



The Climate Doesn't Care If You're Left or Right

Episode 66: Featuring Author & Oceanographer, John Englander
Hosted by Addison Wiggin.

Addison: Welcome to *The Wigg Sessions*. I'm Addison Wiggin. I have with me today, John Englander, who is an oceanographer and has been studying the rising sea level as a result of climate change. So there's a lot packed into that. And so we're going to have John help us unpack that. Because it's a political issue, of course, but also there's a lot of science involved. And we don't want to fall into the trap of saying we don't believe in science.

John's going to help us understand that there's a couple of other things that are going on. John leads trips to Greenland, among other things, to look at the glaciers and how they're actually melting. I will join John this August to actually walk on the glaciers and see how that ecology is unfolding. There will be other interesting writers that are going to be on that trip as well.

One works for the New York Times. Another one works for Epoch Times. We're going to be engaged in a conversation about what the melting of the glaciers means. I want to introduce John because he's been studying the rise of sea levels for over 12 years. His book is called [Moving to Higher Ground](#). And that just means as the sea level rises, we're going to need to understand the economics of what happens to cities that are close to the water. John knows way more about this than I do. So let me welcome you, John Englander.

John: Thanks, Addison. Great to be with you. And by the way, it's hard to read the title of the book in the upper corner there, but it's *Moving to Higher Ground*.

Addison: You know, we live in a place in Baltimore called Mount Washington. And we, and our neighbors think, oh, that would be great. Because then we would have seaside.

Addison: But that's not really what's going on. And I know that you've spent some time in Annapolis, which is not far from us, trying to help them understand what rising sea level was going to do to property values and those kinds of things. So why don't we get started just by having you describe what your project is, what the book says, and how you're trying to work with municipalities. Because that's your goal, is to try to help people understand how the property values are going to change as it grows. And then I want to get into the science of the melting glaciers, and what can be done about it. Because we've had many conversations about this. And it's not just about carbon emissions. But let's just start with your project.

John: Great. And by the way, mentioning Annapolis, I live in Florida now. Which is another subject for sea level rise, which we'll get to.

But Annapolis was great, and I'm glad you reminded me, because I spoke to your old college actually, St. John's College, if I recall. And for the city. But I also lectured on this at the U.S Naval Academy, because of course the Navy and the Coast Guard, and the armed forces have a great interest in what's going to happen with sea level rise.

Addison: It's right there, too.

John: So I gave a big lecture in Annapolis, at the Naval Academy. The simple premise is this, amongst all the confusion and concern about environment, and ecologies, and things that are happening on the planet that should be of concern to everybody. There's a physical issue that often gets overlooked. Which is that the boundaries of the land ocean, what we call the shoreline or the coastline. They move as sea level changes. And we hadn't seen that, because for 6,000 years it's been fairly stable.

But indeed, sea level moves up and down about 400 feet, by nature, with the ice ages. You don't recall that. We talked about that a few years ago. It's a stunning fact to most people to say that there was a natural climate variation called the ice ages. Nobody doubts that. It happened about every hundred thousand years for the last several million years.

And as the ice sheets change size, sea level goes up and down 400 feet. That's a mindblower. Because if sea level was 400 feet higher or lower, you can imagine the shoreline would be miles inland, or out to sea. And we've been in this stable period for 6,000 years where sea level hasn't changed hardly at all. So we've taken it for granted as if sea levels are stable and the shoreline's are stable. And we get confused when there's a little erosion.

But we need to be preparing for a different future. Sea level is going to be five or 10 feet higher in the next century or so. And it probably won't stop there. We can get into that. That's another discussion.

John: But the simple concept that, even with natural sea level up and down movements, by the ice ages. Because of the size of Greenland and Antarctica, everybody knows about these huge ice masses. It's in two places in the world, Greenland, and Antarctica, that's 98% of the ice on land.

And as that ice sheet changes size, sea level changes. And as sea level changes, the shoreline moves. It's really profound. And we need to wake up to this new reality that, after 6,000 years of stable sea level and stable shoreline, it's changing. And it's going to change regardless of how many solar panels and electric cars and all the other good things we're doing. So both sides have it wrong, as you've heard me say.

Even in your audience in Vancouver years ago, at your conference, I pointed that out. This isn't a right or left issue. This should be of interest to anybody doing financial planning beyond 10 or 20 years, thinking about their kids and grandkids, their estate planning. Because the world's going to look different. And it doesn't care whether you're Republican or Democrat. The ice is melting faster and faster. And if we look back in history, we can see where this is headed.

Addison: Can we talk about that a little bit? There's the science behind it, which I would like to hear about. But also the political response Is it possible for us to mitigate the rising sea level? Is that even a thing?

John: It's a great question. And it's perhaps the most important one of all. Here's the absolute simple facts. We can no longer stop sea level from rising because we've put a lot of heat in the oceans. The ocean's already over two degrees Fahrenheit, over a degree Celsius, warmer than they were a few hundred years ago. That extra heat means the ice sheets and glaciers are going to get smaller. That's a simple correlation of just melting ice.

If we don't do anything to slow the greenhouse gasses and the warming carbon dioxide layer that's trapping heat, this is going to happen a lot faster. But even if we are perfect, even if we mandate that everybody should drive an electric car starting tomorrow, and have solar panels and not burn any fossil fuels, even if we mandated that the ice isn't going to stop melting tomorrow, because there's a long lag time, it's kind of like stopping a super tanker, if you will.

There's a lot of momentum. In this case, thermal momentum. The heat that's in the ocean can't disappear quickly. So the truth is implausible to both sides. If we don't do anything, we're going to have an absolute catastrophe within our children or grandchildren's lifetime. So we need to do something. But we shouldn't be silly to think that if we just take all the right environmental steps, that climate change is going to stop. So that's why this position is actually disturbing to both sides on the political spectrum.

Addison: But how much of it is just naturally occurring?

John: I've got a slide I'll share with you for your listeners. If you look back over 400,000 years, that carbon dioxide and temperature go together. Interestingly, they go in this up and down swing about every 100,000 years. And as global temperature changes, the ice sheets change and sea level rises. So carbon dioxide, temperature and sea level all move together over long periods of time. But the response is an instant. And the problem is that the natural cycle, what we think of as the ice ages, which was not affected by humans, the natural cycle was driven by a change in the solar energy received because the elliptical orbit around the sun changes about every 100,000 years. That's not the magnetic pole shifting, by the way, is something. But we know that the ice age cycles, according to something called the Milankovitch Cycle, correlates with the amount of energy we receive, because the elliptical orbit around the sun varies.

So that's the natural driver of climate change over millions of years. Normally when it's in the warming phase, it releases carbon dioxide as the ocean's warm. So when you warm the oceans, they release carbon dioxide and the level goes up. That's not what's happening now. We actually should have been entering the cooling period and we'd have had an ice age 80,000 years from now, but that's not going to happen because we've changed things. Humans have changed things. And carbon dioxide, as was demonstrated back in 1859 and it's not contested, it traps heat in the atmosphere. It's a clear gas, it's different from carbon, and soot and what we think of as pollutants in the air. It's a kind of pollutant, it's invisible, but it does trap heat.

And what it's doing now that it's gone from the normal range of 180 to 280 and it's now at 420, it's 50% higher than it's been in millions of years, it's trapping heat and warming the planet. So both are true. There was a natural climate change cycle that is in any earth science textbook that's been understood for centuries, the ice ages as we call them. But now we've broken out of the natural pattern because carbon dioxide is 50% higher than natural, and it traps heat and it's warming the planet. So that's why it's confusing, because you have it from both ends, the natural cycle, and now what humans are causing, and they both affect the temperature-carbon dioxide relationship, but from one direction or the other.

Addison: So on the political spectrum, the argument is always about what humans are doing to cause it. What do you think about that? On a political level, people want to change policy, they want to make things happen that will slow it down.

John: The warming. Yeah. And there's a lot of resistance for people thinking that we're going to take their big trucks away from them, or their SUVs or anything like that, or tell them to drive small cars or bicycles to work. I understand that. But let's set aside that policy prescription for a moment and make sure we understand the problem, mankind's technology, which is wonderful, and the current lifestyles, and 8 billion people headed to 10 billion, and people wanting better and better lifestyles and driving fantastic economies.

John: The truth is that's changed the atmosphere and that's trapping heat. And that extra heat is melting the ice, the glaciers that you're going to see next month in Greenland and Antarctica. And as those melt, we're getting into a higher sea level, such that we have not seen on earth or has not existed on earth for 122,000 years.

That was the last natural sea level high water mark, and it was 25 feet above present. Now, most people don't even know that it existed, but it's simple geologic history, as simple as the ice ages. We have to get a side around politics. And again, I don't favor either side. I think both sides tend to distort and use hyperbole. The truth is there's enough ice on Greenland and Antarctica, if it all melts, sea level will be 212 feet higher and the shoreline will be tens of miles inland in most places. We can't let that happen because the planet won't be livable, frankly. So the question is where do we balance having good energy in a free market?

Addison: How do you stop it? You're mentioning the free market, and I know we've talked about this before, but how does a free market approach a global crisis? We have a lot of global climate change initiatives going on with the COP26 summit in Edinburgh. Then there's Klaus Schwab with the World Economic Forum and Larry Fink with Blackrock are raising a lot of money to try to change politics and the economics to address the problem. But if it's a scientific problem, how does that actually happen? It's a trend that's in place that I don't see how that works unless you're, I don't know, if we're talking about investing, you invest with them.

John: Well, remember, let's play it back to 50 years or so when we were kids in effect. There was a problem with rivers catching on fire, the famous Cuyahoga River, and air pollution was so bad that buildings were deteriorating. And so when Nixon created the EPA, and the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act back in the 70s to deal with those huge environmental problems, there were people who didn't want those government interventions either.

But Richard Nixon, a strong conservative Republican, felt that was the right thing to do. And we cleaned up a lot of those things because in fact, we put a price on pollution. And over the period of time between regulation and economic incentives or penalties, we did clean up the rivers in the United States at least significantly, and everybody's quite pleased with that, I think.

And that came out on the conservative side, the Teddy Roosevelt side, if you will, the Teddy Roosevelt to Richard Nixon side. And Ronald Reagan, who felt that the environment was important in that context to have a healthy environment. The problem is whether just dumping industrial waste and pollution into rivers to the point where they catch on fire or caught on fire, how do you introduce that to the free market?

I believe there should be some pricing, whether people want to call it taxes or not, or fees to associate the damage to the public good and give us economic incentives to shift policy.

John: That's prior to most people's geologic understanding, but it's simple to go and find out and you can do it with that funny cartoon movie. When you make people aware that sea levels go up and down 400 feet in a repeating natural cycle, it gets their interest because that suggests that it's not caused by us.

But then I can show where the natural cycle of the last 2.58 million years of natural sea level going up and down 400 feet that now we're going up where we should be going down. That we've changed eras. And it correlates when changing the atmosphere, all of these numbers do add up. Even the people who've tried to disprove it, but done it with integrity. Like Richard Mueller out at Berkeley's earth science, he tried to disprove this. And he came to the conclusion that no, it's true we are changing the climate and we're warming the planet, we're melting the ice, we're raising the ocean. And we better start changing it, or by our grandkids' generation, there's going to be a world of hurt.

Addison: But all right describe a world of hurt, because we're adaptable humans and we've been adaptable for millions of years, right?

John: Yep. The last time sea level changed quickly was 12,000 years ago and it rose about 15 feet in a century. Like the pandemic, you can get fooled by the numbers today and extrapolate them and think they're going to stay linear, or you can plot a curve, or you can say this could get to exponential growth, which is what happened with the pandemic of course. And we saw two goes to four to eight to 16 to 32, and surprised the hell out of us in just a few months. Well, the same thing will happen with the melting glaciers and ice sheets that you're going to see in Greenland in August. The rate of melting has tripled in 30 years. Now it's still only a quarter of an inch of year, so who cares?

The problem is if you double it, hypothetically, if you go from a quarter of an inch a year to a half to one to two to four inches a year, just on the five fingers of your hand, we go from a quarter of an inch to five inches a year, okay. That's 50 inches a decade. That's four feet of sea rise in a decade. Okay, now I don't think it'll get quite that bad, but the point is just like the pandemic surprised us with the low numbers at first. But exponential growth happens in economics as you've pointed out with high-interest rates when inflation got above 11%, it changed the world, right? Because we could see that you can't sustain.

Addison: It's happening again.

John: Right? And so that's counterintuitive. You have to do the numbers to see where that extra growth goes, but it's happened in geologic history. Now we've changed it this time. We should be in the cooling period and 80,000 years from now we should be in the next ice age. Of course that's too far in the future to worry about, but it doesn't matter because that's not going to happen. We've broken out of the cooling cycle that was natural.

John: And we've added enough heat to this system that the planet is measurably warmer. And when the planets measurably warmer, the ice sheets get smaller. And when the ice sheets get smaller, the sea level rises.

When you say, let's think about this practically, we look at the coastlines of the world. We look at the maps of the world as if they're static. But the two white things, Greenland and Antarctica, as they change volume, sea level changes and that changes the shorelines. This is so profound it's going to put 30 nations underwater. Vietnam, just a foot or so of sea level rise will put most of Vietnam underwater. The Economist magazine has projected that this century hundreds of millions of people will be displaced by rising waters.

Addison: Because they will have to be.

John: Right.

Addison: They won't be able to live there anymore.

John: That's right. We tend to confuse flooding from storms like a hurricane and coastal erosion and extreme high tides and sea level rise. They're really very different. Weather events are hard to predict, but are getting more extreme. Extreme high tides change by the position of the planets and are very predictable. Erosion is a natural thing. And from Cape Cod to the Chesapeake to Florida, erosion happens all over the world. Sea level rise is different, it's a drip filling the bucket. So we tend not to see it. And again, in human history of 6,000 years, sea level hasn't changed much.

We measure land. Your house I'm sure you know, is so many feet above sea level, probably on its property plat. Whether it's a hundred feet above sea level I think we talked about, or my house is 11 feet above sea level here in Florida. That hasn't changed. That's only changed like eight inches in a century. So we tend to think of it as pretty stable, but it's the acceleration, it's like that pandemic growth rate.

Addison: Yeah. Do you think that the rise in sea level has increased the dramatic storms that we see and the fires? Because my own impression is that we just dramatized those things and they've always happened.

John: Sea level hasn't affected them at all. You've got it backwards with due respect, okay. That we've warmed the atmosphere and that's put heat in the ocean. Ninety-three percent of the heat state is stored in the sea. And so you think about like a giant outdoor swimming pool and you come out of summer when it's warm and then it stores its heat in the pool. And so it stays warm even after a few days of cold weather outside. So this giant ocean swimming pool has stored this excess heat, an incredible amount of excess heat.

John: That's not going away anytime soon, that extra heat does a few things. It changes weather patterns, both ocean and atmospheric circulation. So the heat changes the patterns of weather giving us more drought, more high heat days as we're seeing in the headlines all over the world. More days lose rainfalls because the oceans evaporate more and come down as more rain or snow, that's all predicted with warming oceans.

So as you warm the planet by trapping the heat and the atmosphere, it has these several effects of changing weather patterns, changing ocean currents, more droughts, more heat, more wildfires, et cetera. Sea level is a very specific phenomenon that as we melt the ice on land, not the floating sea ice or icebergs, but the ice on Greenland and Antarctica, 98% of it is those two places. Sea level is a function of melting the ice on land, raising the sea level for the first time significantly in 6,000 years.

Addison: All right. So when you're talking to groups of people, when you're trying to explain what you see happening, how do you convey to them that the sea level rise is a phenomenon? Whether we agree with it or not, and when they disagree with you. If somebody challenges you on this and says they just don't agree with you, how do you deal with that?

John: I relate it to things that they can relate to. We did it face to face at your last conference in Vancouver a decade ago, and you've seen me do it elsewhere. I do it with military leaders and engineering and intelligence agencies and there's skeptics in every group.

I admire skeptics in science, that's good. But when I relate it to the ice ages and how those two miles of ice that everybody knows covered North America and left things like Long Island and Cape Code as remnant relics of the retreating glaciers. We don't doubt that the ice ages happen. But when I explain it in real context and say the ice ages, the glaciers created the Great Lakes 11,000 years ago, we tend to think they're permanent.

The Earth's landforms are not permanent. They're just durable. And when you relate what we know of as the ice ages, and nobody disputes the ice ages, and explain that for two and a half million years we've had ice ages about every 100,000 years is a natural cycle.

That makes sense to people. But now we're in a super warming era. We're already two degrees Fahrenheit, one degree Celsius, round figures warmer than we were before the industrial era. That extra heat is melting more ice. As ice melts more sea levels are going to rise. Now it could rise 10 feet, 20 feet, 30 feet. It depends on how warm we get and how quickly we warm.

I try to be nonpolitical about, or certainly nonpartisan about it, and invite people to look at it through an environmental lens, through an economic lens, through a national security lens, through architecture, engineering. There's lots of ways to get people's interest to their own house.

John: But to be clear, not only do you talk about where you live. So I live in Florida. People ask me all the time, why would I live in Florida if I'm concerned about sea level? Well, I'm two miles inland. I'm 11 feet above sea level. Water's not going to get to my house for 60, 80 years, okay even in the worst case. Florida's not a flat state. People think it's all going to go underwater. Even the New York Times mistakenly wrote something about that. Florida's about to go beneath the waves. Orlando's 80 feet above sea level. We need to get some reality into our earth science.

People have this super simplistic view of things because it's emotionally driven in most cases. They don't want Miami to go underwater. They don't want the Bahamas or the Florida Keys to go underwater. I don't want to get older, but I'm going to get older and we need to wake up to reality. I talk to people like that. There's a natural part of this and there's part that we've affected. And if we care about our legacy, our investments, our kids, and the legacy for future generations, we need to be honest.

The “Greenwashing” of ESG

Addison: Well, let's talk about investments. And this is part of the reason I wanted to talk to you is that there are initiatives underway. One of them is ESG, which is the acronym for environmental, social, and governance that is being propelled in the corporate environment to try to address climate change and social issues like racism and that kind of thing. And then governance We don't invest in companies that are defrauding their customers, right?

John: t's more of an issue in Europe and Asia, I find. Some investment houses in Hong Kong and London had me give presentations to their analysts about sea level rise as an ESG issue. So, that's how I got exposed to it. ESG, for your viewers who aren't familiar, as you say, is environment, social and governance.

And even the SEC has written about it. In the last 20 years, just doing some quick research, it went from being mentioned in 1% of the earnings calls to 20% last year. So, there's been a huge growth in 20 years, since 2003, it started as the first use of the term. But interestingly, BlackRock and Larry Fink, the president, who's one of the biggest investment firms in the world, of course, it's interesting. He was one of the big proponents, and he was recently quoted as saying, "Maybe it's been overplayed at the moment."

Because of course the complication of the war in Russia, or in Ukraine, I should say, and the issues about Russian energy, which are causing companies and countries to look at fossil fuels with a fresh eye because of the problem of supplying the world with enough energy. Even Larry Fink with BlackRock said, "Maybe we overstepped it a little bit."

John: In fact, there's a headline last week on July 5th, 2022 in the Financial Times of London. The title was, "How ESG Investing Came to a Reckoning" with allegations of greenwashing at the highest levels. Does it still make sense for funds to package together environmental, social and governance factors? Finally, the term ESG is less than two decades old, but it may already be coming to an end of its useful life."

Okay, so a very appropriate and timely quote to your question. It's been a new thing, beyond what's on the balance sheet and the income statement of a company, what are the environmental, social, or governance issues that could affect its value? And ESG had two-sided aspects, I guess. One is, how can we use ESG to do some good in the world, but also how will those issues affect the company's values, whether it's a coffee company like Starbucks and what the concerns about what's happening to growing the coffee bean, for example, is one example of how environment could affect the value of a company. If the price for Dunkin Donuts or Starbucks goes too high to the customer, it could impact its value. But, it was proactively being used as a way to create funds that embraced good governance, good social values, representation of women and minorities, and so on, and good environmental policies as a way to pursue change. But again, this is not John Englander talking, according to the Financial Times, "Maybe it was overplayed a little bit."

Addison: And so what does that mean, it was overplayed though?

John: Based upon your question the other day, I did some research and there was this tremendous growth in ESG funds, Morningstar said up to trillions of dollars being managed. Yeah, to 2.7 trillion dollars is the level of ESG funds, according to Morningstar. Huge amounts of money are being put into funds that would invest with that consideration to try and effect change.

Addison: But, Larry Fink himself manages 11 trillion dollars.

John: Right. And so I guess, I'm not an expert in this, but obviously not all of his funds or not all of BlackRock's funds were following ESG. But, those were the funds and portfolios and ETFs that specifically said they were taking ESG considerations into their valuation where they're buying the company. So again, that's beyond my level.

Addison: I get when you say that it's beyond your level, because I feel like it's beyond my level, too, But, when I'm doing the work that I do, and I look at like the policies that are put in place in China, where they just ignore all these things, like ESG only applies to the Western world really, and mostly in Europe.

John: Yeah, as I say, actually my two presentations were in London, one was for a British firm, one was for a Chinese, Hong Kong firm whose office was there. So, they seem to be much more sensitive to ESG. This was before the pandemic, so that was three or four years ago.

Addison: I don't know. It's weird that it's, for me anyway, that it's a theme that is recurring right now. We're coming out of the pandemic and suddenly everyone's talking about ESG.

John: Well again, they must have heard you, because the FT said, "Maybe it's peaked."

My Upcoming Trip to Greenland With John Englander

Addison: Well, yeah, that could be. Lots to talk about. So, John, we're going to be going to Greenland. Tell us about that.

John: Again, Greenland, it tends to be an overlooked place for most people, only 56,000 people live there. It's the biggest island on the planet. It's nearly the size of Australia, which is a continent and it's covered by two miles of ice. And, the history of it is fascinating. We're going to talk about that somewhat. But, it's been well documented there for centuries, and even with historical records, even longer, how the ice sheets changed. And, it's a place of great scientific discovery drilling down into the ice sheet and deciphering the ice cores layer by layer, year by year, just as you would look at tree rings, and into a tree and see what happened year by year, whether it was fire or drought or different conditions as a tree grew. Well, as the ice sheet gets laid down snowfall by snowfall, we can decipher that, and we're going to see some of those ice cores actually in the ice core lab in Copenhagen, before we go over to Greenland.

But then, watching and putting in scale what happens with the Greenland glaciers and ice sheet really puts us in a different perspective. It's like the first time you were in a boat and went out of sight of land, we're going to be doing that, but it's going to be ice all the way around us even from a helicopter height, but it puts it all in context. And again, the ice on Greenland by itself, if we allow it all to melt, which hasn't happened for millions of years, but if we warm the world enough that it melts quicker and quicker, sea level will be 25 feet higher globally.

Antarctica is seven times that volume 186 feet. So the two of them together, 212 feet of potential sea level rise, we need to be sensitive and observant about what's happening in Greenland and Antarctica, because when we put them in the Ice Age cycles of the last two and half million years, which were natural, and we see that something's changed now, because we're warming and we should be cooling according to the natural cycle. And, all the numbers add up, forget the politics and the agendas, the truth is we can't stop sea level rise quickly, as we said earlier. And, we are going to see evidence of that in Greenland in a way that's just unmistakable. I find having taken senators and military leaders from the Navy and the Air Force and the Coast Guard to Greenland and putting the pieces together there on site has a really penetrating impact because there are no distractions.

John: Our cell phones are off. And, it's just a way to contemplate the world from a very different perspective. And it's very, very powerful.

I think, as you've cited in my book, my new book, *Moving to Higher Ground*, Senator Angus King wrote the introduction and he talked about that, because he was one of the people I took to Greenland, or he took me to Greenland, I guess, with the [inaudible 00:45:14] Valley Coast Guard a few years ago, and it had a profound impact on him. And, I know you'll find it enlightening and everybody takes away something slightly different. I've been there about 9 or 10 times. I find it compelling.

Addison: Well, right now I owe you my measurements for my parka.

John: Yes, we do. I need that.

Addison: So, I'll get those to you. All right, John, we'll catch up, and we'll do a couple more of these interviews. I know you're bringing more interesting people on that trip, so it'll be good.

John: And well, actually, one thing that you might want to include in this, for those that are confused by the graphics I was describing, I do have a small slide set, and I can give you a simple email address if anybody wants to get the graphics.

Addison: Yeah. Send it to me. I'll publish it.

John: It's slides@johnenglander.net. I'll put it in an email. But, the last time you interviewed me, I gave you some graphics, which you cut in, and you can use those again.

Addison: Plus, I'm going to bring my camera when we go.

John: Great.

Addison: So, we'll get some good stuff.

John: Great. You need to fill out that little questionnaire, too.

Addison: Oh, that one.

John: It's just like 10 questions. It's really simple. It's just like where to ship the parka and what flight you're arriving and all that. It was last week.

Addison: You can tell I'm a detailed person.

John: Yeah. That's why you have good staff.



Meet your host, Addison Wiggin

The Wigg Sessions, conceived during the COVID-19 pandemic and tornado warning in Baltimore, Maryland. Addison started interviewing key thinkers on Politics, Science, Economics, Philosophy and History to find out how their ideas impact financial markets and our financial lives. Key thinkers include Jim Rickards, Bill Bonner, George Gilder, James Altucher and over 50 others.

In 2020, he launched a new project called **Consilience**, which is an enlightenment era term that means “the unity of knowledge”. He is the co-author of the New York Times best-selling books **Financial Reckoning Day** and **Empire of Debt**, as well as **The Demise of the Dollar** and **The Little Book of the Shrinking Dollar**. Addison is the writer and executive producer of the documentary **I.O.U.S.A.**, an expose of the national debt, shortlisted for an Academy Award in 2008.



John Englander

John Englander is an oceanographer, consultant, and leading expert on sea level rise. His broad marine science background coupled with explorations to Greenland and Antarctica allows him to see the big picture of sea level rise and its societal impacts.

LISTEN ON

