

# NoTricksZone

"Not here to worship what is known, but to question it" - Jacob Bronowski. Climate news from Germany in English - by Pierre L. Gosselin

Browse: [Home](#) / [2015](#) / [August](#) / [26](#) / Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees "Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles"  
**Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees "Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles"**

By P Gosselin on 26. August 2015

**Note: This has been updated to a sticky post (hence the dark background). New posts are below.**

*Former NOAA meteorologist David Dilley has submitted an essay below that has 2 parts: 1) How the government has been starving researchers who hold alternative opinions of funding, and 2) climate cycles show we are starting a cooling period.*

*Readers will recall that David Dilley is a 40-year meteorology veteran and the producer of the excellent video: "[Is Climate Change Dangerous?](#)", which first was [presented at NTZ](#). Since then the video has been viewed more than 10,000 times and the NTZ story shared in social media over 800 times.*

=====

## Suppressing the Truth – the Next Global Cooling Cycle

By David Dilley, former NOAA meteorologist

### Subscribe!



### Pages

- ✦ [100+ Papers – Sun Drives Climate](#)
- ✦ [129 Climate Scandals](#)
- ✦ [About](#)
- ✦ [Climate Bet For Charity](#)
- ✦ [Climategate 2.0](#)
- ✦ [Contact](#)
- ✦ [Impressum](#)
- ✦ [Rules For Reposting](#)
- ✦ [Who's Who Guide In Germany?](#)

### Recent Comments

For over 15 years an inordinate proportion of government and corporate research grants have been awarded to universities for a single specific purpose: to prove human activities and the burning of fossil fuels are the main driving mechanisms causing global warming.

Unfortunately agendas by strong arm politics and the suppression of contrary views have become the primary tools used to manipulate the media, local and state governments (and in turn the general public) into believing what they want us to believe.

Many former research department heads, such as Dr. Reid Bryson (known as the Father of Climatology), openly state that research grants are driven by politics, and in order to receive a government grant you have to play the game. Topics for grants go with the political wind.

In the mid 1990s government grants were typically advertised in such a way to indicate that conclusions should show a connection to human activity as the cause for anthropogenic global warming. The result: most of the research published in journals became one-sided and this became the primary information tool for media outlets.

According to some university researchers who were former heads of their departments, if a university even mentioned *natural cycles*, they were either denied future grants, or lost grants. And it is common knowledge that United States government employees within NOAA were cautioned not to talk about natural cycles. It is well known that most university research departments live or die via the grant system. What a great way to manipulate researchers in Europe, Australia and the United States.

**Disinvited, views suppressed**



- ✦ JaFree on Danish Meteorological Institute Data Show GREENLAND ICE MASS BALANCE HAS GROWN IMPRESSIVELY Since 2014
- ✦ Burns on NOAA Data Show Outgoing Long Wave Infrared Radiation Higher This Decade – Planet Cools Slightly!
- ✦ Burns on NOAA Data Show Outgoing Long Wave Infrared Radiation Higher This Decade – Planet Cools Slightly!
- ✦ sod on Danish Meteorological Institute Data Show GREENLAND ICE MASS BALANCE HAS GROWN IMPRESSIVELY Since 2014
- ✦ sod on German Media On The Prophets Of NASA: “Prophesizing Gigantic Floods” – 200 Years In The Future!
- ✦ sod on German Handelsblatt: German Households Getting Crushed By Green Energies To The Tune Of 28 Billion Annually!
- ✦ Mike on NOAA Data Show Outgoing Long Wave Infrared Radiation Higher This Decade – Planet Cools Slightly!



Not only governments manipulate, but so do some universities in order to protect their grants. A perfect example happened in 2012 when I contacted the Eagle Hill Institute in Steuben Maine USA to see if they would be interested in a climate change lecture. It should be noted that the institute has very close ties with the University of Maine. So I indicated that my lecture would involve information on natural climate cycles, and they responded saying, “That is fine.” Then In May of 2013 they asked me to speak at their lecture series on June 29th – an invitation that I accepted. They even consequently advertised the event and posted it on their online calendar.

All seemed well as I prepared for the lecture. But then came the manipulation and suppression of views. Just four days prior to the lecture, three people from the University of Maine viewed our web site ([www.globalweatheroscillations.com](http://www.globalweatheroscillations.com)). The next morning, just 3 days prior to the June 29th lecture, I received an email from Eagle Hill stating that my “*lecture is canceled due to a staffing shortage*”.

Upon checking their web site, the calendar did show my lecture as being canceled, but carried the notation that “*we hope to have a different lecture on the 29th*”.

So what happened with the staffing shortage? A news service called “The [Maine Wire](#)” interviewed the President of Eagle Hill, and he said that the University of Maine “*felt some people in the audience may be uncomfortable hearing Mr. Dilley’s lecture*”.

### **What did they want to hide from the public?**

The IPCC and most anthropogenic believers want to maintain the belief that global warming during the past 100 years has been caused by human activity alone, and this is why most of their climate talks and lectures do not even mention prior global warming cycles.

## Videos

- ✦ [Climategate – English](#)
- ✦ [Climategate – German](#)
- ✦ [Those Who Claim Absolute Knowledge](#)
- ✦ [Dr Werner Kirstein](#)
- ✦ [Salby On CO2 vs Temp](#)
- ✦ [Meeresspiegel](#)
- ✦ [The Boy Who Cried Warming](#)
- ✦ [Baliunas on Weather Cooking](#)

## Climatic Indicators

- ✦ [ENSO BoM Report](#)
- ✦ [ENSO 3.4 Chart](#)
- ✦ [ENSO Outlook 6 Months](#)
- ✦ [ENSO Report](#)
- ✦ [Sea Ice Antarctic-Cryo](#)
- ✦ [Sea Ice Arctic AMSR-E](#)
- ✦ [Sea Ice Total – Cryo](#)
- ✦ [Sea Level – Global](#)
- ✦ [Sunspot Watch](#)
- ✦ [Temp Arctic DMI](#)
- ✦ [Temp Forecast Europe](#)
- ✦ [Temp Forecast Global](#)
- ✦ [Temp Surface AMSU Satellite](#)
- ✦ [Temp UAH Satellite](#)

Share




The politically driven United Nations IPCC and United States global warming ruse will likely end up being one of the greatest scandals of the 21st century. If left unchecked it will continue to lead the world down a dangerous path that could jeopardize the lives of millions of people. Many have been led to believe the earth is heading into catastrophic global warming. Is this a political ruse, and will it likely blindside governments within the next few years? When it comes to climate, history does repeat itself.

### Cooling has already begun

Alternating global warming and cooling cycles have historically occurred and ended like clockwork every 220 to 230 years, with nearly 4000 cycles occurring during the past half million years. The last global cooling cycle began around 1795, or about 220 years ago. If the time clock strikes on time as it has over and over again throughout history, the upcoming cooling cycle has already begun in the Arctic and Antarctic, as shown in my video, "[Is Climate Change Dangerous?](#)"

Earth has experienced 5 global cooling cycles during the past 1,000 years (soon to be 6). The initial 20 to 40 years of a new global cooling cycle are historically the coldest period, and associated with the most rapid cooling (see attached graphic). If a large volcanic eruption occurs during this period, large amounts of sulfur dioxide will be emitted into the atmosphere with the cooling



- ✦ Temp Unisys SST
- ✦ Temp Forecast US/Canada
- ✦ Sunspot Tracking Graph
- ✦ Sea Ice Arctic View
- ✦ PDO Index
- ✦ PDO index graph
- ✦ Snow/ice Cover
- ✦ Scafetta temp trend
- ✦ Surface Temp Global

### NoTricks Blogroll

- ✦ Bishop Hill
- ✦ Changement Climatique
- ✦ Climate Depot
- ✦ Donna Laframboise
- ✦ EIKE
- ✦ Lubos Motl
- ✦ Reader's Edition
- ✦ WUWT
- ✦ Wood for Trees
- ✦ Tom Nelson
- ✦ The Climate Scam
- ✦ Climategate.nl
- ✦ Der Wettermann
- ✦ China Climate Blog
- ✦ Science Skeptical
- ✦ Nonoy Oplas
- ✦ Nir Shaviv
- ✦ PDO Index Chart

Share

Twitter

Facebook

LinkedIn

Email

cycle being exacerbated by sulfate aerosols floating in the upper atmosphere ([www.cas.org/science-connections/volcano](http://www.cas.org/science-connections/volcano)). The sulfate aerosols are highly reflective and can cool the earth for 1 to 3 years, with the end result being a year of no summer in some regions of the world.

### Major volcanoes during cooling periods

Of the past 5 cooling cycles dating back to 900 AD, 4 were associated with strong volcanic eruptions during the initial 15 to 25 years of the cooling cycles. The volcanic explosive index (VEI) for these eruptions were between 5 and 7 on a VEI scale ranging from 1 to 8. The last occurrence was in 1815, when VEI 6 Tambora erupted. The combination of this massive volcanic eruption occurring some 15 to 20 years into the new global cooling cycle was instrumental in causing the year of no summer in 1816. During the next several years, nearly one third of Europe perished from famine, plague and civil unrest. Back then the earth had a population of 1 billion to feed; today there are 7 billion.

Similar cooling cycles and eruptions occurred in the year 1600 when VEI 6 Huaynaputina (Peru) occurred about 20 years into the new cooling cycle. In 1350 Rangitoto (New Zealand) about 25 years into a cooling cycle, and in the year 834 Eldgja (Iceland) a great VEI 6 eruption occurred about 25 years into the new cooling cycle. The current global warming cycle is now ending.

Shouldn't governments around the world be preparing for a major event that is by far more dangerous than any warming cycle could possibly be?



*Posted in Cooling/Temperature, Scepticism | 131 Responses*

131 responses to “Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees “Were Cautioned Not To Talk About

- ✦ CFACT
- ✦ Climategate 2 mails
- ✦ GWPF – Benny Peiser
- ✦ Die kalte Sonne
- ✦ 1000+ papers
- ✦ Bob Tisdale
- ✦ Tallbloke's Talkshop
- ✦ toryaardvark
- ✦ Judith Curry
- ✦ Klimazwieback
- ✦ Kiwi Thinker
- ✦ Skeptical Science
- ✦ Pop-Tech Resource
- ✦ Ice Age Cometh!
- ✦ Wheat Belly Blog
- ✦ Weather Action
- ✦ 38 pause excuses
- ✦ Polar Vortex Myth
- ✦ Climate Common Sense
- ✦ Climate Dispatch
- ✦ Wamists' View Of Dissenters
- ✦ Climate Change Predictions
- ✦ Wo bleibt

### Categories

- ✦ Abnormal Climate Psych
- ✦ Activism
- ✦ Agriculture
- ✦ Alternative Energy

Share



## Natural Cycles””



*Robin Pittwood* 26. August 2015 at 12:38 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Great article. Glad I live in the sunny South Pacific. By the way, the volcano referred to in New Zealand is Rangitoto.



*Der arktische Polarwinter hat begonnen: Dauerfrost nördlich 80°N – Grönlandeis wächst 2015 kräftig! | wobleibtdieglobaleerwaermung* 26.

August 2015 at 3:49 PM | [Permalink](#)

[...] <http://notrickszone.com/2015/08/26/suppression-of-science-former-noaa-meteorologist-says-employees-w&#8230;> [...]



*goldminor* 26. August 2015 at 4:44 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Great article,I would bet my last dollar that David Dilley,s assessment of the real future trend is correct. As a complete amateur, I also arrived at the conclusion that part of the ‘Why’ of a grand minimum is that changes in the Sun during the event are able to trigger seismic/volcanic events on the Earth. Check out the history of the New Madrid Fault in the US. The known large events that have struck on that fault line all correlate with a grand minimum cooling event, or with the Gleissberg cycle. The last rumbling on the New Madrid was in the early 1900s during a Gleissberg cycle. I think that the odds of experiencing another New Madrid quake in the next 20 years are greatly increased. This may even be the correct explanation of why there has been increased activity of quakes striking in Oklahoma and Kansas, plus in states east of those two states. I do not think that fracking has been the cause of the many quakes in these locations. Even the Iceland eruption is likely part of the

- ✦ Antarctic
- ✦ Arctic
- ✦ Climate Bet For Charity
- ✦ Climate Politics
- ✦ CO2 and GHG
- ✦ Cooling/Temperature
- ✦ Drought and Deserts
- ✦ Glaciers
- ✦ Gore
- ✦ Green Follies
- ✦ Greenpeace
- ✦ Hockey Team
- ✦ Humour
- ✦ Hurricanes/Tornados
- ✦ Innovation
- ✦ IPCC
- ✦ Lifestyles of the Rich and Alarmist
- ✦ Media / Bias
- ✦ Misc.
- ✦ Models
- ✦ Monthly summaries
- ✦ Nuclear energy
- ✦ Oceans
- ✦ Paleo-climatology
- ✦ Pollution
- ✦ Russian Climate Science
- ✦ Scepticism
- ✦ Sea Levels
- ✦ Solar
- ✦ Solar Sciences
- ✦ Stupid Predictions

Share



shifting trends, along with the moderately strong eruptions which have taken place this year.



*DirkH* 26. August 2015 at 5:01 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Hey at least Gavin's jolly GISS Gang will assure us that it's the hottest time ever while we're trying to find more heating fuel!



*Robin Pittwood* 26. August 2015 at 8:51 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

It is a good time to buy coal shares Dirk. Price is low at the moment, and would be expected to rise as it gets colder. That's if you can get some ahead of Mr Soros that is.



*DirkH* 27. August 2015 at 9:48 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

You haven't seen low yet. Wait til October and then some as the carnage unfolds.

As to Soros: Yes, we noticed.



*on Black* 26. August 2015 at 7:13 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Is there any backup for the NOAA claim? "...United States government employees within NOAA were cautioned not to talk about natural cycles."



*David Dilley* 27. August 2015 at 12:44 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

If you remember the head of NASA began talking about natural cycles a few years ago, then 1 week later he would no longer talk about this

- ✧ [Tectonics/Volcanoes](#)
- ✧ [Uncategorized](#)
- ✧ [We're To Blame](#)
- ✧ [Weather](#)

## Archives

- ✧ [September 2015](#)
- ✧ [August 2015](#)
- ✧ [July 2015](#)
- ✧ [June 2015](#)
- ✧ [May 2015](#)
- ✧ [April 2015](#)
- ✧ [March 2015](#)
- ✧ [February 2015](#)
- ✧ [January 2015](#)
- ✧ [December 2014](#)
- ✧ [November 2014](#)
- ✧ [October 2014](#)
- ✧ [September 2014](#)
- ✧ [August 2014](#)
- ✧ [July 2014](#)
- ✧ [June 2014](#)
- ✧ [May 2014](#)
- ✧ [April 2014](#)
- ✧ [March 2014](#)
- ✧ [February 2014](#)
- ✧ [January 2014](#)
- ✧ [December 2013](#)
- ✧ [November 2013](#)

Share



subject...

And yes employees of NOAA have been cautioned not to talk about climate change, especially cycles. I cannot name names, they are still employed with NOAA.

Also...most television meteorologist have been told not to talk about natural cycles as a possible cause of global warming. This has been done not only by their employers, but also the American Meteorological Society (AMS) has pushed strongly to quiet the TV meteorologists.

Hope this has helped.



*Don Black* 27. August 2015 at 2:31 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David, I'm sorry, that's not enough evidence to rely on your assertion. I am a hard over cynic of the climate alarmism, but need more than that. I cited your comment on another blog then took it down for lack of back up evidence. Sorry, your response does not add enough support even for this cynic.



*Paul Vaughan* 27. August 2015 at 6:04 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Are you kidding Don Black??

They don't even admit that their ERSSTv4 "bias" "corrections" match the decadal IPO (interdecadal pacific oscillation)!

[http://s1.postimg.org/thgs72a7j/IPO\\_BIAS\\_ERSSTV4\\_HAD1](http://s1.postimg.org/thgs72a7j/IPO_BIAS_ERSSTV4_HAD1)

- ✦ October 2013
- ✦ September 2013
- ✦ August 2013
- ✦ July 2013
- ✦ June 2013
- ✦ May 2013
- ✦ April 2013
- ✦ March 2013
- ✦ February 2013
- ✦ January 2013
- ✦ December 2012
- ✦ November 2012
- ✦ October 2012
- ✦ September 2012
- ✦ August 2012
- ✦ July 2012
- ✦ June 2012
- ✦ May 2012
- ✦ April 2012
- ✦ March 2012
- ✦ February 2012
- ✦ January 2012
- ✦ December 2011
- ✦ November 2011
- ✦ October 2011
- ✦ September 2011
- ✦ August 2011
- ✦ July 2011
- ✦ June 2011
- ✦ May 2011
- ✦ April 2011

Share



That's a fatal error. V4 should have been retracted by now.



*empiresentry* 2. September 2015 at 9:02 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Here is a call for coordinated effort to shut down any weatherperson who dares to say otherwise.

<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/01/20/407995/foreca-the-facts-exposes-americas-climate-denier-tv-weathermen/>

A new campaign, Forecast the Facts (www.forecastthefacts.org), launches Sunday to pressure TV meteorologists to inform their viewers about climate change. The launch coincides with the kick-off of the American Meteorological Society's (AMS) annual meeting in New Orleans, LA.

“This is an important moment in the history of the AMS,” said Daniel Souweine, the campaign’s director. “It’s well known that large numbers of meteorologists are climate change deniers. It’s essential that the AMS Council resist pressure from these deniers and pass the strong statement currently under consideration.”

How many examples do you need? Perhaps the adventures of the 3 researchers including Dr. Soon whose crime was the audacity to try to find out why ALL the climate change models fail...no through coordinated effort, his career and job are gone.

- ✦ [March 2011](#)
- ✦ [February 2011](#)
- ✦ [January 2011](#)
- ✦ [December 2010](#)
- ✦ [November 2010](#)
- ✦ [October 2010](#)
- ✦ [September 2010](#)
- ✦ [August 2010](#)
- ✦ [July 2010](#)
- ✦ [June 2010](#)
- ✦ [May 2010](#)
- ✦ [April 2010](#)

## Die kalte Sonne – German bestseller!



## Meta

- ✦ [Log in](#)
- ✦ [Entries RSS](#)
- ✦ [Comments RSS](#)

Share





David Dilley 27. August 2015 at 6:08 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Possibly the link below will shed some light upon government censorship. This particular article refers to Dr. James Hansen former head of NASA being censored by the government. This particular censorship actually occurred under the Bush administration and to his energy program. But all near, close and within the government know this is still occurring because we now have a different administration, but one with a strong policy.

The link below describes part of what I am referring to.

<http://www.ucsusa.org/our-work/center-science-and-democracy/promoting-scientific-integrity/james-hansen.html#.Vd8weJeUL8c>

Also..a couple years ago I was on a climate change discussion panel in Boulder Colorado, two other climatologists/meteorologists, one from NOAA and a glacier expert from Colorado State University had different views than I. When I asked them about the warm cycles 1,000 years ago, 7 thousand years ago etc., their answer was; we do not recognize them.

Now as for TV meteorologists... probably cannot get a now working meteorologist to put their name out for fear of losing their position. One did at the Weather Channel a few years back. I have heard first hand about this, and that they would lose their job.

---


P Gosselin 27. August 2015 at 6:28 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

## Seitwert



29.08.15

## Temperature



Share





Lets also not forget that one prominent weather-lady once called for the decertification of any meteorologist who did not agree with the AGW alarmism.



*Don Black* 27. August 2015 at 6:54 PM | [Permalink](#)

Pierre, David et al, I don't disagree with your observations, but it is all anecdotal. Evidence that NOAA was restricting it institutionally is important. It would color all their reports, but the key is evidence.



*P Gosselin* 28. August 2015 at 11:52 AM | [Permalink](#)

Jo Nova is now bringing it up:  
<http://joannenova.com.au/2015/08/former-noaa-meteorologist-tells-of-years-of-censorship-to-hide-the-effect-of-natural-cycles/>



*Jeff* 27. August 2015 at 7:13 PM | [Permalink](#)

This censorship and manipulation is part and parcel of Media Matters' purpose:

*“Media Matters for America is a ... progressive research and information*

Share



*center dedicated to comprehensively monitoring, analyzing, and correcting conservative misinformation in the U.S. media.”*

I would put it that they are a biased, progressive research and information center dedicated to disseminating ultra-liberal misinformation in the U.S. media. Another Soros organization.



*P Gosselin* 27. August 2015 at 8:56 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Remember this?

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/sep/23/robert-kennedy-jr-we-need-laws-punish-global-warmi/>



*David Appell* 31. August 2015 at 3:31 AM | [Permalink](#)

Robert Kennedy Jr is as wrong about that as he is about vaccines.



*H. D. Hoese* 2. September 2015 at 8:39 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Evidence is important, but check the definition of anecdote. There was a run of using it between ‘only’ and ‘data’ as a pejorative about

Share



observations. I heard first hand evidence from fishery managers that the reason for ignoring natural cycles is that you could not control them, unlike fishing. This was before the hockey stick and the treatment of those claiming ability to control climate as normal.

One example was “...human actions would be considered harmful unless proven otherwise.” (Restrepo, V. R., P. M. Mace and F. M Serchuk. 1999. The precautionary approach: a new paradigm or business as usual? pp. 61-70, IN, Our Living Oceans, Report on the status of U. S. living marine resources. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-F/SPO-41. )

While I never heard direct evidence in the grant world, an examination of numerous papers in marine ecology and fisheries would show bias against natural cycles. One example is the “Dead Zone,” which is not metabolically dead, admitted in some of the main advocate’s papers if you read the fine print. More properly called a hypoxic area, the one off Louisiana is seasonal but the discipline followed the climate treatment pattern, with nitrogen as the demon. Noted after the Mississippi River floods of 1973-75 as caused by stratification, it turned to emphasis on increasing nitrogen levels, ultimately involving advocacy against nitrogen from the National Academy of Sciences. Stratification has been restored in the literature as the primary driver, with nitrogen as a modifier. The use of spring Mississippi River nitrogen as a (poor) predictor is still used, a recent example of the problem—

<http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1307/1307.8064.pdf>

Again, as another example of the confusion of science and advocacy— (Rabalais, N. N., R. E. Turner and W. J. Wiseman, Jr. 2002. Gulf of Mexico Hypoxia, A.K.A, “The Dead Zone.” Annual Review of Ecology

Share



and Systematics. 33:235-263, concluded “Fortunately, ...decrease(s) (of) excess nutrient loads proceeded without complete scientific consensus.”.)

At least there was evidence that nitrogen levels did increase and does push systems into hypertrophy, but its treatment followed a pattern like the climate development which overshadowed it. I suspect similar events occurred in many other cases based on observations in marine science covering over a half century.



*SOPPRIMERE LA VERITA' - IL PROSSIMO CICLO DI  
RAFFREDDAMENTO GLOBALE : Attività Solare ( Solar Activity ) 26.*

August 2015 at 9:44 PM | [Permalink](#)

[...] Fonte: NoTricksZone [...]



*Joe Chang* 26. August 2015 at 10:05 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“to prove human activities and the burning of fossil fuels ...”  
Perhaps it is more appropriate to say: “assume that human activities ..., figure out how to fudge the models and adjust the number to support this, and then speculate on the horrible consequences” despite the fact that warming might actually be good, but unfortunately its not coming because the original premise was baloney to begin with?



*mauri ses. italy* 26. August 2015 at 10:11 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

great and deeply interesting piece, it has been immediately translated into italian and it's now posted on – <http://www.attivitasolare.com> –

Share





*P Gosselin* 26. August 2015 at 11:00 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Molto bene e grazie



*Ruth Hertzberg* 26. August 2015 at 11:40 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

This article makes a lot of sense to me. What I don't understand is why so many individuals want to prove that it is getting warmer.



*Harry Dale Huffman* 27. August 2015 at 12:32 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

The short answer is, because they believe that climate science is too big, and too settled, to fail.

All of our institutions have been suborned by the global warming narrative (it should never have been taken seriously within climate science, and scientists in other, related fields, especially physicists, should have never let it prosper, especially before the public). At its root, the global warming narrative is due to a general, gross incompetence among all physical scientists, foremost those in positions of authority over other scientists. It is the yet-unadmitted, and unadmittable, utter failure of (global) climate science, for none of it is true, and cannot be saved. For all of those in authority, in any affected field from education to the media, it is a matter of absolute power corrupting absolutely. It is now like a train going at high speed, and it will not just wreck countless lives (it has been doing that, to honest and competent scientists' careers, for the last 25 years and more, since the inception of the scientifically and politically criminal IPCC), its inevitable crash will likely lead to World War III—there is

Share



simply too much general weakness of mind and character, too much intellectual division and confusion, for the incipient tyrants and terrorists of the world to ignore; they will sniff the blood in the air as the predators they are (that, in fact, is what the radical Left—the Insane Left, as I call them, since Obama came to power—is doing now: Attacking the US and the West, supposedly in the name of justice and sustainability, but really only for power to coerce the masses to their will).

Too-long-nurtured dogma in science—going all the way back to Darwin and the fundamentally false paradigm, of uniformitarian, undirected evolution of everything science can observe in the world—has bred first general incompetence, and now the current political power struggle for dominance, using the hysterical global warming narrative. Society—civilization—cannot live on lies, just as it cannot live on deep divisions (“a house divided against itself cannot stand”).



*vdc* 27. August 2015 at 3:20 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

I have this same question. They call us nut cases for not falling into lock step but there are so many unanswered questions with the biggest being WHY?



*Kenneth Simmons* 27. August 2015 at 8:41 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

An oldies song goes, “Money, money, money, money”. I believe the songs answers the why question quite nicely.



*DirkH* 27. August 2015 at 10:31 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



WHY?

Because NWO / UN World Government.

The idea was always to repeat the successful trial balloon of “The Montreal protocol ban of Halon gases” with CO<sub>2</sub> – giving the UN ultimate control over every country’s energy sector, and therefore, ultimate power.

Of course the Montreal ban looks, just like warmunism, like a hoax today... There’s not much science in anything non-classified these days...



*David Appell* 31. August 2015 at 3:32 AM | [Permalink](#) |

[Reply](#)

WHY? Anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. (And black carbon.)



*David Appell* 28. August 2015 at 5:58 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

It is wrong because our climate is not very sensitive to changes in solar intensity.

This is easy to estimate. The simplest climate model treats the Earth as a rotating sphere with no GHGs. That leads to the extremely well known equation for Earth’s surface temperature

$$(1-\text{albedo})S/4 = \epsilon \cdot \sigma \cdot T^4$$

where S is solar intensity and T is its surface temperature. Sigma is the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, and epsilon the atmosphere’s (gray) emissivity.

Share



For  $S=1360 \text{ W/m}^2$ ,  $\text{albedo}=0.3$  and  $\text{epsilon}=1$ , we find  $T=255 \text{ K}$  — the temperature of Earth with no atmosphere. It's not far off from the observed  $T=288 \text{ K}$ . The difference is the greenhouse effect.

Differentiating, we find

$$dT/dS = T/4S = 0.05 \text{ K}/(\text{W/m}^2).$$

That's small. Especially compared to  $\text{CO}_2$ . The Sun's irradiance over a solar cycles changes by only 1.5-2  $\text{W/m}^2$ . It was, at most, 3  $\text{W/m}^2$  lower during the Maunder Minimum.

No realistic change in the Sun's output can compete with decadal warming from  $\text{CO}_2$ .



*S Allnutt* 28. August 2015 at 9:35 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

It is strange then that others link the onset and end of ice ages to changes in solar activity. How do you explain the phenomena?



*DirkH* 28. August 2015 at 4:04 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

There were no ice ages. Nor anything else remotely interesting in the past. A figment of the imagination of the Big Oil funded denialists. Global Warming models prove that climate was eternally benign before the invention of the steam engine, which was given to James watt in exchange for his soul by Satan. Who is coal powered. (Hell is just one big underground burning coal seam.)

---

---

*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 6:23 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share





S Allnutt wrote:

“It is strange then that others link the onset and end of ice ages to changes in solar activity.”

Wrong. They are attributed to Milankovitch forcings and resulting ice-albedo feedbacks and CO2 feedbacks.

---



*cheshirered* 28. August 2015 at 11:49 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David Appell 28. August 2015 at 5:58 AM

“No realistic change in the Sun’s output can compete with decadal warming from CO2.”

\*\*\*\*\*

David, for a so-called ‘expert’ it’s astonishing you’re willing to publicly post such unutterable drivel. Thanks for the laugh.

---



*AndyG55* 28. August 2015 at 1:21 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“for a so-called ‘expert’”

only by himself..!

Everyone else thinks he’s an ingorant clown.

---

---

Share





*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 6:25 PM | [Permalink](#)

| [Reply](#)

cheshirered wrote:

“David, for a so-called ‘expert’ it’s astonishing you’re willing to publicly post such unutterable drivel.”

In my world, calling an argument “drivel” necessitates that I disprove the argument first.

But clearly not in your world.

---



*Bernd Felsche* 28. August 2015 at 12:06 PM | [Permalink](#) |

[Reply](#)

... **assuming** that albedo is constant.

It isn't. Nor is the spectral content of the sun as nearly-invariant as TSI at the top of the atmosphere. Albedo and (depth of) absorption are dependent on spectral content.

The real world isn't nearly as grey as modelled.

Nor is it as thermodynamically simple as modelled by the above simplistic equations. Nowhere near that simple. The model is at best a teaching model in Physics 100 for instruction about radiation.

Such a model is **unsuitable** as a basis for making decisions that affect peoples' lives. The model omits about 99% of applicable thermodynamics; 100% of fluid mechanics and 100% of the

Share



effects of a living planet that e.g. absorbs energy and stores it chemically and alters the physical state influencing the thermodynamics and fluid mechanics.

---



[David Appell](#) 29. August 2015 at 6:27 PM | [Permalink](#)

| [Reply](#)

Bernd: Read again — I said, “in the simplest climate model.” This model is used as a heuristic device to see that, to a first approximation, the climate’s sensitivity to solar changes is small. I’m hardly proposing this model be used for policy decisions.

BTW, this model does predict the pre-GHG surface temperature (288 K) to within 12%. Do you have a simple model that can do that?



[Bernd Felsche](#) 30. August 2015 at 5:35 AM |

[Permalink](#)

That’s not a “*pre-GHG surface temperature*” David.

It’s *argument from ignorance* to attribute those (meaningless) “12%” to GHG.

It’s ignoring most physical factors that actually translate irradiation into “temperature”; factors like thermal capacity; and factors that modulate surface insolation such as cloud albedo and depth of atmosphere.

Share



Also; I do know when a model is **too simple**.

---



*David Appell* 31. August 2015 at 3:35 AM |  
[Permalink](#)

Bernd wrote: “It’s argument from ignorance to attribute those (meaningless) “12%” to GHG.”

That’s confirmed by a more detailed and complete study:

“Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>: Principal Control Knob Governing Earth’s Temperature,” Laciš et al, Science (15 October 2010) Vol. 330 no. 6002 pp. 356-359  
<http://pubs.giss.nasa.gov/abs/la09300d.html>

See especially their Figure 2 (p 358).

---



*Bernd Felsche* 2. September 2015 at 7:31 AM |  
[Permalink](#)

David Appell:

*That’s confirmed by a more detailed and complete study:*

Nothing of the sort. The paper assumes the magnitude of GH effect and its existence. It doesn’t TEST it. Not against real-world observations.

Share



The paper *tests* nothing at all. It's full of e.g. GISS ModelE runs.

Further, the paper contains absurd statements in its abstract:

*Ample physical evidence shows that carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is the single most important climate-relevant greenhouse gas in Earth's atmosphere. **This is because CO<sub>2</sub>, ..., does not condense and precipitate from the atmosphere at current climate temperatures, whereas water vapor can and does.** Noncondensing greenhouse gases, which account for 25% of the total terrestrial greenhouse effect, thus serve to provide the stable temperature structure that sustains the current levels of atmospheric water vapor and clouds via feedback processes that account for the remaining 75% of the greenhouse effect. **Without the radiative forcing supplied by CO<sub>2</sub> and the other noncondensing greenhouse gases, the terrestrial greenhouse would collapse, plunging the global***

Share



*climate into an icebound Earth state.*

How on Earth (and above it) does the majority of the atmosphere, composed of O<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>, cool after being heated by the surface and convecting upwards, out of contact with the surface if there were no “greenhouse gases” at all?

---



PeterK 28. August 2015 at 1:02 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David Appell strikes again. Always love your posts. Thanks for my morning laugh as I roll on the floor in hysterics.



AndyG55 28. August 2015 at 1:26 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Only a complete moron thinks that TSI is the only variable of the sun..

Oh.. its David Appell... I was right !



Gordon J. Fulks, PhD 31. August 2015 at 10:30 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David Appell is a journalist who is thoroughly sold on climate hysteria. Because he has a scientific education but worked as a journalist his whole life, you will find that the best he can do is repeat the details of the Global Warming paradigm without deviation and without any critical

Share



thinking. He is perhaps the only person who still defends Michael Mann's Hockey Stick.

---



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:17 AM |  
[Permalink](#)

“He is perhaps the only person who still defends Michael Mann's Hockey Stick.”

A hockey stick has been found over 36 times by now:

<http://davidappell.blogspot.com/2015/08/36-hockey-sticks-and-counting.html>

which isn't surprising, because basic physics and mathematics show how easily a hockey stick curve is obtained:

<http://davidappell.blogspot.com/2015/08/more-about-generating-hockey-sticks.html>

The real surprise would be if the data DO NOT show hockey sticks.



*Bernd Felsche* 2. September 2015 at 6:16 AM |  
[Permalink](#)

**Surprise!**

---

Share





empiresentry 2. September 2015 at 9:15 PM |

[Permalink](#)

thumbs up to Berndt Felsche

---

---



Konrad 29. August 2015 at 6:55 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

”That leads to the extremely well known equation for Earth’s surface temperature

David,  
that 255K figure for “surface without radiative atmosphere” is utterly wrong. It is derived by simply imputing 240 w/m<sup>2</sup> of average solar insolation into the Stefan-Boltzmann equation with absorptivity and emissivity set to unity. But this effectively treats our deep SW translucent oceans as SW opaque and constantly illuminated and ignores that hemispherical SW absorptivity is asymmetric with hemispherical LWIR emissivity for water.

71% of our planets surface is an extreme short wave selective surface, nowhere remotely close to a “near blackbody”.

Empirical experiment shows that sun alone could drive the oceans to around 335K were it not for cooling by our radiatively cooled atmosphere. A better estimate of global average “surface without radiative atmosphere” is 312K. Given the current average is 288K, this tells us the net effect or our radiatively cooled atmosphere is surface cooling not warming. As there is

Share



no net atmospheric radiative GHE, global warming due to CO<sub>2</sub> is a physical impossibility.

That inane 255K figure is the permanent burning shame of the climastrologists. They got the “basic physics” of their “settled science” utterly wrong.

---



*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 6:30 PM | [Permalink](#)  
| [Reply](#)

Konrad: Again, I said “the simplest climate model.” It is....s-i-m-p-l-e. It’s a heuristic device, a first guess, a simplification used to begin working on a problem.

It predicts the Earth’s surface temperature to within 12%. So it has that going for it, and it suggests what much more detailed work confirms: the climate is not very sensitive to changes in solar output.

---



*Konrad* 29. August 2015 at 11:29 PM | [Permalink](#)

David,  
that “simplest climate model” is rubbish. For the most critical “surface without radiative atmosphere” calculation it returns an 80K error for 71% of the planets surface. 80K!

The utterly wrong 255K figure is the foundation for the whole hoax. It is spread from one side of the Internet to the other. It is in hard copy papers and textbooks. The shame can never be hidden. Going

Share



full “flappy hands” about complexities will do no good. There is a massive fist-biting mistake in the very foundation of your hoax.

As to your repeated claim that this “simplest model” can prove solar variability has no influence on climate? You are just being ridiculous. If you don’t treat the oceans as an extreme SW selective surface, how can you possibly model the effect of cloud cover changes or solar spectral variance on ocean heat accumulation?

For our oceans, the shorter the incident wavelength, the deeper it penetrates and the more it heats. 1 watt of UV has a greater heating effect than 1 watt of SW. The use of TSI variance to dismiss solar climate effects is clearly disingenuous. Solar spectral variance is far more pronounced, and to the oceans, this is what is critical.

Climastrologists have proven beyond doubt they don’t understand how the sun heats the oceans. Therefore they don’t understand climate on this planet.



*David Appell* 30. August 2015 at 9:17 PM | [Permalink](#)

Konrad wrote:  
“that “simplest climate model” is rubbish. For the most critical “surface without radiative

Share



atmosphere” calculation it returns an 80K error for 71% of the planets surface. 80K!”

False. For albedo=0.3 and emissivity=1, that baby model predicts a surface temperature of 255 K.

At least get the simple things right, Konrad.



*David Appell* 30. August 2015 at 9:24 PM |

[Permalink](#)

Konrad wrote:

“For our oceans, the shorter the incident wavelength, the deeper it penetrates and the more it heats. 1 watt of UV has a greater heating effect than 1 watt of SW.”

When we talk about climate sensitivity, we mean the warming after equilibrium has been reestablished — after all feedbacks have played out.

For that discussion, a Watt is a Watt. It’s a Watt added to the climate system; it will raise the temperature accordingly. Whether that Watt first goes into the ocean or into the atmosphere, it is, at equilibrium, the same Watt.

So, no, spectral changes in solar irradiance don’t affect climate solar sensitivity. Climate sensitivity depends on energy balance, and the planet will heat

Share



up until the energy imbalance created by a forcing is restored to equilibrium.

---



Konrad 1. September 2015 at 12:39 AM |

[Permalink](#)

Fervent AGW propagandists destroys last shreds of credibility defending inane 255K “surface without radiative atmosphere figure”.

Priceless! Thanks for the screen-shots David 😊

Here are just two simple experiments that show that liquid water is an extreme SW selective surface, not a “near blackbody” –

<http://oi61.tinypic.com/or5rv9.jpg>

<http://oi62.tinypic.com/zn7a4y.jpg>

– In each, the samples have equal ability to absorb SW and emit LWIR, the only difference is the depth of SW absorption. Equal SW illumination of the samples returns very different temperatures, but attempting to model using the S-B equation does not.

Of course engineers have known for decades about SW translucent surfaces and solar heating. Only climastrologists would be so stupid as to ignore the engineering basics. This stuff is spacecraft thermal control 101. Even swimming pool cover manufactures know it. But not David Appell and the climastrologists!

Share



Sure all watts are equal, the question is delay (accumulation) of energy within the climate system. Penetration depth for UV causes greater delay in the oceans than it does for SW. Dare I say “It’s basic physics”? 😊

There is a radiative GHE on this planet, but it is in the oceans not the atmosphere. Climate on planet Ocean is simple –

The sun heats the oceans.  
The atmosphere cools the oceans.  
Radiative gases cool the atmosphere.

On this ocean planet “surface without radiative atmosphere” is well over 300K. You have spent years defending garbage David.



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 9:45 PM | [Permalink](#)

Konrad: The approximation made in climate science is the atmosphere is a blackbody in the infrared, not in the shortwave. Huge difference.



*Konrad* 3. September 2015 at 1:25 AM | [Permalink](#)

“Konrad: The approximation made in climate science is the atmosphere is a blackbody in the infrared, not in the shortwave. Huge difference.”

Share



Oh no you don't David!

Everyone knows your tricks, trying to weasel away from the subject at hand when your lack of science is exposed.

My claim was that the inane climastrologists treated the SW illuminated surface of our planet as a near blackbody, thus falsely treating the oceans as SW opaque and constantly illuminated to obtain their false "255K for surface without radiative atmosphere" figure. You have even posted the maths behind that false figure showing that it was for solar illumination of the surface.

You don't get to put words in my mouth. You don't get to imply that I ever claimed the climastrologists were treating the atmosphere as a blackbody in the SW band. I claimed they were stupid enough to treat the SW selective surface of our oceans as a blackbody in the SW band, and you do not get to change that claim.

I claim the oceans are an extreme SW selective surface and  $240 \text{ w/m}^2$  (delivered intermittently) would drive them to 335K were it not for cooling by our radiatively cooled atmosphere. The record shows your attempt to refute this has you pointing to the misuse of the Stefan-Boltzmann equation which treats the oceans as SW opaque.

---

---

Share





*Maarten Woerlee* 27. August 2015 at 1:13 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Great article with the most important part on the end :

Shouldn't governments around the world be preparing for a major event that is by far more dangerous than any warming cycle could possibly be?

Who knows?



*The Climate Change Debate Thread - Page 5110* 27. August 2015 at 1:48 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] [...]



*Pointman* 27. August 2015 at 12:55 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Smashing article David. It's good to see an insider with the guts to speak out.

<https://thepointman.wordpress.com/2015/08/26/its-not-rocket-science-its-a-matter-of-conscience/>

Pointman



*Eliza* 27. August 2015 at 1:41 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

This should be a major news story, not necessarily here but MAJOR mainstream. This guy was an insider in NOAA and highly qualified, this will be believed. The TEAM is probably trembling like hell hoping this fellow does not get close to MSM media...

Share





*DirkH* 27. August 2015 at 10:33 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

These days no “MSM” would report anything truthful. I refuse to call them MSM, they are not the mainstream anymore, they are a vicious government propaganda entity (of the true government – CFR, Bilderbergers, Fabians etc – not of the elected puppets) – I prefer the term hatemedia now. I call the google news frontpage “The Evil Blog”.



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:18 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

The media are all conspired against you, huh Dirk?



*DirkH* 2. September 2015 at 12:49 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Yes, they are, David. I can tell you the owners of the German and American media blocs and their connections to CFR/Bilderberger/political parties circles. In case you wondered who calls the shots. This is of course nothing new. Hearst is famous for inciting the 1898 attack on the failing Spanish empire. NY times is famous for lying about the Holodomor.



*David Appell* 28. August 2015 at 5:49 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Eliza: Why is this guy “highly qualified?”

Share



Where is his CV?

Where is his list of research publications?



*nightspore* 29. August 2015 at 3:17 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Dilley is talking about research being deflected away from its normal course by bullying tactics from higher-ups. Why does he need a “list of research publications” to tell us about that? And why are you seizing on that point – if it’s not to deflect attention away from the basic subject of this posting?

(And why is someone with a Ph.D. in particle physics from a reputable institution reduced to shilling for Stalinist thugs?)



*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 6:34 PM | [Permalink](#)  
| [Reply](#)

Dilley needs research publications because that’s where colleagues and experts go through claims very carefully and affirm or refute them. It’s where science actually takes place.

No real scientist is going to watch Dilley’s little video and take the time to critique it, let alone ever cite it, because Dilley himself hasn’t cared to take the time to carefully lay out his arguments with supporting data and evidence, as he would have to in a scientific paper submitted to a journal.

Anyone can make a video. Writing and publishing one’s scientific ideas is difficult.

Share





*P Gosselin* 29. August 2015 at 8:01 PM |

[Permalink](#)

Difficult especially if the referees are closed minded and will accept no outcome other than one they are hired and paid to promote. The Climategate e-mails show this clear as day. You're very naïve when it comes to institutionalized science.



*P Gosselin* 29. August 2015 at 8:04 PM |

[Permalink](#)

Don't wish to rain on your fantasies, David, but I know for a fact that a number of scientists have viewed it.



*AndyG55* 30. August 2015 at 12:01 AM |

[Permalink](#)

OMG, still the moronic peer-review journal meme.

Peer-review is NOT about science, its about journals. !!

The video is out there for ALL to review.. peers and everyone..

It IS PUBLISHED. !!

*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 9:47 PM | [Permalink](#)

Share





Pierre: Viewing a video is hardly taking it seriously.

Serious scientists publish in the peer reviewed literature. Dilley is not a serious scientist.



*P Gosselin* 2. September 2015 at 9:50 AM |

[Permalink](#)

I think he explained it very well in a previous comment, which of course you did not bother to read – obviously. Better to read first before blowing off hot air. Peer-review is not at all the gold-standard of science. There's lots of peer-reviewed literature out there that is nothing but garbage, and un-peer-reviewed literature that is turning out to be totally correct. Take cholesterol for example. For decades the “peer-reviewed” literature said butter, coconut oil and eggs, etc. were bad for you. Today we are finding out that those who claimed otherwise, but could not get past the peer-review process, are turning out to be right. The peer-review argument is what is used when you have no arguments left. It's an appeal to authority. Frankly it's best to just piss off with it.



*David Appell* 30. August 2015 at 9:14 PM | [Permalink](#)

| [Reply](#)

Share



The video is self-published. Anyone can do that now.

---



*Mauri Ses. - Italy* 28. August 2015 at 9:59 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

There is no chance the (horrible) mainstream media will pay attention anytime soon to any person moving outside the borders of the huge GW lie! But still David Dilley is gaining lots of attention over the internet these days and apart from his last articles posted here and few other 'climate sites', (4 ex. <http://www.attivitasolare.com> in italy and iceagenow.info in the us) the US news site WND has just published two days ago an omnicomprehensive piece about global cooling (is it turning into a "movement"?) and D. Dilley is leading the "cold front": there are almost 600 comments to that article, the gc issue is getting some attention for sure – <http://www.wnd.com/2015/08/mankind-threatened-by-global-cooling-not-warming/>



*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 7:18 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

WND plays to the choir. No one else takes it seriously.



*Mauri Ses. - Italy* 29. August 2015 at 9:37 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

It might be so but still the choir looks pretty big! The 'no one else' group is still too busy diving (and drowning) into the big GW lie!

---

*AndyG55* 29. August 2015 at 11:57 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share





“No one else takes it seriously.”

David lives in a maze of mirrors. 😊



*”GLOBAL COOLING’ – World Temp Forecast 2019-2150 ‘Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former #NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees “Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles”” | Telcomil Intl Products and Services 27. August 2015 at 3:27 PM | Permalink*

[...] Sourced through Scoop.it from: notrickszone.com [...]



*Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees “Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles” | NOT A LOT OF PEOPLE KNOW THAT 27. August 2015 at 8:54 PM | Permalink*

[...] <http://notrickszone.com/2015/08/26/suppression-of-science-former-noaa-meteorologist-says-employees-w&#8230;> [...]



*Peter Wells 27. August 2015 at 11:25 PM | Permalink | Reply*

I suspect another example of suppression. See the website

<http://solarscience.msfc.nasa.gov/SunspotCycle.shtml>.

Solar cycles are a prime cause of climate cycles. Note the transfer of Dr. David Hathaway. For a while the website was updated every couple of months. Now, no update since March, and no new person to update it.

Share





*empiresentry* 2. September 2015 at 9:21 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Thanks for link.

Most interesting was the Cycle 24 prediction.



*Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees “Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles” | The Next Grand Minimum* 28. August 2015 at 1:11 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] post is [HERE](#). Suppressing the Truth – the Next Global Cooling [...]



*David Appell* 28. August 2015 at 5:48 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Isn't it odd how cooling is supposed to be JUST around the corner.... Yet it never is. So people like Dilley just keep pushing it out a few years, then, in a few years, a few years more.

There is no cooling in our future until our emissions of GHGs cease. Period.



*ClimateOtter* 28. August 2015 at 10:17 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Lead the way, lil' Davey. Sell your car, shut off the heat to your home, refuse to buy anything which generated GHGs during manufacture, stop breathing. That should pretty much End your contribution of GHGs, and provide an example for the rest of us.



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 9:48 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



Breathing?

Breathing????

Breathing is carbon neutral. Go learn at least a little science.



*AndyG55* 28. August 2015 at 1:24 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“There is no cooling in our future until our emissions of GHGs cease.”

If you were capable of feeling embarrassment, you are in for a world of it.

But your posts show that you are not capable of feeling embarrassment.



*David Smith* 28. August 2015 at 2:07 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David,

Isn't it odd how total thermageddon is always just around the corner but never happens e.g. "we only have x years to save the planet" (pick any value for x that you like.)

Where are the 50 million climate refugees? When is the imminent collapse in food production supposed to occur? Because food production levels are rising just fine right now.

When is Wadhams going to stop pushing the date of "polar ice collapse" forward into the future each time his last prediction failed to occur?

When are sea levels going to start rising catastrophically? The current rise of a risible 3mm/year is not really worrying anyone. 30cm in 100

Share



years – who cares?

You can bleat about people not being allowed to comment unless they have published a climsci paper in a scientific journal, but I don't need to have produced something for Nature to include in one of their editions to realise that the science is alarmist nonsense. If someone wrote a paper claiming the moon was made of cheese would you believe it just 'cause it got published in a journal?

I like reading your comments David, as they make me laugh. So please don't stop typing on that computer of yours made out of fossil-fuel derived plastic...



*AndyG55* 29. August 2015 at 11:39 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“The current rise of a risible 3mm/year ”

Actually , it more like 1 – 1.5mm/years.

It appears the satellites are referencing to a geodetic region that is actually sinking by some 1.5-2mm/year.

The tide gauges are correct, and while there are outliers at either end because of land movement, the mean is around 1-1.5mm/year.. SCARY , hey ! 😊



*David Dilley* 28. August 2015 at 2:29 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Appears you didn't watch my full video on NoTricksZone called “is climate change dangerous”.

1. It shows the rapid cooling in the Arctic and Antarctic....not the warming you are professing.
2. Also appears you did not read my article about the coercing that the

Share



University of Maine has done.

4. Also appears that you do not believe government strong arming does

not exist, like it did with Dr. Hansen

5. Why is it that just about all news releases by NOAA are politically written about how hot it is... they should just be stating the facts and not cherry picking data to prove something that did not happen.

6. Why is it that Great Britain's Met Dept. had to call NOAA out about saying 2014 was the hottest year on record...because it was a lie of course.

7. Why is it that no individuals within NOAA are talking about the climate ... it is only political news releases for agendas

9. Why is it that you never see a TV meteorologist discuss Climate Change

10. And most importantly ... why are you not presenting facts that support continued global cooling... probably because there are none

11. Why are so many places in the northern and southern hemisphere now experiencing their coldest summers in 20 to 50 years, and or in southern hemisphere colder weather.



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:21 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

I'll read your stuff when it appears in a quality peer reviewed quality.

Why aren't you submitting your Earth-shaking conclusions to them?



*P Gosselin* 1. September 2015 at 10:04 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



“...when it appears in a quality peer reviewed quality.”  
We are all waiting for “quality” in peer-reviewed papers. It has been in short supply in climate science.

---



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:26 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David Dilley wrote:

“It shows the rapid cooling in the Arctic and Antarctic....not the warming you are professing.”

What are your data sources?? The graphic above doesn't give any.

The surface and (esp) the ocean have been warming fast, according to a host of datasets.

UAH's data shows the last 10 years of the lower troposphere above the Arctic (60N-85N) are +0.19 C warmer than the previous 10 years.

They show the last 10 years of the LT above the Antarctic (60S-85S) have cooled by all of... 0.02 C.

And no reconstructions show a globally warm medieval period, as your graph above shows. Again, what are your data sources?



*P Gosselin* 1. September 2015 at 10:02 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



To David Dilley,

In case you are not aware, Mr. Appell is an incurable pessimist and obsessed with the end of the world, and refuses no matter what to believe anything except in catastrophe for the future. He confirms it himself here: <http://notrickszone.com/2015/08/26/suppression-of-science-former-noaa-meteorologist-says-employees-were-cautioned-not-to-talk-about-natural-cycles/comment-page-1/#comment-1036710>



*nightspore* 28. August 2015 at 7:39 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Where I am I've already witnessed cooling over the last several years. And it's because the North Atlantic has cooled (much like it did in the 50's, although this time the decline seems more dramatic).



*Mauri Ses. - Italy* 28. August 2015 at 10:14 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

GHGs have nothing to do with climate. Period.



*Hugh* 28. August 2015 at 8:20 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Like H2O has nothing to do with climate? 😊



*mauri ses. italy* 28. August 2015 at 9:57 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



Like CO2 has nothing to do with climate... change! 😊



*Howard R. Hamilton* 28. August 2015 at 10:36 PM | [Permalink](#) |

[Reply](#)

Actually, GHG provide the buffer that prevents temperature extremes like you will find on the ISS surfaces or the moon.



*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 6:21 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“GHGs have nothing to do with climate. Period.”

So do you think GHGs don't absorb infrared radiation, or do you think the Earth doesn't emit any?



*Mauri Ses. - Italy* 29. August 2015 at 9:12 PM | [Permalink](#) |

[Reply](#)

So do you think GHGs don't absorb infrared radiation, or do you think the Earth doesn't emit any?



*Mauri Ses. - Italy* 29. August 2015 at 9:15 PM |

[Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

I just don't think that GHGs have nothing to do with climate...change!



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:28 AM |

[Permalink](#)

Share



Then you're wrong. Everyone else is well aware than GHGs affect climate.



*Boyfromtottenham* 28. August 2015 at 10:46 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Hi from Oz. Several years ago I searched for 'sunspots' on the Australian Bureau of Meteorology website, and got the response 'the Bureau does not keep data on sunspots as there is no evidence that they affect climate', or something very similar. As a former radio amateur, I am well acquainted with the effect that sunspots (or at least the EM radiation that corresponds to them) have on radio propagation, and this extraordinary statement caused me to look further into the whole AGW story. I have been deeply skeptical of the AGW story ever since.



*David Appell* 29. August 2015 at 6:20 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Because sunspots affect radio waves does not mean they affect climate.



*Bernd Felsche* 2. September 2015 at 6:14 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Sunspots, like e.g. ENSO, are a symptom of variability; not drivers. They constitute signs of variability.

Sunspots have been "measured" for many centuries and correlated with e.g. crop yields; crop yields depending on long-term weather conditions. The results of changes in solar activity

Share



*evident* through sunspots are far more significant and “predictable” than the changes in CO2 levels; the latter having risen substantially over the past ca. 18 years without any correlated rise in near-surface global average atmospheric temperature.



*global warming, nothing but a scam of the left ... | pindanpost* 29.

August 2015 at 3:16 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] Jonova adds the context: Pierre Gosselin has a great post: Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees “Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles”. [...]



*Gross Suppression Of Science ...Former NOAA Meteorologist Says Employees “Were Cautioned Not To Talk About Natural Cycles” | wchildblog* 29. August 2015 at 3:32 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] From NoTricksZone, bAug 2015 [...]



*Paul Vaughan* 29. August 2015 at 8:26 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

100% guaranteed this distorts 101-level sun-climate relations:

[http://s1.postimg.org/thgs72a7j/IPO\\_BIAS\\_ERSSTV4\\_HADNMAT2\\_ICOADSS](http://s1.postimg.org/thgs72a7j/IPO_BIAS_ERSSTV4_HADNMAT2_ICOADSS)

Since the release of ERSSTv4 anyone trusting NOAA on climate change is a naive fool who won't get any sympathy or leniency from me. Whether it's ignorance or deception it's dark and it's devilish and it's due to be fired without mercy.

Share





*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:29 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

How do you feel about the recent adjustments made by UAH — which were about 3 times larger than NOAA's?



*Peter Wells* 29. August 2015 at 3:27 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

In a previous post I indicated that the NASA Solar Physics website had not update their solar cycle charts since March, a fact that I check prior to posting. Two days later I see that an update has taken place.

We are now into the lowest solar cycle in 100 years. This past February was reported in the news in March as the coldest February in Canada in 115 years. The earth does not cool equally. Cooling is greatest toward the poles. Ice age glaciers were pretty much limited to beyond the 40th parallel except in higher elevations where even today there is snow near the equator.



*Felix* 29. August 2015 at 7:46 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

How long and when did Dilley actually work for NOAA? From his webpage it seems he left in 1992.

Of course NOAA scientists routinely study nature climate cycles. Dilley's claim is that "climate change is the combination of the elliptical paths of the moon and earth, changes in solar radiation and changes in the gravitational pulses and electromagnetic pulses." He also claims he can predict earthquakes and hurricane seasons years ahead. So, he is an obvious crackpot.

*David Dilley* 29. August 2015 at 9:30 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share





Felix....I have over 40 years of experience and research. Believe this would make me an expert, not a crackpot. Can you back up your assertions? I can backup my predictions and research!



*AndyG55* 29. August 2015 at 11:31 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David, you have to realise that now you have put yourself forward, the alarmista cult members will fight back with the only weapon they have... slime.



*Felix* 29. August 2015 at 11:34 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Well, you dodged my question. That's a telltale sign of being a crackpot. Not publishing in professional journals is another. You are probably a nice guy and I wish you well, but you are clearly a crackpot.



*David Dilley* 30. August 2015 at 1:21 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Felix... I run a private business and do not receive grants to publish. Universities live on grants and are paid to publish. As a private business we create and research so we can put forth new forecast techniques. As I said, a private business so we do require keeping some of our research private and I have been very generous in proving information to the public...of which I did not have to. So our publishing is via Ebooks for the public, public lectures and sharing some data on sites such as NoTricksZone.

Share



If you give a the same grant money as many universities receive...I will gladly publish some of our secret data. We are a different organization than governments and universities, but have provided very beneficial information publicly, free of charge. If you have problems with free of charge, then give me a grant.

And by the way...my video “is climate change dangerous”. my EBook “Earth’s Natural Climate Pulse”, and my article on this site are ALL Published.

---



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:31 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“climate change is the combination of...changes in the gravitational pulses...”

What does that even mean?

Just what do you think is pulsing gravitationally???



*Bernd Felsche* 2. September 2015 at 6:54 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

It seems that you’ve not been paying attention in class, Mr Appell. Watch the video again.

---



*Paul Vaughan* 30. August 2015 at 1:21 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



Felix, there's hard proof that NOAA is corrupting the record of natural oscillations:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2015/08/former-noaa-meteorologist-tells-of-years-of-censorship-to-hide-the-effect-of-natural-cycles/#comment-1740525>

If you want to verify that remarkably trivial fact for yourself, brace yourself because you'll need the following skills:

1. ability to subtract one column of numbers from another in a spreadsheet.

That's it. Literally. No further skill is needed to verify the dead simple fact.

Are you willing to bluntly call NOAA out on this blatant unethical distortion of recorded nature??

So far they have not even acknowledged the fatal error. They've been informed of it and admitted nothing. It takes mere seconds to verify the fatal error, so they're unnecessarily accruing additional reputation damage by not retracting corrupted v4 without delay.

These people are due for a firm lesson on integrity and the community is remiss if we don't vigilantly see it through all the way to completion. I advise the community to organize for this historic event. It's a 100% guaranteed success.

It's so clear-cut and simple they'll only succeed in evading correction if the community relents, so I would advise them that if their aim is to continue facing this deviously their best option is to pay off climate blog hosts to not report the fatal error. (They don't need to worry

Share



about MSM because MSM & MSM audience don't have a clue about how to interpret the simple graph.)

Because the fatal error is so simple and so effortlessly verified, NOAA's delays in admitting the fatal error and promptly retracting v4 are scandalous. One gets the impression they're delaying until after the upcoming climate talks, but the negative impact on their reputation is more severe this way. Delaying was a short-sighted, ill-advised choice. It's guaranteed to harden and mature the cynicism directed their way and they'll never be able to recover from that.

It's clear that their leaders are choosing hubris and blunt force over integrity, so that narrows the range of viable counter-strategies. We know with 100% certainty that they aren't playing fair in response to a dead simple, effortlessly verified, 100% administratively defensible grievance, so again: that narrows the range of viable counter-strategies that are sensibly applicable in dealing with this particular adversary. It's pretty creepy. It's crystal clear that the circumstance demands a high office firing (it's not the muzzled workers' fault) and we have to settle for no less since the offense is so over-the-top in-your-face hostile & egregious.

I recommend that someone check into their whistle-blower protection rules. No doubt there are good people of integrity on the inside who are incredibly frustrated with their fatally naive &/or incompetent "leadership". Some of them might want to report the failure formally, but I can't imagine it being safe for them to do so given the darkly devilish indicators we're seeing in clear focus.



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:33 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Share



Raw data are input into a data model to correct for known biases; an accurate and consistent time series is the result.

How would you correct for those biases, Paul?



*Bernd Felsche* 2. September 2015 at 6:58 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

*Raw data are input into a data model to correct for known biases*

... as determined by the *Ministry of Climate Truth* but with no physical basis.

*an accurate and consistent time series*

Like a soufflé; it's up to the chefs to define the recipe and the Cooks to spoil. The result may taste nothing like any of the original ingredients but it pleases the crowd.



*Robert H* 30. August 2015 at 11:24 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

As a layperson and very much so, I have to ponder the following in trying to sort out climate matters (1) despite what I read here solar cycles, ice ages etc. are considered by the IPCC (2) contrary to what David Tilley and others write, the globe has warmed significantly in the last 20 years; the situation is that less of the heat is going into the surface and more into the oceans – such global warming for that period is very clearly shown by the continued and

Share



faster rise in sea level that occurred (3) David Tilley has published nothing in the science journals despite his long research career.



*Paul Vaughan* 30. August 2015 at 4:01 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Robert, there has been a thoroughly saturating amount of misleading brainwashing about sun-climate relations. The brainwashing is (deliberately or accidentally) based on false assumptions that harshly fail careful diagnostics. Top so-called “experts” have been devilishly shameless policing beliefs. It’s downright creepy.

The way the strategy works is they hold up a story about how they say sun-climate relations are supposed to work. It’s a straw man argument, because careful diagnostics on observations clearly indicate that the narrative is based on false assumptions. They kill the straw man and declare sun-climate relations “tiny” (“0.1 degrees Celsius per solar cycle” is the way they tell their story). They pretend that the narrative isn’t based on false assumptions (notably static uniformity, which they’ll deny) and they apply militant thought policing and relentless merciless hostile bullying tactics to coerce blog commentators into line with their false-assumption-based narrative (or at least into silence).

Given that the campaign is based on shamelessly false assumptions that fail elementary observation-based diagnostics, it’s of historical significance how vulnerable the online climate discussion community has been to the militant sun-climate thought policing campaign.

Pushing aside the false-assumption-based (dead straw man) brainwashing campaign, here’s what observations actually show:

Share



Multivariate sun-climate attractor identified by constraining aggregation with laws of:

- A. large numbers.
- B. conservation of angular momentum.

<https://tallbloke.wordpress.com/2015/08/11/niv-shaviv-nice-one-the-sun-still-is/comment-page-1/#comment-106030>

The vital information needed to deduce all of that was leaked visually by way of illustration (but mentioned nowhere in the accompanying text) by Dickey & Keppen (NASA JPL 1997). (See figures 3a & 3b.)

From the starting point exposed by Dickey & Keppen, it's just a trivial exercise in geometry: intersection of a family of straight lines with a single curved line in phase space, affording an effortless generalized solution.

Surface sampling occurs at a cross-section of air-sea interactions. The phase error of the attractor estimated in this manner is what we know as interannual variations, for example notably ENSO in the case of surface temperatures.

Thusfar few have adequately appreciated the significance and implications of Dickey & Keppen's seminal work.



*jipebe29* 30. August 2015 at 11:52 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Two lectures by Pr François Gervais and Pr Weiss, about climate cycles (1000, 230 and 60 years):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xLNCPTb15Xs&feature=youtu.been>

Share



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tAELGs1kKsQ>



[jipebe29](#) 30. August 2015 at 2:05 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

“Climate: 22 Inconvenient Truths”:

<http://dropcanvas.com/7vno7>

Not too bad, is'n't it?



*“Suppressing the Truth – the Next Global Cooling Cycle”* By David Dilley, former NOAA meteorologist | [budbromley](#) 31. August 2015 at 5:47 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] <http://notrickszone.com/2015/08/26/suppression-of-science-former-noaa-meteorologist-says-employees-w&#8230;> [...]



*Weekly Climate and Energy News Roundup #194 | Watts Up With That?* 31. August 2015 at 9:14 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] <http://notrickszone.com/2015/08/26/suppression-of-science-former-noaa-meteorologist-says-employees-w&#8230;> [...]



*Divergence: climate predictions and “warmest year on record” versus observable reality* | [Atlas Monitor](#) 31. August 2015 at 10:43 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] <http://notrickszone.com/2015/08/26/suppression-of-science-former-noaa-meteorologist-says-employees-w&#8230;> [...]

Share





*Paul Vaughan* 31. August 2015 at 5:47 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

I've posted a kindergarten-level cookbook recipe to help people detect NOAA's corruption of the natural record firsthand:

<https://tallbloke.wordpress.com/suggestions-13/comment-page-1/#comment-106428>

This isn't something esoteric. On the contrary it's clear cut, simple, immediately tangible, and within full local control. Anyone who can subtract one column of numbers from another in a spreadsheet can fingerprint NOAA's corruption of the natural record firsthand.

I'm going to suggest that all community members have a responsibility to pursue this dead simple exercise that shines a bright light exposing taxpayer-funded corruption of the natural record.



*David Appell* 1. September 2015 at 6:36 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Paul: Are you aware the adjusted temperatures LOWER the long-term warming trend?



*Paul Vaughan* 2. September 2015 at 5:47 PM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

David, are you suggesting that a manipulated globally averaged trend makes it ok that natural spatiotemporal features of the record have been corrupted??

I hope not ...because that's the kind of rationale I would expect from someone who's part of the problem (letting a political

Share



agenda eclipse devotion to sound nature exploration) rather than part of the solution.

Sound exploration of nature demands that natural spatiotemporal features of the record be left intact (rather than systematically corrupted by devilishly dark agents of ignorance &/or deception).



*NOAA Meteorologist: Politics and Money Drive Global Warming Hysteria* | *The Penn Ave Post* 1. September 2015 at 2:45 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] Hinderaker) David Dilley has been a meteorologist for 40 years, 20 of which he spent with NOAA. At NoTricksZone, he writes about how government money and political pressure have distorted climate research: For [...]



*NOAA Meteorologist: Politics and Money Drive Global Warming Hysteria* | *Western Free Press* 1. September 2015 at 3:10 AM | [Permalink](#)

[...] Dilley has been a meteorologist for 40 years, 20 of which he spent with NOAA. At NoTricksZone, he writes about how government money and political pressure have distorted climate [...]



*Evan Jones* 1. September 2015 at 4:08 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Reply](#)

Excellent article. They can't touch me, though. Our work on surface stations (me, Anthony Watts, John Christy, and John Nielsen-Gammon) is entirely unfunded. We find that Tmean land surface trends are spuriously exaggerated by 60% to 100% from bad siting (moreso to Tmin trends), with a

Share



kick upward from equipment (CRS units carry their own heat sink around on their backs, leading to a spuriously and staggeringly high Tmax trend). That not only casts current LST trends into serious question, but the whole pre-MMTS record, as well).

This will notch overall warming trend down by perhaps ~15% (as land surface is only ~30% of the globe.

FWIW, in terms of actual studies, I think funding is overrated. A liberal application of good old elbow grease proves an extremely satisfactory proxy.

### Leave a Reply

Name \*

Email \*

Website

Comment

**Post Comment**

Share



[« Previous](#)

[Next »](#)

Share

