

Daily Mail



What your paper reported...

By Neil Martin, October 20, 2023

Deadly Babet wreaks havoc

Storm kills three as giant waves tear off lighthouse dome

SOUTH SHIELDS

Recent headlines

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

BRECHIN

LEEDS AIRPORT

ABERDEENSHIRE

Wined as it rages 'sweep her away'

Ship A jet skied off the runway on to grass & landed

Housebound widow

NO climate breakdown mentioned

gully Mast, Monday, October 23, 2023

Water level reached knee

Housebound gran, 83, dies as flood water rises half way up her room

Trapped: Ruins of front room where Maureen Gilbert died. Inset: On her wedding day in 1975

By Andy Dolan and Richard Marsden

CHESTERFIELD

NO climate breakdown mentioned

FIVE-DAY WEATHER FORECAST

TODAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
North Dry High: 10C (50F) Low: 7C (45F)	North Dry High: 10C (50F) Low: 7C (45F)	North Cloudy with rain in the west later High: 12C (54F) Low: 7C (45F)	North Rain with clearing then showers High: 14C (57F) Low: 9C (48F)	North Identified with showers High: 15C (59F) Low: 10C (50F)
South Dry High: 10C (50F) Low: 7C (45F)	South Dry High: 10C (50F) Low: 7C (45F)	South Cloudy with rain in the west later High: 12C (54F) Low: 7C (45F)	South Sunny with showers High: 14C (57F) Low: 9C (48F)	South Windy with showers High: 15C (59F) Low: 10C (50F)

MATT RIDLEY: The official true cost of net zero is the same as spending £1 a SECOND for the next 31,000 years!

By MATT RIDLEY
PUBLISHED: 22:13, 18 October 2023 | UPDATED: 23:18, 18 October 2023

265 shares | View comments

The truth is out. An official report has admitted for the first time the scale of the cost of reaching net zero by 2050.

A study by the National Infrastructure Commission, released on Tuesday, concluded that hitting the 2050 target will roughly double the amount of money we would have spent anyway on infrastructure over the next 27 years to £2 trillion: an additional £1 trillion spent on the green agenda.

Climate mentioned

Please see over for an explanation

What your paper did not report...

The Daily Mail opposes measures to reach Net Zero on the basis that it will cost too much for the working people. Given the cost of living crisis, it sounds like a worthy argument. What they don't report is the much bigger cost of not reaching Net Zero quickly, and the massive loss of life that comes with it. **This is not a balanced view.**

The science: as the planet gets warmer, more water evaporates into the atmosphere and then in cooler air, condenses as rain, dumping much larger volumes of water in a shorter time, causing floods. We always had occasional floods, of course, but they are getting heavier and more frequent, causing more harm and damage because of climate breakdown.

Who will pay for the damage caused by Storm Babet and climate breakdown?

Extreme weather events cost \$2.8 Trillion from 2000 until 2020 and it has got much worse in the last 3 years. This is why experts have clearly advised that the sooner we transition to Net Zero, the cheaper and safer the future will be.

Who on earth, would stand in the way of a cheaper, safer future?

Obviously the coal, oil and gas companies want to maintain their obscene profits at the expense of everyone else. But then there are the banks that invest heavily in fossil fuels like JP Morgan and Barclays Bank; the lawyers, the insurers, the PR and advertising companies that support new fossil fuel extraction.

Finally, there are the billionaires, people like 4th Viscount Rothermere who owns the Daily Mail, the Murdoch family who own the Sun and the Barclay family who own the Telegraph/Spectator. **The richest 1% of people produce double the carbon emissions of the poorest half of the world's population (according to Oxfam).** They are profiting massively from polluting industries and have a clear motive for delaying transition to clean energy.

The Daily Mail recently used a survey (commissioned by Don't Cry Wolf) to criticise the climate movement. They failed to mention that the same survey found that Conservative voters earning over £150K were the group least willing to change to address climate breakdown.

- 1.** When the Daily Mail reports on the cost of Net Zero, could it also mention the massive financial cost and loss of life that comes with NOT reaching Net Zero?
- 2.** When the Daily Mail reports on extreme weather events like Storm Babet, could it mention how climate breakdown is a factor on frequency and severity?
- 3.** When the Daily Mail reports on such disasters, could they include the significant cost of rescue and repair - cost which can be reduced by transitioning to renewable energy and reducing carbon emissions?

This would give a more balanced view