


Global Data Change – Vital Signs Of NASA Climate Corruption

Published on October 10, 2016


Written by Tony Heller

In 1982, NASA showed about 10 mm of sea level rise from 1955 to 1980. Now they show almost 40 mm of sea level rise during that same period. They quadrupled recent sea level rise by altering the data, or perhaps went back in time and took some new readings.




[NASA 1982](#) [NASA 2016](#)

But quadrupling sea level rise wasn't enough for NASA experts, so in 1993 they switched over to satellite measurements, which immediately doubled their already quadrupled sea level rise. Satellite orbits decay over time, and it doesn't require a lot of decay to bring them 1.7 mm closer to earth over the period of a year.




NASA is the same agency which ignores satellite temperature data, because it doesn't suit their global warming agenda. Satellites are only used when supportive of their agenda, and only for measurements which are most subject to decay errors.



[Wood for Trees: Interactive Graphs](#)

The net effect of their data tampering is an 800% increase in sea level rise. Ninety percent of NOAA tide gauges are below NASA's claimed 3.4 mm/year, and the average of all tide gauges is only about one mm/year.

Sea Level Rise Rates At All 233 NOAA Tide Gauges



Sea Level Trends – MSL global stations trends table

The 1990 IPCC report said sea level rise rates did not accelerate during the 20th century.

9.3.3 Accelerations in Sea Level Rise

Is there evidence of any "accelerations" (or departures from long-term linear trends) in the rate of sea level rise? From examinations of both composite regional and global curves and individual tide gauge records, there is no convincing evidence of an acceleration in global sea level rise during the twentieth century. For longer periods, however, there is weak evidence for an acceleration over the last 2-3 centuries.

[ipcc_far_wg_i_chapter_09.pdf](#)

NOAA says sea level is rising half as fast as NASA claims.



absolute global sea level rise is believed to be 1.7-1.8 millimeters/year

Sea Level Trends – Global Regional Trends

NASA's claims about sea level rise don't stand up to any scrutiny, but they generate revenue for the climate community – so they breeze through peer review.

Read more at realclimatescience.com

Share This:

[Twitter](#) [Facebook 15](#) [G+ Google](#) [LinkedIn 1](#) [More](#)

Related

Global Data Change – Vital Signs
Of NASA Climate Corruption
October 5, 2016
In "Current News"

NASA Shows How Science Fraud
Is Done
October 28, 2016
In "Current News"

New study shows coastlines
gaining land despite sea level
alarmism
September 21, 2016
In "Current News"

[Trackback](#) from your site.

Leave A Comment

You Must Be [Logged In](#) To Post A Comment.



Search for:

Follow us:



Donate Today!

Currently, joining PSI is free. When you make a donation of the suggested amount of \$25 (any amount will help, though!) you will help to sponsor sound, alarmist-free scientific work.



Latest News

["Heat" is not "Pollution"](#) November 17, 2016

[Effects of Elevated CO2 and Nutrients on the Growth of Mangroves](#) November 16, 2016

[Why Does The US Space Agency Ignore Satellites?](#) November 16, 2016

[Record Global Cooling Over The Last Eight Months](#) November 16, 2016

[Human Caused Global Warming: The Biggest Deception in History, by Dr. Tim Ball](#) November 16, 2016

[Gov't Research Says Plants Are Already Stopping Global Warming](#) November 15, 2016

[Response to the 31 'Scientific' Societies advocacy letter to congress](#) November 15, 2016

[Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the Greenhouse Gas Theory: Interview](#) November 15, 2016

[Book review: Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the Greenhouse Gas Theory](#) November 15, 2016

['It's going to happen': NASA simulates asteroid impact on major city](#) November 15, 2016



Trending Climate Tweets

Trending Climate Tweets

A Twitter list by [@ccdeditor](#)

Latest climate change/global warming tweets trending on twitter.



Judith Curry

@curryja

Sounds like a really good idea to me . . .

24s

Breitbart News Retweeted



Hayley Barlow

@Hayley_Barlow

Tonight on #c4news: all round charmer & Breitbart News blogger Milo Yiannopoulos to @cathynewman "I don't give a stuff about your feelings"

[Embed](#)

[View on Twitter](#)

Get A Daily Digest Of The Day's Headlines



Every evening, you'll get an email showing you the day's headlines posted here at PSI. Email goes out between 5 and 7 G.S.T.

FBF ■ Powered by @Google Feedburner

Or Get Instant Notifications

Get instant notifications of new posts by email



Recent Comments

Nickreality65



November 17, 2016 | #

“.....disregard for the scientific method.....”

The alarmist camp is the one guilty of the phrase copied above through the name-calling, threats, censorship, misrepresentations and outright lies.

If climate change were based on real, honest science a change in administration, a change in presidency, would make no difference.

Head for cover all you climate change cockroaches, it's hammer time. The real science that has been maligned, marginalized and demonized for decades is going to blowtorch its way through the CAGW house of cards.

The greenhouse effect theory, i.e. upwelling/down welling/"back" radiation violates conservation of energy and thermodynamic laws. Not that it matters because the theory actually does not do anything, i.e. no net change in radiative balance at the ToA, per NASA 100 km.

The notion that the earth is 33 C warmer with an atmosphere than without is incorrect. The conditions postulated for the "no atmosphere" scenario are quite obviously with an atmosphere. The true explanation for the prevailing surface temperature, heat transfer's most fundamental equation $Q = U * A * dT$, is ignored.

The Stephan Boltzmann ideal black body equation is incorrectly applied by ignoring the theory's limitations and conditions, e.g. a surface, no conduction/convection, i.e. a vacuum, emissivity, gas density, tropospheric temperatures, etc.

The eccentricity of the earth's orbit causes a TSI fluctuation, aphelion to perihelion, +/- 45 W/m², 50 times greater than the atmospheric heating due to CO₂. Natural variations such as eccentricity, albedo, water vapor, vegetation, etc. are orders of magnitude more influential over the climate than GHGs/CO₂.

The US is responsible for about 16% of the world's CO₂ output. Power generation represents about 31% of US CO₂ production. Therefore – 16% * 31% * 32% = 1.6%. CPP will reduce the global C₂ output by 1.6%. China and India will cancel that out with their next dozen coal fired power plants.

Arise Homo Sapiens: From The Ashes Of The G-Ds - New Earth Media

November 17, 2016 | #

[...] of 21st century socio-political engineered scaremongering is perfectly reflected in the great 'climate change' swindle. This is the kind of preferred fear-based narrative which is adopted wholesale by an [...]

Atheists Go After Football Coach For What They Call 'Pray To Play' Baptism - Page 85

November 15, 2016 | #



[...] Originally Posted by Michael J You have a couple of very large logical fallacies right there, both of which you have made several times before. In the post that this quote responds to, I asked you to tell me what you think Evolutionary Theory says. I asked you this because you claim to reject the Theory of Evolution, and I have a strong hunch that you don't even know what the theory says. Instead of answering my question, you make yet another Poisoning the Well fallacy, where you attempt to point out something unpleasant (and in this case, demonstrably false) about me. So I will ask you the question again: What do you think the Theory of Evolution says? By that, I am not referring exclusively to Speciation. I'm asking you what the entire theory (including both Micro and Macro Evolution) says? This logical fallacy is called a Red Herring where you bring up

theory (including both micro and macro Evolution) says: This logical fallacy is called a Red Herring, where you bring up something irrelevant to the discussion topic. Global Warming and the Theory of Evolution are entirely different things. The former says fossil fuel emissions trap heat in the Earth's atmosphere, and the latter is a measurement of organisms' changes in their gene frequencies over time. Assuming that is even true, that wouldn't disprove the Theory of Evolution. Just because the climatologists were wrong doesn't mean all the biologists were wrong, too. I drew the comparison of global warming and evolution to show both were determined by scientist. Global warming scientist were caught fudging climate details to justify their theory. If scientist did that with Global warming why should I trust scientist with Evolution NASA Exposed in ?Massive? New Climate Data Fraud – Principia Scientific International [...]



Ronald Clutz

November 15, 2016 | #

Rosco, I hope you can clarify. The Irish GHG experiment is confusing. I have no agenda other than to understand the import of this report.

The surface is at 180C, and radiative proportion of heat transfer is between 38% (cooling with forced convection) and 64%. (cooling with natural convection). From Table 1 in paper. This makes sense to me, though I wonder about the reality of 180C compared to real world temperature.

Then these relationships are reversed later in the paper in figure 9, where a graph shows the higher % of radiative cooling occurs under forced convection, and the lower % under natural cooling. This seems to contradict table 1 and makes no sense to me.



John O'Sullivan

November 15, 2016 | #

Hi Ed, thanks for your comment on the article. The author is Dr Charles Anderson who runs his own laboratory services at Anderson Materials Evaluation Inc. In case he misses your comment on here he may be reached directly at:

<http://www.andersonmaterials.com/our-team-2.html>



Portions copyright © Principia Scientific International

Principia Scientific International (PSI) is a not-for-profit community interest association.

