

Summer Sale

BOOKS 40% OFF!

SALE ENDS  
JULY 5TH

Store  
>  
Independent Books  
>  
Book Detail



High Resolution Cover

# Hot Talk, Cold Science (2021)

## Global Warming's Unfinished Debate (Revised and Expanded Third Edition)

S. Fred Singer (Author), David R. Legates (Author), Anthony R. Lupo (Author), Frederick Seitz (Foreword), William Happer (Foreword)

Hardcover • 256 pages • 36 figures • 2 tables • 6 x 9 inches  
ISBN-13: 978-1-59813-341-7  
Publication Date: Feb. 16, 2021  
Publisher: Independent Institute  
Educators: [Request exam copy](#)  
Bulk discounts available: [Learn more](#)

Formats

Hardcover (ISBN 978-1-59813-341-7)

eBooks

Amazon Kindle

Apple iBooks

Barnes and Noble Nook

List Price: ~~\$26.95~~  
Price: **\$16.17**  
Discount: \$10.78 (Save 40%)

ADD TO CART

Sale Ends 7/5/2023!

Free Shipping On Orders Over \$60! (Within U.S.A.)

Or, Become a Member and Get FREE!

MEMBERSHIP

Overview

Contents

Detailed Summary

Praise

Awards

News

Highlights

- **Twenty-two years after the publication of *Hot Talk, Cold Science, 2nd Edition*, S. Fred Singer’s classic primer on global warming—and antidote to alarmism—has been brought up to date, incorporating numerous recent scientific findings and making this fascinating and complex subject accessible to general readers.** With assistance from climate scientists David R. Legates and Anthony R. Lupo, the late Dr. Singer has produced a clear-headed work of scope and substance that no one who claims to value science, the environment, and human well-being can afford to ignore.
- **Aside from the difficult, often-perplexing scientific issues related to climate change, the topic is marred by “hot talk”—overheated rhetoric that has politicized and misinforms public discussion.** The Climategate email scandal, for example, revealed that key IPCC scientists were hiding their raw temperature data and the methodology of their selection and adjustments, conspiring to delete incriminating emails, and undermining the peer-review system to make it difficult for skeptical scientists to publish their work in scientific journals.
- **The fact of observed global warming—roughly 0.5°C (0.9°F) over the past 130 years—is evidence of neither a greenhouse effect nor human activity.** We must accept the possibility that this warming had the same causes as the unexplained Medieval Warming Period (900-1300 AD) and natural recovery from the Little Ice Age (1450-1850 AD). Additional warming of about 1°C may occur over the next few centuries regardless of what humans do.
- **Claims about a recent global warming trend are based the surface temperature record, but this record is inconsistent with data from other sources.** Warming alleged to have occurred from 1978 to 1997, for example, is based on just one database of surface observations, whereas data showing no trend during this period come from oceans, lower-atmosphere satellite-based readings, and proxy data. Satellite-based temperature readings are accurate and truly global, and they show a minor warming trend well below that predicted by the models.
- **The existence of the global warming “pause” from the early 2000s to the mid-2010s—and the failure of dozens of IPCC models to predict it—cannot be ignored by scientists or responsible political leaders.** Present models cannot properly handle clouds and other important climate factors.
- **Catastrophic sea level rise is not a foregone conclusion.** Sea level has been rising since the Ice Age 18,000 years ago, but theory alone can’t predict whether additional warming will accelerate sea level rise. It’s conceivable that sea level could fall due to increased evaporation, precipitation, and accumulation of ice on Greenland and Antarctica. From 1915 to 1945, when surface temperatures warmed by about 0.5°C, sea level rise did not accelerate.

Synopsis

Is climate change harming Earth’s biosphere and human well-being? How should policymakers respond to the possibility that greenhouse gases emitted by human activity, chiefly from the burning of fossil fuels, can lead to global warming? Is there a single book on climate science and policy that serves as both an accessible starting point for lay readers and a concise summary of new studies useful to those already versed in these complex and vital issues?

In 1997 atmospheric physicist **S. Fred Singer**—the founding director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Center—wrote the first edition of *Hot Talk, Cold Science: Global Warming’s Unfinished Debate*. A second edition came two years later, and the book is now deemed a classic. Dr. Singer passed away in 2020, but not before expanding and updating his much-discussed book with assistance from climatologist **David R. Legates** (University of Delaware) and atmospheric scientist **Anthony R. Lupo** (University of Missouri).

Incorporating recent developments in science, economics, and public policy, *Hot Talk, Cold Science, 3rd Edition* is a badly needed de-coding device to a sprawling, highly technical literature, giving readers a clear understanding of what scientists and policymakers know about climate change—and what they don’t. By separating rhetoric from reality, this well-timed release allows readers to better detect and think beyond the hyperbole and propaganda all-too-common in media coverage of this heated subject.

The stakes in this global debate, Dr. Singer reminds us, are monumental. With some calling for restrictions or carbon taxes to reduce the use of fossil fuels and get climate change under control, and others warning that impeding access to affordable energy would consign large segments of the world’s population to deeper, more prolonged poverty, the only ground shared by all sides may be a burning sense of urgency for more research and education. By bringing vital but often neglected findings to the forefront of the reading public, *Hot Talk, Cold Science: Global Warming’s Unfinished Debate, 3rd Edition* can play a critical part in stimulating fresh discussion on the most important scientific and policy issue of our times.

**Hot Talk**

Like the entire temperature record, the timeline of rhetoric about climate worries is marked by periods of advancement and retreat. By the mid 20th century, scientists had known for decades that atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) were rising due to the burning of fossil fuels—oil, gas, and especially coal. Most thought it wasn’t cause for concern: water vapor, they believed, was already absorbing any long-wave radiation that might otherwise cause

additional CO<sub>2</sub> to exert a greenhouse effect. Moreover, air temperatures had been declining since about 1940, prompting some to worry that air pollution and human activity could hasten the onset of another ice age.

Fear of global warming didn't gain momentum until the 1980s. In 1979, the National Academy of Sciences speculated that water vapor feedback would cause a doubling of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> to increase temperatures by 1.5° to 4.5° Celsius. More alarming, temperatures rose rapidly from 1975 to 1980. At a time when Western nations were showing progress on water and air pollution, environmentalists increasingly took up the cause of global warming.

In 1988, as heat waves and droughts swept North America, hot talk reached a new peak. U.S. Senate hearings drew massive attention when NASA scientist James Hansen testified that he was "99 percent" sure that global warming had arrived. Unconvinced, Dr. Singer published that summer an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal arguing that "observed trends do not agree with expectation from greenhouse theory" and laying out scientists' uncertainties about climate change. (The essay is one of seven short pieces reprinted in the book and recalling Dr. Singer's key role throughout the climate debates.)

The year 1988 also saw the founding of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a scientific body whose reports have greatly shaped—and been shaped by—the views of policymakers. What followed was a series of meetings, in Rio de Janeiro, Berlin, Geneva, Kyoto, Madrid, and Paris, convened to lay the groundwork for a treaty restricting and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The IPCC has been a key driver for a global treaty and a source of misinformation and alarmist rhetoric—on catastrophic droughts, floods, storms, rapid sea-level rise, a collapse of agriculture, and a spread of tropical disease—messaging adopted and amplified by environmental groups and media around the world. The organization has also repeatedly hid scientific uncertainty, the absence of critical data, and evidence that questions or contradicts its apocalyptic prediction.

The IPCC has walked back some of its earlier alarmist claims, but it hasn't been the only scientific authority to pass off misinformation. In the late 1990s, geoscientist Michael Mann got media attention by publishing his "hockey stick" graph, purporting to show nearly one thousand years of flat temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere, until spiking around the turn of the 20th century with the surge of industrial civilization. Later analysis found Mann's inferences and methods lacking, and his graph was dropped from subsequent IPCC reports. A different episode—dubbed Climategate—uncovered emails from the Climate Research Unit suggesting unethical attempts to hide raw data and to prevent climate "skeptics" from getting published in top scientific journals. The media coverage may have played a decisive role in cooling the public's enthusiasm for a global climate treaty.

Cold Science

Scientists of all stripes overwhelmingly agree on several key issues related to climate. They agree, for example, that human activity has increased levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere; and that the leading greenhouse gas is water vapor (which along with atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> has kept the oceans from freezing over). Moreover, what scientists know about global trends in climate events and other phenomena often run counter to popular belief: Severe storms have not increased in frequency or intensity since 1970 (except in the eastern North Pacific); heat waves and droughts are not becoming more common; global warming is not harming coral reefs; and sea levels are not rising any faster than usual.

Unfortunately, what we think we know about climate change is dwarfed by what we don't know, and the gaps in our knowledge lead to disagreements. Scientists disagree, for instance, about why rising levels of greenhouse gases have not caused the degree of global warming predicted by current climate models; they disagree over whether changes in global temperature or other climate elements are due to increased concentrations of greenhouse gases (especially CO<sub>2</sub>) in the atmosphere; and they disagree about what constitutes the "right" or "best" atmospheric levels of CO<sub>2</sub> and global temperatures for humans or for the natural world. The list goes on.

Temperature data—past and present—are fundamental in the climate change debate. The only reliable global temperature record, however, comes from satellite-based readings of lower-atmosphere temperatures taken since 1979. When that record is used to test the accuracy of models that purport to show the impact of human activity on Earth's climate, the models invariably fail, revealing that human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have little or even no influence on global temperatures.

The gap between temperature observations and model estimates raises a key question: Why does CO<sub>2</sub> appear to no longer affect the climate? Dr. Singer offers informed speculation (but notes that his hypothesis is counterintuitive and has yet to be tested).

What about sea level rise? Here is another area where specialists depart from common belief. The rate of sea level rise isn't accelerating. Local coastal sea level rise, however, is highly variable worldwide, depending on differing rates at which coasts undergo tectonic uplift or subsidence of the shoreline, as groundwater and minerals are extracted. Dr. Singer forecasts sea level rise in the range of 18 to 20 centimeters by 2100. Presumably due to improved evidence and methods, the IPCC has reduced its maximum forecasts to 59 centimeters (IPCC 2007), down from 367 centimeters (IPCC 1990).

The climate change debate can be understood as just one more clash between economic and technological pessimists ("Malthusians") and optimists ("Cornucopians"). These opposing groups have clashed over economic development, resource depletion, and environmental progress. A full assessment must take stock of the benefits of modest warming, such as its boon for plant and animal life in nearly all parts of the globe and positive effects on human health. The conflict of visions also surfaces in regard to which response to global warming is given priority: mitigation, CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration, or human adaptation. Dr. Singer argues that adaptation has more associated benefits.

In their afterword to *Hot Talk, Cold Science, 3rd Edition*, climatologists David R. Legates and Anthony R. Lupo state that no one was more qualified to write a book incorporating recent developments in the science and politics of climate change than Dr. Singer. "His myriad of accomplishments serves to illustrate why he is one of the very few people who have both the requisite political experience and the scientific background," Drs. Legates and Lupo write. "Over the years and despite all the invectives poured upon him by the alarmists, Dr. Singer has stood his ground for scientific integrity and adherence to the scientific method. For that, he is to be greatly commended."

More like this



73 Comments

Login

G

Join the discussion...

LOG IN WITH


OR SIGN UP WITH DISQUS

Name

5

Share

BestNewestOldest




Stephen E Fairchild

a year ago

Tell me how we charge these batteries. What fuel will we use to create the energy to charge them? Just a guess ,but we would need to build coal plants at the rate of one a week. All batteries wear out with time. How will we dispose of the "worn-out" batteries? Besides the disposal problem; where do we deal with the mining and processing to do all this without producing even more problems?

102

ReplyShare



CB

Stephen E Fairchild

4 months ago

edited

How do you charge a battery?

You plug it in!


O\_o

"It's Official: Solar Is the Cheapest Electricity in History"

[www.popularmechanics.com/sc...](http://www.popularmechanics.com/sc...)

22

ReplyShare



Think!


CB

3 months ago

What a silly and inane comment! Reveals that you have no clue!

10

ReplyShare



greenmagpies


Think!

2 months ago

That's a very good question!!!! You're the one that's silly! He's referring to EVs! You have to find a charging station and wait inline, charge for 45 minutes. If you run out of 'juice' you need to have a generator in your trunk that requires gas! That would be fun if your battery runs out on the freeway. If your battery dies, which it will eventually, you get a new one for \$30,000. That what it cost for a Chevy Volt battery.

00

ReplyShare



CB

Think!

3 months ago

My apologies.


How do you charge a battery?

"Powerwall is an integrated battery system that stores your solar energy for backup protection, so when the grid goes down your power stays on."

[www.tesla.com/powerwall](http://www.tesla.com/powerwall)

00

ReplyShare



greenmagpies


Stephen E Fairchild

2 months ago

You need to haul a gas/generator in the trunk of your car, along with a gas can. Then plug in while you're stranded on the freeway for 45 minutes+ ... I'm sticking with gas!

00

ReplyShare



greenmagpies


greenmagpies

2 months ago

Oh, I forgot to mention, if you need a new battery for a Chevy Volt, you're looking at \$30,000!

00

ReplyShare




ChiefThundermoon

a year ago

79 volcano eruptions in 2021,48 erupted in 2022 so far and still erupting,this is what causes climate change for the most part.

30

ReplyShare



NiCuCo

ChiefThundermoon

4 months ago

Volcanic emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are about 1% of human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>. If you compare total volcanic emissions of volcanoes, all solids and gases, they are more than human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, but if you compare volcanic CO<sub>2</sub> only, human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are about 100 times volcanic emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>.

The effect of total volcanic eruptions on climate can be enormous:


The year 1816 is known as the Year Without a Summer because of severe climate abnormalities that caused average global temperatures to decrease by 0.4–0.7 °C (0.7–1 °F).[1] Summer temperatures in Europe were the coldest of any on record between the years of 1766 and 2000.[2] This resulted in major food shortages across the Northern Hemisphere.[3]

Evidence suggests that the anomaly was predominantly a volcanic winter event caused by the massive 1815 eruption of Mount Tambora in April in the Dutch East Indies (known today as Indonesia). This eruption was the largest in at least 1,300 years (after the hypothesized eruption causing the volcanic winter of 536); its effect in the climate may have been exacerbated by the 1814 eruption of Mayon in the Philippines.

- Wikipedia

11

ReplyShare



Martin Lewis

2 years ago

HERE'S AN 'INCONVENIENT TRUTH'!!!

CO<sub>2</sub> in the Earth's atmosphere is now about 410 parts per million and was about 270 parts per million 300 years ago!!!

CO2 in the Earth's atmosphere is now about 410 parts per million and was about 280 parts per million 200 years ago!!!  
If CO2 levels got below 150 parts per million, photosynthesis would stop and every green thing on this planet would turn brown and die and then we would die!!!  
HERE'S THE 'INCONVENIENT TRUTH'!!!  
All of the Gas, oil, coal, and trillions of tons of limestone, in the Earth's crust, along with everything living on the Earth today, was once CO2 in the early Earth's atmosphere!!!  
When life 1st appeared on Earth, 4.5 Billion years ago, the atmosphere WAS NOT 270PPM, CO2!!!  
It was 350,000 PARTS PER MILLION, ABOUT 1,296 TIMES AS MUCH CO2, AS TODAY!!!  
Greenhouses routinely crank the CO2 levels up to 1,000PPM to increase plant growth!!!

10 5 Reply • Share ›



**disqus\_XC2bqon5pt** → Martin Lewis

2 years ago

This is just a money making idea of a few wealthy individuals.

6 2 Reply • Share ›



**Only Human** → disqus\_XC2bqon5pt

6 months ago

Hardly. Much more money made by the carbon lobby

1 0 Reply • Share ›



**BobbyGlnAZ** → Martin Lewis

2 years ago

Mr Lewis, kindly take Mike Hoffman aside somewhere and educate him. He is a keyboard bully who runs his ignorant mouth via his fingers, feeling totally safe behind the computer screen. Science is what YOU'RE quoting and not the routine insults tossed about by mr Hoffman. He is actually quite ignorant. Great job Martin Lewis, keep up the good work spreading science and not snotty comments.

3 1 Reply • Share ›

P

**Peter Couzynse** → BobbyGlnAZ

7 months ago

Bobby you should enrich yourself with truth not the BS you are reading. The global warming mantra faded. Then Climate changed came about. EV batteries turbine fans parts wear out. too Where does all this waste go?

We need fossil fuels for everything you use daily, weekly monthly... etc. Coal is needed to charge EV batteries. What happens to these batteries?they poison the earth. The SH\_t gets in the water tables, eventually.. That s a really good plan?

1 1 Reply • Share ›



**disqus\_vSEYAbV4f1** → Peter Couzynse

3 months ago

Yes. when the polar ice caps weren't melting down like they warned us,, then came "climate change." a Trojan horse for more communism.

0 0 Reply • Share ›

J

**John Roe** → BobbyGlnAZ

8 months ago

Mike is a moreOFF and living proof that dimming down (cannot type what I'd like to) and DE-EDUCATION exists

0 1 Reply • Share ›



**Mike Hoffman** → Martin Lewis

2 years ago

Your lack of understanding simple things like Climate Change is simply appalling. To them try to say it's not real is just inane on your part.

6 15 Reply • Share ›



**dtheroux** Mod → Mike Hoffman

2 years ago

Climate science is hardly simple as climate is an immensely complex and dynamic system.

18 0 Reply • Share ›



**Only Human** → dtheroux

6 months ago

Okay, then it should be simple just to take co2 out while we 'study' how complex it all is, shall we?

1 0 Reply • Share ›



**Jett\_Rucker** → Mike Hoffman

10 months ago

Is it the simplicity of climate change that inspires you to write it with Capital Letters?

0 0 Reply • Share ›

J

**John Roe** → Mike Hoffman

8 months ago

Hey mike, keep drinking that kool aid.....

0 1 Reply • Share ›



**Cindy Whitehead-sehl** → Mike Hoffman

9 months ago

As opposed to you..a astrophysicist?? Maybe your gullibility is the appalling thing.

0 1 Reply • Share ›



**Dan Kloster** → Martin Lewis

4 months ago

350,000 ppm!! That's nuts! Cite your source. That would create atmospheric pressures that could not sustain life. Not to mention temperatures that would rival Venus.

0 0 Reply • Share ›



**Rick Reynolds** → Dan Kloster

3 months ago

<https://archive.epa.gov/cli...>

0 0 Reply • Share ›

P

**Peter Couzynse** → Martin Lewis

7 months ago

don't believe your BS

0 0 Reply • Share ›

P

Peter Couzynse

→ Peter Couzynse

7 months ago

Reason is fossil fuels are needed for everything Sorry your climate global warming pitch is BS. You cannot prove anything. All yo can do is change numbers to reflect your ideas. Making money on a shame is exactly what it is theft. You cannot prove any of the things are talking about. Green new deal is enriching the democrats and more than likely yourself.

01 ReplyShare

Guest

a year ago

Climate change is natural and I don't deny it happens.  
All the sheep who believe it is caused by CO2 are fools.  
The climate temperature cycles because at times the Earth is over 3 million miles closer to the sun.  
The greenhouse affect plays a very small part in our climate cycle. ENJOY!

62 ReplyShare

NiCuCo

→ Guest

4 months ago

"Climate change is natural and I don't deny it happens."  
  
Forest fires is natural and I don't deny they happen.  
  
Therefore, human beings cannot cause forest fires.

11 ReplyShare

SILENTHAMMER

→ Guest

9 months ago

What "sells" better than sex? It ain't "religion."

01 ReplyShare

Michael Tatro

→ SILENTHAMMER

5 months ago

Climate religion is as a mater of fact!

11 ReplyShare

Deborah Butler

7 months ago

How convenient for affluent individuals to justify their irresponsible treatment of the planet. The inequity is obvious to the casual observer. Rich countries create changes in sea levels, glacial melting, and rainforest destruction while impoverished countries suffer the consequences. To those with so much invested in mining, overfishing, factory emissions, and all other sources of wealth and power, it's important to denounce all of the climatologists and other scientists. That's how inequity lives and breathes. Talk about sheep! How about corporate wolves in sheep's clothing?

31 ReplyShare

Rick Reynolds

→ Deborah Butler

3 months ago

<https://royalsociety.org/to...>

00 ReplyShare

R

Rose Ellen Ray

2 years ago

I've wondered how accurate and representative of the temperature the gauges are. Where are they placed? Garbage in; garbage out. I hope there are answers in the book.  
Anyone discussing climate mandates also needs to study UNESCO & UNEP's Agenda 21/2030 and have a long memory. Is environmental hysteria to be the catalyst for global government? Sure looks like it.  
I knew the late Natalie Grant, called the Grande Dame of Soviet disinformation. She wrote in 1998 in a monograph the following: "Although 'peace' still remains a prominent item on the list of deceitful operations of Soviet leaders, protection of the environment has become the principal tool for attack against the West and all it stands for." I found her to be prescient.

42 ReplyShare

mikesixes

→ Rose Ellen Ray

2 years ago

Surface temperature measurements are wildly skewed toward the hot side. There's a good article here:  
<https://wattsupwiththat.com...>

42 ReplyShare

Mike Hoffman

→ mikesixes

2 years ago

Deniers are the most ignorant people to have ever existed.

521 ReplyShare

hlj3rd

→ Mike Hoffman

2 years ago

edited

Why not read the book and then discuss the specific points and/or methodologies presented in it that you believe to be wrong? Failing to engage opposing ideas is itself a form of denial.

152 ReplyShare

RonitaM

→ hlj3rd

2 years ago

Excellent. Thank you Mike.

24 ReplyShare

noel heim

→ Mike Hoffman

2 years ago

edited

Intelligent and informed people do not deny that there have been thousands of climate changes over billions of years. However, there is no scientific evidence that man causes global warming. It is all computer generated using false data.The medieval warm period was warmer than today. How could that be? Man has never caused climate change! You appear to be the ignorant one. Also, the antarctic just experienced it's coldest winter on record.

132 ReplyShare

BobbyGlnAZ

→ noel heim

2 years ago

yipppeeel Nice to see some intelligence displayed! Good going Mr Heim! Keep it up!

40 ReplyShare

- 4 u reply 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100
- Only Human** → noel heim  
6 months ago  
Where is your data? This is all just heresay evidence. Its like saying there are no such thing as garbage dumps. Well, there are, and there are getting to be more and more of them. And within a few hundred year they will be everywhere. Because civilization has consequences. Oil wells dry up. Man takes them and then they are finished. Man is throwing the carbon that once was in the air back into the air by burning it. But he's doing it too quickly for the earth to reabsorb it and man is also attacking all the filtering systems at the same time. So there is nowhere for the heat and co2 to go except into the environment. How is this not totally obvious?
- 1 0 Reply • Share ›
- disqus\_XC2bqon5pt** → Mike Hoffman  
2 years ago  
Those in line to make a million by buying carbon offsets are the most ignorant people on earth.
- 8 1 Reply • Share ›
- Kyle Dawson** → Mike Hoffman  
2 years ago  
People who believe everything the news says are no better.
- 6 1 Reply • Share ›
- BobbyGlnAZ** → Kyle Dawson  
a year ago  
would that include those who believe what you say?
- 2 0 Reply • Share ›
- Just Thinking** → Mike Hoffman  
a year ago  
I have yet to find a skeptic who does not know twice as much as an alarmist does. But even if one is open to being persuaded, a few witty comments in a thread will not be persuasive. I do encourage open minds and truly listen to skeptics – and not the strawmen argument of alarmists.  
Over the last 38 years – yes, I have been researching this for 38 years – the skeptics have been more right than alarmists.  
All temperature records should be taken with a grain of salt because of the mind-boggling number of adjustments in most of them. It should send alarm bells to see the temperature set being by those who want a particular result and benefit by that result.  
Therefore, look at extreme weather – the actual record, and not the twisted deceptions of MSM.
- 5 1 Reply • Share ›
- Dave Wilson** → Just Thinking  
9 months ago  
Hasn't there been a big change in the permafrost?
- 1 0 Reply • Share ›
- BobbyGlnAZ** → Mike Hoffman  
2 years ago  
Okay, define what a Denier is, other than "they don't agree with me".
- 6 2 Reply • Share ›
- Martin Lewis** → Mike Hoffman  
10 months ago  
And you probably also believe that Trump colluded with Russia, The laptop was Russian Dis info, and the virus came from a meat market that was near a virus bioweapons lab, RIGHT?
- 2 1 Reply • Share ›
- peaceman48** → Martin Lewis  
7 months ago  
There's recent info that Trump did collude with Russia and, if you know his history at all, this would not be a stretch for you to grasp. Hunter's Laptop is just a meme with nothing to show, no less than the hearings on HRC's emails and Benghazi did. Covid could very easily have been manufactured, maybe one day we'll actually know...  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2022...>  
<https://www.reuters.com/art...>
- 5 0 Reply • Share ›