

How Apollo 17, NASA and Boeing Refute Greenhouse Gas Believers

by John O'Sullivan

March 20, 2012

Prominent climatologists still insisting the greenhouse gas theory is real are under a sustained assault from critics in an ongoing private debate being waged by email and blogs. An increasing number of experts from specialist sciences have come forward to present compelling evidence that climate science either misrepresents, or misunderstands certain physical effects.

One of the most outspoken of the current defenders of the greenhouse gas effect (GHE) is climatologist, Dr Roy Spencer. Spencer has been backed in his beliefs by a fellow scientist, Lubos Motl in a private email debate earlier last week. To challenge Motl and Spencer on their errors the following question was put to them: "So do we agree that the vacuum of space inhibits heat energy loss?" Lubos replied, "Not really." Spencer made no comment.

Motl sought to defend [Spencer's astonishing claim that outer space is "cold"](#) and the atmosphere of Earth acts "like a blanket to keep our planet warmer than it would otherwise be."

Space Scientists Say Climatologists Wrong About Space Science

But from the field of space engineering and astrophysics (including current leading NASA experts) has come proof of how climatologists have misunderstood a critical aspect of the physics of space to sustain belief in the junk science of the so-called greenhouse gas effect.

It is this erroneous "blanket effect" that is the crux of GHE faux physics and the cause of the current disconnect in understanding between climate science analysts and the REAL experts - astrophysicists and space engineers. It was soon put to Lubos (and Roy) that they need not take the word of experts associated with the Slayers or [Principia Scientific International](#) (recently recruiting 20 more science experts), they could try NASA's.

For example, [Geoffrey A. Landis](#) who is a space scientist at the NASA John Glenn Research Center working on Mars missions and "advanced concepts and technology for future space missions" makes a definitive clarification:

"A few recent Hollywood films showed people instantly freezing solid when exposed to vacuum. In one of these, the scientist character mentioned that the temperature was 'minus 273'-- that is, absolute zero.

"But in a practical sense, space doesn't really *have* a temperature-- you can't measure a temperature of a vacuum, something that isn't there. The residual molecules that do exist aren't enough to have much of any effect. Space isn't "cold," it isn't "hot", it really isn't anything.

[“What space is, though, is a very good insulator.](#) (In fact, vacuum is the secret behind thermos bottles.) Astronauts tend to have more problems with overheating than keeping warm"

Apollo 17 Lunar Rover Dangerously Overheats in Spencer's “Cold” Outer Space

It was put to Lubos and Roy that during the Apollo 17 Apollo mission we had a superb demonstration of how, during an unfortunate accident, the vacuum of space acted as a perfect insulator almost causing the moon mission to be aborted. This was due to overheating of the Moon Rover. This novel four-wheeled, two-astronaut vehicle was driven for three days on the lunar surface becoming increasingly caked in dust reducing the effectiveness of its heat-dissipating design.

Moon Rover's batteries dangerously over-heated because a fender had broken off exposing the carefully designed reflective surfaces such that they became dust-covered and could no longer effectively dissipate the build up of received solar energy. As [NASA's Mission Summary](#) shows, only an emergency remedial fix rectified this potential catastrophe.

This over-heating problem in the temperature-free vacuum of space also impacted the astronauts. Their carefully designed heat dissipating suits also had to be constantly wiped clean of the moon's heat-absorbing dust.

Boeing Corporation Also Says Spencer is Wrong

But then consider the approach of the Boeing Corporation, leaders in the field of designing specialist equipment for the International Space Station (ISS). Boeing has to specifically address the constant problem of heat build-up in the ISS due to the perfect insulating properties of vacuum space that Roy and his GHE religionists would have you believe is “cold.” The spokesmen for GHE religionists just don't want to heed what [Boeing's 'Active Thermal Control System \(ATCS\)'](#) or NASA experts like Landis are telling them.

Indeed, if Spencer and Motl insist on sticking to the fallacy that outer space is extremely “cold” and light from the sun is “hot,” then it would be concomitant that the temperature of sunlight would quickly deteriorate as it passes through space. Yes, the ENERGY of sunlight does decline with distance, but this is simply due to the inverse square law. An added temperature effect would invalidate that law, but nothing of the sort has been observed. This suggests either that space has no temperature or that light has no temperature. Or both.

Now it was put to Lubos (and Roy) that absent a better explanation from them, such evidence proves the point that vacuum space inhibits heat energy loss from Earth and this directly impacts what they have misinterpreted as the greenhouse gas effect. This is because the built-in fallacy of this ‘theory’ is that so-called greenhouse gases act like a

'blanket' to keep our planet's surface warmer than it would otherwise be. But the whole time what is actually happening is that our dynamic 'wet' atmosphere is working (in day time) to keep our planet cooler than it would otherwise be, very much like those ATCS's designed by Boeing. Otherwise, without our atmosphere, the average day time temperature on Earth would rival that of our moon (around 107° C/225° F). But does a [particular psychological barrier](#) impede such understanding?

The world awaits to see how these staunch defenders of faux theory respond. But it's been a week now and all we have from Roy and his supporters is his latest [Alabama Two Step dodge](#); rather hastily assumed by [WUWT's Anthony Watts](#) as the final word on the matter. However, it appears Watts, Spencer and Motl don't converse much with space scientists.

John O'Sullivan is the co-founder and coordinator of [Principia Scientific International](#)