


# Why Does The US Space Agency Ignore Satellites?

Published on November 16, 2016

Written by Tony Heller

Satellites are far more accurate at measuring global temperatures than the severely flawed surface temperature record. NASA claims global warming is rapidly occurring, but satellites show very little warming this century. What could possibly motivate the US Space Agency to ignore their own satellites?



[Wood for Trees: Interactive Graphs](#)

The answer is obvious. Much of NASA's funding depends on keeping the global warming scam alive, so NASA generates scientifically unsupportable graphs and distributes them hysterical politicians and journalists.

### Hotter and Hotter

Global temperatures this year are up .88 degrees from 1961 and 1.2 degrees from the 1800s



Source: World Meteorological Organization

Bloomberg

[As Trump Heads to Washington, Global Warming Nears Tipping Point – Bloomberg](#)

Read more at [realclimatescience.com](http://realclimatescience.com)

#### Share This:

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



#### Related

Global Data Change – Vital Signs Of NASA Climate Corruption  
October 10, 2016  
In "Current News"

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

NASA Climate Fraud At A Pace Unprecedented In 1,000 Years  
September 3, 2016  
In "Current News"

[Trackback](#) from your site.

### Leave A Comment

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

---

≡

 **Principia Scientific**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

---

≡

 **Principia Scientific**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

---

≡

 **Principia Scientific**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

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.



**Pure Climate Skeptic**

@Carbongate

Michael Jackson - Thriller Music Video [youtu.be/hG6oy46qKE4](https://youtu.be/hG6oy46qKE4) via @YouTube



**YouTube** @YouTube



[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/m<sup>2</sup>, 50 times greater than the atmospheric heating due to CO<sub>2</sub>. Natural variations such as eccentricity, albedo, water vapor, vegetation, etc. are orders of magnitude more influential over the climate than GHGs/CO<sub>2</sub>.

The US is responsible for about 16% of the world's CO<sub>2</sub> output. Power generation represents about 31% of US CO<sub>2</sub> production. Therefore – 16% \* 31% \* 32% = 1.6%. CPP will reduce the global C<sub>2</sub> 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>

---

≡

 **Principia Scientific**  
**INTERNATIONAL**

Portions copyright © Principia Scientific International

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

