



Yale: Who Will Pay For Huge Costs Of Rising Seas?

Rising sea levels due to climate change has been thoroughly debunked by top scientists, but this doesn't change the scare-mongering rhetoric to drive massive spending to stop it.

In 2009, the [Telegraph](#) headlined *Rise of sea levels is 'the greatest lie ever told'* and wrote:

*"But if there is one scientist who knows more about sea levels than anyone else in the world it is the Swedish geologist and physicist Nils-Axel Mörner, formerly chairman of the INQUA International Commission on Sea Level Change. And the uncompromising verdict of Dr Mörner, who for 35 years has been using every known scientific method to study sea levels all over the globe, is that **all this talk about the sea rising is nothing but a colossal scare story.**"*

In other words, the claim that there is "scientific consensus" on rising sea levels is completely fabricated in order to drive Sustainable

For cities in the United States, the price of infrastructure projects to combat rising seas and intensifying storms is coming into focus — and so is the sticker shock.

In Boston, where many neighborhoods have been built and recently expanded in low-lying areas, an estimated \$2.4 billion will be needed over the next several decades to protect the city from flooding, [one study says](#). That report came as the city abandoned plans to build a harbor barrier that would have cost between \$6 billion and \$12 billion, which researchers concluded was economically unfeasible.

In Charleston, South Carolina, the mayor said last year that the city, which floods regularly during high tides, had an estimated \$2 billion in needed drainage projects.

In Norfolk, Virginia, the Army Corps of Engineers has recommended a [\\$1.4 billion series](#) of seawalls and other infrastructure to protect part of the shoreline. As with many cities, that's just the start.

In Harris County, home to Houston, planners say \$30 billion is needed to provide protection against a 100-year flood. Hurricane Harvey, which in 2017 [caused 68 deaths and \\$125 billion in damages](#) in the state, was the city's [third 500-year-flood](#) in three years.

And in New York City, Mayor Bill de Blasio has proposed a storm surge barrier and floodgates to shield parts of the city and New Jersey from rising waters. The estimated cost: \$10 billion.

While the threats to these cities are growing as climate change intensifies, what is not clear is how to pay for projects needed to protect tens of millions of people and trillions of dollars of property. Conservative estimates of the capital investments needed to combat rising seas and worsening storms run into the hundreds of billions of dollars in the coming decades.

The failure to face these costs is the next phase of climate denial," says Richard Wiles, executive director of the [Center for Climate Integrity](#), an

environmental advocacy group that champions forcing polluters to pay for climate crisis costs. “We’ve got to look at this squarely and figure out how to pay for it.”

The center recently [issued a study](#) concluding that by 2040, building sea walls for storm surge protection for U.S. coastal cities with more than 25,000 residents will require at least \$42 billion. Expand that to include communities under 25,000 people and the cost skyrockets to \$400 billion. That’s nearly the price of building the 47,000 miles of [the interstate highway system](#), which took four decades and cost more than \$500 billion in today’s dollars.

The research is a rough yardstick because it only considers sea walls, not other ways to mitigate flood risk including buying out homeowners and improving storm water systems. “It’s a deliberate underestimate,” Wiles adds. “We know it will cost more — a lot more.”

For comparison, Wiles notes, protection for Jacksonville, Florida, would cost [\\$3,990 per capita](#), while in New York the cost would be [\\$231 per capita](#). Outside cities, the price per person jumps dramatically to [\\$37,366](#) in Cumberland County, New Jersey, and [\\$154,747](#) in Dare County, North Carolina.

Globally, the question of equity is even more acute, with cities in developed nations far better able to fund climate change adaptation projects than in developing countries. “In an environment of scarce resources for local authorities, especially in poor countries, mobilizing such resources will be a real political and institutional challenge,” according to a [World Bank study](#).

William Stiles, the head of [Wetlands Watch](#), a Norfolk-based group that advises local governments and non-profits on sea level rise adaptation and floodplain management, says local officials are just coming to terms with the staggering scale of the challenge. State and local money is limited. [Resilience bonds](#), which could fund extensive capital improvements to deal with flooding and sea level rise, have been slow to take off. “There is no coordinated strategy nationally, there is not enough money, states are not moving, and this loose talk of resilience

bonds in the private sector is not a reality yet,” Stiles says.

He estimates that Norfolk and neighboring Virginia Beach, hotspots for relative sea level rise on the Atlantic coast, each have about \$4 billion in resilience work to do over the next couple of decades. That does not include protecting the port, one of the busiest on the East Coast; the area’s military shipyards; or the world’s largest naval base. A [land-use study](#) by the local planning district identified 22 projects, many estimated to run from \$10 million to \$50 million, including raising roads, improving storm water systems, and making wastewater treatment plants more resilient to serve the six military bases in Norfolk and Virginia Beach.

[Read full story here...](#)



World Resources Institute: Go

Vegetarian To Combat Climate Change

The logical absurdity that a vegetarian diet will do anything to affect earth's climate is deeply embedded into the radical green movement, which exclusively promotes the UN's Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy. Note that the study referenced is sponsored by the World Bank! ☐

Unfortunately, the writer of this story suggests that inventing genetically modified food (GMO) is the future of feeding the world. - TN Editor

The World Resources Institute (WRI), which is supported in part by the U.N., is encouraging humans to give up eating meat. Doing so, they believe, will not only help with food supplies but will also combat climate change. Become a vegetarian or watch the world starve to death and burn is the messaging, I guess.

[Writing in their report](#), the WRI project claims:

Consumption of animal-based foods to rise 68 percent between 2010 and 2050, with an 88 percent increase in consumption of ruminant meat (meat from cattle, sheep, and goats). These trends are a major driver of the food, land, and GHG mitigation gaps. For every food calorie generated, animal-based foods—and ruminant meats in particular—require many times more feed and land inputs, and emit far more greenhouse gases, than plant-based food.

After the begrudging acknowledgment that meat does provide some needed nutrients to people in developing countries, the WRI adds that the increase in meat consumption around the world “is both unnecessary and unhealthy.” Playing the spoilsport, WRI felt the need to then insert that science “has now identified processed meats as carcinogenic and red meat as probably carcinogenic.”

We get it, leftists, things that humans enjoy are bad and should be taken away from us. Who cares that quinoa tastes like dirt, no matter what you do to it? Massive amounts of red meat *might* be carcinogenic and forests

have to be cut down to accommodate the cows. We should stop eating delicious meat and eat more tasteless quinoa and kale instead.

Well, no thank you. I was once a vegetarian and I ain't going back. I'm much smarter now than when I was a member of PETA.

I also grew up in the Florida Panhandle surrounded by tree farms, so I don't buy the "we're running out of trees" scare tactic. Acres and acres filled with rows upon rows of pine trees blanket the area. As a fun way to combat any leftist tendencies they may have, I love pointing out those tree farms to my kids whenever we visit my dad. I then ask, "So, kids, what do you say whenever your teachers complain about deforestation?" The correct reply, that they've learned by looking out of the windows of our car, is, "Trees are a renewable source of energy."

Of course, raising more cattle to feed this world's growing mouths will require some deforestation. So, what? There are more trees in this country than when the Pilgrims landed. There are also way more fields containing cattle, too. Lots of deforestation has happened as has even more reforestation. I understand that land is ultimately a limited resource, but we are far from coming close to that limit. Protecting virgin forests is all fine and dandy until it begins to threaten humanity's ability to flourish. Cut trees down when and where needed, and plant and cultivate trees when and where needed.

Another way to help ensure that everyone has enough food is to put an end to the [irrational attack on GMO food](#). The Green Revolution started by American scientist Norman Borlaug has been attributed with preventing billions of people from starving to death. Imagine how many future people could be fed if we'd stop demonizing big businesses that have the resources and incentives to develop more and better GMO crops.

[Read full story here...](#)



Twisted: Sacrifice Fat People For Climate Change And Overpopulation

The radical, anti-human side of climate change fanatics is clearly seen in this BBC host suggesting that fat people should be shunned from health care and left to die in order to fight climate change. □ TN Editor

BBC host Michael Buerk says the state should let fat people die to save the NHS money.

Buerk, who hosts Radio 4's The Moral Maze, said obesity should not be classed as a disease, which encourages people to seek treatment on the Health Service.

He added: "You're fat because you eat too much."

Writing in the Radio Times, the host suggested allowing deaths due to obesity could be a benefit to society.

“The obese will die a decade earlier than the rest of us,” he wrote.

“See it as a selfless sacrifice in the fight against demographic imbalance, overpopulation and climate change.”

The former I’m A Celebrity... Get Me Out Of Here! star queried Public Health England’s claim that overweight and obesity-related ill-health costs the NHS £6.1 billion a year.

He wrote: “Who can calculate how much an obese person would have cost if they were slim?”

“How much would he or she cost if, instead of keeling over with a heart attack at 52, they live to a ripe, dementia-ridden old age, requiring decades of expensive care?”

“In any case, VAT on takeaways, confectionery and fizzy drinks more than covers it.

“The freedom to make bad choices is what personal autonomy, indeed democracy, is all about . . . who is to say longevity is the ultimate goal in life?”

“Give them the facts to make informed decisions; by all means ‘nudge’ all you like, but in the end leave couch potatoes alone. They’re weak, not ill.”

Meanwhile, researchers say getting patients to wear fat suits could reveal medical students’ prejudices against overweight and obese people, researchers say.

Scientists at the University of Tuebingen, south Germany, asked trainee doctors to take an anti-fat attitudes test (AFAT) after taking part in a role play with “patients” wearing fat suits.

A total of 207 medical students took part in the study, where volunteers helped to simulate a meeting between a “family doctor” and a “patient with diabetes”.

The AFAT responses, published in the British Medical Journal, showed

that students harboured more negative attitudes towards obesity than either teachers or the patients.

[Read full story here...](#)