unification. Likewise, his line charts of Britain's balance of trade during wartime were intended to support specific political positions. Visualization, for Playfair, was not merely a tool of exploration—it was a language of advocacy.

Importantly, Playfair worked without formal statistical theory. He lacked the concepts of variance, correlation, or sampling, but still grasped that patterns in data could be made visible and compelling through spatial relationships. His approach was practical and intuitive, rooted in the visual habits of engineering and drafting (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, p. 68). That these forms have endured for more than two centuries is a testament to the power of his intuition.

Playfair's legacy lies not just in the invention of chart types, but in a new vision of data graphics as public reasoning. His work established a precedent for using visualization not only to understand the world but also to communicate that understanding clearly and persuasively, shaping decisions in business, governance, and public discourse.

V. Scatterplots and the Quantification of Relationships

While bar charts and line graphs helped visualize trends and comparisons, the scatterplot allowed viewers to explore relationships between two continuous variables, a major step toward understanding association, variation, and eventually, causation. As Friendly and Wainer (2021) describe, the scatterplot did not emerge from statistical theory but grew out of observational sciences, particularly astronomy and biology.

The earliest uses of scatter diagrams came from the work of John Herschel in the 1830s, who plotted star positions and residuals in astronomical measurements (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, p. 88). However, it was Francis Galton who transformed the scatterplot into a statistical tool. In his investigations of heredity, Galton plotted children's heights against their parents' and noticed a linear pattern that led him to formulate the concepts of regression to the mean and correlation. His diagrams were not mere illustrations, and they were conceptual tools that revealed latent structures in the data.

These innovations laid the foundation for Karl Pearson's formalization of the correlation coefficient and regression line, which gave mathematical expression to Galton's visual insights. Pearson turned the intuitive patterns seen in scatterplots into measurable quantities that could be standardized and compared across studies (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, pp. 90–92).

What makes the scatterplot so powerful is its dual function. It is both exploratory and explanatory. Before running a regression, a researcher can look at a scatterplot to assess whether a linear model is even appropriate. And after modeling, the plot can reveal outliers, clusters, and nonlinear patterns that suggest further questions. In this way, the scatterplot exemplifies Friendly and Wainer's argument that visualization is a mode of reasoning, not just presentation.

This shift from visualizing quantities to visualizing relationships marked a major advance in data analysis. It also underscored the central role of visualization in the development of statistical thinking itself. Concepts like correlation and regression were not derived from abstract mathematics alone; they were shaped by what people saw in the data.

VI. The Expansion of Graphic Language

As the volume and complexity of data grew throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, so did the visual tools designed to make sense of it. In Chapter 9, Friendly and Wainer (2021) explore how innovations in technology, computing, and statistical modeling expanded the scope of data visualization, particularly in representing time, space, and multidimensional relationships.

One major development was the refinement of time-series graphics. While William Playfair had pioneered the basic line chart for time data in the 18th century, later designers introduced enhancements such as small multiples, dynamic updates, and layering of variables to show trends, cycles, and shocks in complex systems. Visualizing time was no longer about showing a single trend line, and it became a way to tell stories about change and to detect structural breaks in dynamic systems.

Friendly and Wainer also highlight advances in visualizing spatial and geographic data. Techniques such as choropleth maps, cartograms, and isoline plots enabled users to see how phenomena varied across regions, whether in epidemiology, economics, or climate science. These tools built on Guerry's and Snow's early examples but were enhanced by digital mapping software, geographic information systems (GIS), and interactive dashboards that allow viewers to explore data at multiple levels of granularity (Friendly & Wainer, 2021, pp. 140–145).

Modern visualizations often go beyond two dimensions. Multivariate graphics, such as parallel coordinate plots, 3D scatterplots, and principal component biplots, attempt to reveal structure in high-dimensional datasets. While these techniques can be harder to interpret, they reflect a persistent challenge: how to compress complexity into a form that humans can perceive and reason with.

Friendly and Wainer argue that the rise of computational graphics has not replaced earlier methods, and it has extended them. The principles that guided Playfair and Galton still apply: clarity, proportionality, visual encodings of number, and sensitivity to the viewer's perceptual limits. But now, with the help of animation, interactivity, and real-time data, visualization plays an even more prominent role in shaping how both experts and the public understand evidence.

In all these cases, the evolution of graphic forms reveals a persistent theme: visualization is a language, one that adapts as new questions are asked and new tools become available. Its strength lies not just in simplifying data, but in revealing patterns that would be invisible in tables or formulas alone.

VII. What I've Learned

Before this week, I thought of data visualization mainly as a way to present results, as something added to an analysis to make it easier to understand. But reading Friendly and Wainer (2021) changed my view. I now see that visualization has often been the method of discovery, not just a communication tool. From van Langren's attempt to show disagreement about longitude to Snow's map of cholera deaths, visual reasoning has shaped how people identify problems, explore data, and argue for solutions.

I was especially shocked by how deeply tied visualization is to social and scientific needs. Guerry didn't invent shaded maps to be clever, and he needed a way to make sense of regional crime and literacy data. Similarly, Playfair created new forms like the bar and line chart because he wanted to persuade the public and policymakers using economic evidence. These examples reminded me that new methods often arise not from theoretical breakthroughs, but from concrete problems that demand better tools.

The history of the scatterplot also stood out. Galton and Pearson didn't begin with the formula for correlation, they started with a visual pattern. It's easy to forget that foundational statistical concepts like regression emerged because someone looked at a graph and noticed something interesting. That connection between what we see and what we formalize is something I'll carry with me in future work.

Finally, I appreciated the authors' argument that visualization is a language, one that evolves as we invent new ways to encode, explore, and explain. With modern technologies, this language has become more expressive, but the core principles remain the same: clarity, proportion, relevance. Visualization isn't just about making data beautiful; it's about making it thinkable.

This week gave me a better appreciation of visual tools as part of the history of statistics: not as accessories, but as primary methods of inquiry. I'll now approach plots and graphics not just as decorations, but as ways of reasoning that deserve as much care and thought as any model or equation.

Week 8

The Philosophy and Practice of Bayesian Statistics in the 20th Century

I. Introduction

Bayesian statistics offers a fundamentally different view of probability than the frequentist methods that dominate many statistical textbooks. Rather than viewing probability as a long-run frequency of events, Bayesian thinking treats it as a degree of belief, flexible, revisable, and often personal. By updating prior beliefs in light of new evidence using Bayes' theorem, the Bayesian approach allows analysts to incorporate uncertainty, context, and subjective information directly into statistical inference (Lindley, 2000).

Yet for much of the twentieth century, Bayesian methods were marginalized. Despite their theoretical elegance, they were dismissed by many mainstream statisticians as too subjective, too informal, or too difficult to compute. This "anti-Bayesian moment", as Porter (2021) calls it, reflected more than philosophical discomfort: it was shaped by institutional priorities, technological constraints, and a cultural preference for what appeared to be objectivity.

In recent decades, however, Bayesian statistics has experienced a remarkable resurgence, not because its foundational arguments changed, but because it became practically useful. As Porter (2020) emphasizes, Bayesian tools have been applied in fields ranging from epidemiology to machine learning, offering solutions where classical methods struggled. Much of this revival owes to advances in computing power and algorithms like Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), which made it possible to implement Bayesian models that had long been theoretically attractive but computationally inaccessible (Moore & Hennessy, 2006).

Bayesian statistics has evolved from a marginalized framework to a core tool in contemporary applied work. The philosophical roots of Bayesianism, the reasons for its historical rejection, and the computational developments that led to its return reflect a broader relationship between theory, practice, and the cultural context of adopting or ignoring statistical methods.

II. The Foundations of Bayesian Thought

At the heart of Bayesian statistics is a distinctive interpretation of probability: not as an objective long-run frequency, but as a degree of belief. This approach dates back to Thomas Bayes' posthumously published essay in 1763, but it was later formalized and expanded by figures like Pierre-Simon Laplace. In its modern form, Bayesian inference involves updating a prior probability distribution with observed data to produce a posterior distribution, which represents revised beliefs about parameters or hypotheses given the evidence.

As Lindley (2000) argues, this framework provides a coherent foundation for statistical reasoning under uncertainty. Rather than relying on arbitrary significance thresholds or hypothetical long-run properties, Bayesian methods make explicit the assumptions behind inference and offer a clear rule for how to revise beliefs. Lindley emphasizes that probability should be understood as a personal measure of uncertainty, subject to revision but also guided by consistency. This view leads naturally to a decision-theoretic perspective, where actions are evaluated in terms of their expected utility given the posterior distribution.

A key feature of Bayesian thinking is its ability to incorporate prior knowledge or beliefs, whether from expert judgment, historical data, or formal modeling, into the analysis. While this flexibility has long been a source of criticism (on grounds of subjectivity), proponents argue that making assumptions explicit is preferable to pretending objectivity. In many cases, prior distributions can be chosen for convenience (e.g., conjugate priors) or designed to reflect uncertainty in a transparent way.

Another strength of the Bayesian approach is its internal coherence. Unlike frequentist methods that separate estimation, testing, and interval construction into distinct procedures, Bayesian inference uses a single, unified framework. The posterior distribution contains all relevant information for answering inferential questions: point estimates (e.g., the mean), credible intervals (which actually represent probability statements), and probability statements about hypotheses (Lindley, 2000).

These foundational ideas make Bayesian statistics not just an alternative method, but a fundamentally different philosophy of inference. Where frequentists avoid probabilistic statements about unknown parameters, Bayesians embrace them. Where frequentists depend on sampling distributions and repeated trials, Bayesians focus on what we know here and now. For Lindley and other proponents, this approach offers a more natural and useful guide for reasoning and decision-making in uncertain situations.

III. The Anti-Bayesian Moment

Despite its logical coherence, Bayesian statistics was largely marginalized for much of the 20th century. From roughly the 1920s to the 1970s, mainstream statistics was dominated by frequentist approaches which emphasized long-run error rates, sampling distributions, and hypothesis testing. Bayesian methods, by contrast, were often dismissed as overly subjective or mathematically intractable. This period, described by Porter (2021) as the "anti-Bayesian moment," reflected both philosophical objections and institutional dynamics.

The core objection to Bayesianism during this time was its reliance on subjective priors. Critics argued that allowing analysts to input their own beliefs into statistical procedures undermined objectivity and reproducibility. The frequentist emphasis on procedures that performed well in repeated sampling was seen as more scientific, especially in fields like experimental biology and psychology that valued control and replication.

In addition, the Bayesian approach was limited by computational barriers. Before the development of algorithms like Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC), many Bayesian models could not be computed analytically or numerically except in the simplest cases. This made them impractical for applied work, particularly in settings where quick and standardized analysis was required.

Institutional factors also reinforced the dominance of frequentist methods. Academic departments, funding agencies, and journals favored the use of confidence intervals, p-values, and hypothesis tests. These tools were easy to teach, easy to apply, and consistent with the scientific ideals of objectivity and generalizability. As Gigerenzer et al. (1989) argue, the rise of statistical significance testing was not merely a technical preference but a cultural phenomenon, tied to how science defined rigor and authority.

Porter (2021) notes that even as some statisticians continued to defend Bayesianism on philosophical grounds, it remained on the margins of applied practice. It was perceived as esoteric, overly theoretical, or even politically suspect. In many university departments, Bayesian methods were treated as a niche topic rather than a central framework for inference.

This hostility shaped the identity of Bayesian statistics for decades. Rather than evolving in tandem with mainstream statistics, it existed in a parallel space; developing its own literature, methods, and institutional supporters. The result was a discipline divided not just by methods, but by deep philosophical disagreements about what probability meant and how inference should be conducted.

IV. The Bayesian Revival and Computational Turning Point

The widespread resurgence of Bayesian statistics in the late 20th century was not primarily the result of a philosophical conversion, it was driven by practical necessity and computational feasibility. As Porter (2020) argues, Bayesian methods became more attractive because they worked, not necessarily because people changed their minds about subjective probability. Problems in fields like medicine, law, and environmental science increasingly required models that could integrate prior knowledge, quantify uncertainty, and handle complex data structures. Bayesian statistics provided the tools, and advances in computing power made them usable.

The development of algorithms such as Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) in the 1980s and 1990s was pivotal. These methods allowed researchers to approximate posterior distributions even when analytical solutions were impossible. Tools like the Gibbs sampler and Metropolis-Hastings algorithm opened the door to fitting hierarchical models, spatial models, and Bayesian networks; all previously too computationally demanding for practical use (Porter, 2020). What had once been theoretical became applied.

This shift coincided with rapid growth in computing power, which further reduced the barriers to using Bayesian models. As Moore and Hennessy (2006) document, two centuries of improvements in computational productivity, from early mechanical calculators to modern microprocessors, transformed what analysts could do with data. Bayesian methods that were infeasible on paper or punch cards became routine with laptops and cloud servers. As a result, what had once been viewed as an academic curiosity became indispensable for applied modeling in fields like epidemiology, cognitive science, and machine learning.

Bayesianism also gained credibility through high-profile successes. In epidemiology, Bayesian models helped estimate HIV prevalence and predict disease outbreaks when data were sparse or incomplete. In the legal system, Bayesian reasoning offered structured ways to evaluate forensic evidence and eyewitness reports. And in machine learning, where prediction often matters more than inference, Bayesian frameworks helped integrate uncertainty into algorithms that learned from data.

This practical success softened earlier philosophical objections. As Porter (2021) notes in his rejoinder, even fields that once resisted Bayesian methods began to adopt them, not because they embraced subjective probability, but because they needed tools that could solve hard problems. The revival of Bayesian statistics, then, was not a triumph of ideology, but a pragmatic shift grounded in what was now computationally possible and scientifically useful.

Today, Bayesian methods are not just tolerated; they are often preferred in situations that demand flexibility, transparency, and explicit modeling of uncertainty. The anti-Bayesian moment has passed, not because it was decisively refuted, but because Bayesianism proved itself in the domains where it mattered most.

V. Competing Cultures of Inference

The tension between Bayesian and frequentist approaches is not merely methodological; it reflects deeper epistemological and cultural divisions in how science defines knowledge, rigor, and uncertainty. As Gigerenzer et al. (1989) argue, the rise of statistical methods in the 20th century was part of a broader cultural transformation in which probability and statistics came to stand for scientific rationality itself. Within this “empire of chance,” different schools of thought developed distinct values and norms, which shaped how evidence was interpreted and communicated.

Frequentist statistics has long aligned with ideals of objectivity, replication, and procedural neutrality. Confidence intervals and significance tests were attractive partly because they avoided explicit subjectivity and seemed to offer generalizable results. This culture prioritized error control, long-run behavior, and standardized inference procedures. It was especially dominant in academic settings where uniform reporting and peer review required reproducibility and minimal discretion.

By contrast, the Bayesian tradition emphasizes transparency, coherence, and contextual reasoning. Rather than avoiding subjectivity, it makes prior assumptions explicit and updates beliefs in light of evidence. As Lindley (2000) argues, this approach offers a more honest account of how people actually reason under uncertainty: not as frequentist automatons, but as agents combining past experience with current data to make informed decisions.

These two cultures represent not just different statistical methods but different ways of framing scientific inquiry. Frequentist tools often seek to limit researcher discretion, whereas Bayesian methods provide a structure for making and updating informed judgments. One prioritizes error rates across hypothetical repetitions; the other focuses on what the data say given what we already believe.

Porter (2020) notes that the resurgence of Bayesian methods has led to hybrid practices, especially in applied fields. Many analysts use Bayesian tools pragmatically while retaining frequentist intuitions about model checking and robustness. This mixing of approaches reflects the pluralism of modern data analysis, and the fact that no single framework can fully capture the complexity of inference across all domains.

Still, the cultural divide persists. Textbooks, software defaults, and academic training often push students toward one framework or the other. Understanding these traditions as historically and institutionally embedded (rather than purely technical) helps explain why debates over priors, p-values, and significance thresholds continue to generate disagreement.

In the end, Bayesian and frequentist inference are not just technical alternatives. They are embedded in different views about how knowledge is constructed, how uncertainty should be communicated, and what counts as convincing evidence. Recognizing this helps clarify that statistical methods are not neutral tools, and they are shaped by the cultures and purposes for which they are built.

VI. What I've Learned

This week's readings reshaped how I understand both the history and the purpose of Bayesian statistics. I had previously seen Bayesian inference mostly as a computational tool as this is what was taught mostly in class, which is another option in the analyst's toolkit. But I now see it as part of a much longer conversation about what it means to reason with uncertainty. Lindley's (2000) argument that all uncertainty should be treated probabilistically, and that statistical inference should be coherent and decision oriented, helped clarify the philosophical core of the Bayesian approach.

What surprised me most was the extent to which Bayesianism's historical marginalization was not simply about mathematics or logic, but about institutional politics and culture. As Porter (2021) explains, Bayesian ideas were sidelined for decades not because they failed logically, but because they conflicted with dominant views about objectivity, replicability, and the role of subjectivity in science. Gigerenzer et al. (1989) showed how these standards were shaped by broader social and scientific shifts, reinforcing that the adoption of statistical methods always occurs within a context of cultural values.

The story of the Bayesian revival, driven by the development of MCMC and increases in computing power (Moore & Hennessy, 2006), also helped me appreciate how technological conditions shape methodological choices. Many of the models we now take for granted were once inaccessible. The lesson here is that the practical viability of a method often matters more than theoretical approach.

I also came away with a deeper respect for the changing of statistical practice. Bayesian and frequentist methods are not always in competition; they often coexist in applied work, with each contributing different strengths. This perspective moves beyond the idea that one approach is superior and instead encourages critical thinking about when each framework is appropriate.

Overall, learning about the rise, fall, and resurgence of Bayesian statistics made me more reflective about my own assumptions when working with data. I'm more aware now of the philosophical choices put into statistical procedures and more curious about how the history of those choices continues to shape our understanding of evidence and inference today.

References

Friendly, M., & Wainer, H. (2021). *A history of data visualization and graphic communication*. Harvard University Press.

Gigerenzer, G., Swijtink, Z., Porter, T., Daston, L., Beatty, J., & Krüger, L. (1989). The empire of chance: How probability changed science and everyday life. Cambridge University Press. (Introductory chapter)

Lindley, D. V. (2000). The philosophy of statistics. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician), 49(3), 293–337. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9884.00238

Moore, G. E., & Hennessy, J. L. (2006). Two centuries of productivity growth in computing. The Journal of Economic History, 67(1), 128–159. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050707000058

Porter, T. M. (2020). Not only defended but also applied: The perceived absurdity of Bayesian inference. The American Statistician, 74(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2013.760987

Porter, T. M. (2021). Rejoinder: The anti-Bayesian moment and its passing. The American Statistician, 74(1), 16–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.2012.752409