

Learn to form your own opinion.

Session n°8 of July 18, 2023 – French translation – English original.

Location: Mezzaverde in Belgium.

Note Wivine:

The most important thing a seeker of spiritual or worldly truths should be able to do is **step back** when looking for information in books, on the Internet, or through conversations with other people who seem to know something about it.

The second most important thing is to verify all the information received: **is it true?**

Whatever happens, no matter how attractive it may seem, look at it from all angles. Have even a look at what the competition says, other scientists, other thinkers or religious books, take from it what seems true to you in your heart.

Crystallize nothing, stay open to New Truths, even if they throw overboard what you previously believed to be The Truth. This is how science progresses as well as the spiritual seeker.

However, if you want to progress faster spiritually, there is only one option: **contact your indwelling Spirit, your God Fragment in your heart.** Making contact with the Universal Creator is always through the heart. Although much is said in The Urantia Book that the **indwelling Thought Adjuster** works on the human mind, it is in your heart that God lives and where you contact Him. Not in your brain. It is your heart that will influence your brain and make you grow spiritually. And not reverse.

From the moment you contact your **indwelling "little God"** and go to him with all your questions, **you will progress like lightning.**

From the moment you start this friendly and trusting relationship, it will grow. There will be a thin little bridge between the two of you at

first that will eventually become a wide celestial highway as you continue to build this intimate relationship throughout your life.

I know what I'm talking about because I've experienced it just like many others.

I wanted to have a practical example which interests many people today, which has a great influence on the economic field, on our environment, and our attitude towards our fellow human beings. A subject that causes a lot of controversy, with a kind of hidden spiritual ideology, supported by political parties and scientists, but not all.

This subject is **"our environment - with its apocalyptic preachers"**.

Who is telling the "truth" and who is "manipulating" whom for what purpose?

Everyone knows what the mainstream media, political ideologies and scientific theories tell you. But what 'independent' scientists have to say about it is much less known.

The following is an explanation from someone who has a different opinion and also justifies it.

You are not being asked to run from one corner to another. Come out of dualism and sit down first. Before reading, say a small prayer asking God and your spirit guides to provide clarity and insight. After reading it, do a little meditation to ask your questions and get intuitive and indirect answers. Just keep looking because you will have new questions as nothing is what it seems to be.

You can go to God with such questions, questions that pertain to everyday life, and on that basis He will teach your soul to make her spiritually wiser.

The most important thing is to connect with God and never let go. It is from the practical experiences of life, the way to overcome the setbacks, that a human receives his highest divine wisdoms.

Not by living in a monastery and meditating or praying 8 hours a day. Not by withdrawing from material life and taking refuge somewhere.

Bite into life, enjoy it, do not back down from difficulties, do not see yourself as an eternal victim and turn to the Creator who dwells within you and awaits you.

Be humble and surrender to the Wisdom of God. Let go of the idea that you are the great Sage who is going to tell others what to do without improving first and for all yourself. That's not how it works.

Be an objective and independent researcher in all areas! To do this, you must first and foremost control all your emotions, not hold emotional judgments of right or wrong. Because then you can't be objective. I'm not saying it's easy. But definitely doable.

END.

Meet Dr Patrick Moore: Greenpeace co-founder who left the organization hijacked by political left

[Youtube : \(9540\) Meet Dr Patrick Dr. Moore: Greenpeace co-founder who left the organization hijacked by political left](#)

8 May 2023.

Nadia :Dr Patrick Murray joins us, co-founder and former leader of Greenpeace and leader in the international environmental field for over four decades. Dr. Moore, it's really a pleasure to have you with us.

Dr. Moore :Thanks for having me on Nadia. There's lots to talk about these days.

Nadia : it started how you co-founded Greenpeace. You know what inspired you and also at the time what was the state of the environment and the public's perception thereof?

Dr. Moore :

Well as a child I don't think the word environment was ever spoken and certainly ecology was never mentioned. Even when we started Greenpeace, the word ecology was not being used in the popular press but environment was by that time. Of course I grew up in absolute Wilderness on a floating village in a small Bay on Northern Vancouver Island with nothing but water and forest around and no road came to that village. Everything came by boat and the boats had to navigate in open ocean on the west coast of Vancouver Island in the Pacific to get into our harbor. So it was a completely unique childhood that I had there, but the school only went to grade eight. I went to school by boat every day because our floating village was about two miles from the fishing village which was on the land. There was a small one-room schoolhouse with somewhere between eight and twelve children in the average year in all eight grades. I went grade one to eight there and then I was sent to a boarding school in Vancouver to a sort of English Style boarding school, what they call public schools in England. I boarded there and my parents would come a couple times a year to see me and then I'd go home in the summer back to Winter Harbour and work in the logging camp that my father owned. So that's how my childhood was but I didn't realize that I had been in nature naturally. It wasn't like something special, it was where I lived. When I became sort of citified I realized how lucky I had been. I went into *Life Sciences* just naturally. That's because I was interested in birds, in animals and the ocean, in shellfish and fish. I fished all my life and so I did a PhD in ecology eventually after doing a Bachelor of Science in forestry and biology. I was pretty thick into life science already by the time I was 20.

While I was doing my PhD I heard about this little group that was starting to meet in the basement of the Unitarian Church in Vancouver which is a church that accepts people from all religions. Even if you don't have a religion like me, they accepted you. So I joined this group as a fledgling group of people. We all were pretty much hippies by the looks of us but everybody was actually a pretty professional oriented person. There were writers and doctors, lawyers and ecologists. I guess I was the leading life scientist in that early group because it wasn't about life science, it was about stopping nuclear testing at the beginning and so we sailed a boat across the North Pacific Ocean in September 1971 to protest against the five Megaton hydrogen bomb the United States was going to detonate. We managed to get arrested by the Coast Guard and get on *Walter Cronkite's Evening News* nationally in the United States and pretty soon tens of thousands of people were marching against the bomb. The day that bomb was detonated people came from both sides of the border to join hands and shut the border down for a day between all across Canada. I mean that's 4,000 miles or whatever and every border crossing was shut down. It was a really big demonstration and it's a long time ago now, so hardly anybody remembers it because they weren't born yet, but there were many people and that's how Greenpeace begun.

We won and President Nixon canceled the shooter tests of nuclear weapons in Alaska. That was the last time the United States detonated a hydrogen bomb. It was very significant. The beginning of the environmental movement was happening right there.

Then we went against the French atmospheric nuclear testing in the South Pacific. The French public didn't even know that their government was still testing nuclear weapons down there. It was never printed in the newspapers because the [French government owned all the Press and controlled it](#). We went to Paris and

demonstrated in Notre Dame Cathedral while our boat was on its way to Morurowa atoll in French Polynesia where they were detonating these bombs in the air and sending radiation around the whole world. It took two years but we stopped it.

A lot of people thought we must be communists if we were trying to stop U.S and French nuclear testing and weren't going after the Russians.

Well going after the Russians we'd come out in a coffin, that didn't make any sense for us. The Russians should be doing that, not us because we were the enemy. So it did have that element to it. We didn't get much support of course from the United States government or the French government for that matter but we did beat them. Again, this was at the height of the Cold War and at the height of the Nuclear Arms Race and that was the pinnacle of it too.

It eased off after that because partly of the atmosphere we had created and getting people aware of how dangerous the situation was and what a Nuclear war really would do to our world.

We're sort of in a space like that now, a little bit as close as it was to that kind of atmosphere since then, I would say. On the other hand I think people have thought enough about how much ruin there would be, not only to the other side, but to your side too if ever such a thing happened. So I'm a bit optimistic on that front but not very optimistic on the energy front.

We then went on and many of our followers thought what kind of crazy goose are you going to be saving? Whales? After you stopped nuclear war you're now going to save the whales? What's that got to do with anything?

So we lost a few followers but we set out into the Pacific for four years in a row, every summer when the Russians and the Japanese were killing 30 000 large whales every year still in the 1970s. Mainly

for oil and pet food. The oil of the sperm whale is a special type of oil that is used in fine machinery but it's also possible to grow a bean which has just as good oil in it and then you don't have to slaughter a whale. We stopped that by 1981 Whaling was banned in the entire world because of what we did. We got out in front of the harpoons and the pictures of us in a little boat in front of the harpoon with the whale being killed went around the world and that's what really made us famous. We weren't that famous when we were doing the nuclear testing stuff. It was only when we got in the newspapers but when we did the 'Save the Whales' campaign we got everybody excited and interested in being able to do such a thing as to stop that and because it was the Japanese and the Russians it was a sort of balanced in terms of east and west. We didn't have that same attitude of thinking anymore that we were a bunch of Communists because we were actually going against the Communists.

That was what made us catch on and pretty soon millions of dollars were involved and people were just throwing money at us. We started doing some really good stuff. We stopped the capture of orca whales. I was the leader of that campaign on Vancouver Island where the last attempt to capture an orca whale was thwarted by us and that was the end of that. They had already taken nearly a third of the population of the west coast of North America. They started taking some whales from Iceland after that but that too has ended, I believe. I don't think anybody is catching orca whales anymore.

We got to that point and we were famous around the world but then we turned to a very serious problem which was the damaging of the rivers and lakes particularly with toxic waste from factories, especially in Europe. North America had adopted some pretty good air and water pollution control laws in 1972 under Nixon. Again it's funny because Nixon is only remembered for the Watergate break-in, but he actually stopped

- nuclear testing
- killing whales and
- toxic waste.

He was behind all of those things.

The rivers of Europe though like the Elbe, the Rhine and the Thames were all poisoned. There was almost no life in them because factories were putting their waste into the river underwater in a pipe where no one could see it. We took a smaller boat than the ones we'd used on the high seas. They were like 150-foot boats, we took more like a 75-foot boat that could go up the rivers and we put scuba divers in the water to block the pipes where the waste was coming out and it backed up into the factory. That image, that fact intrigued immediately and we got a lot of press for plugging the pipes of these industries and today there's fish in all those rivers.

You know it was really a shame when Greenpeace went bad largely because it was hijacked by the 'political left' because they saw the money and the political power that we'd created. We weren't political particularly. I've never been political. I've avoided it like the plague because I believe that we should just judge every situation on its merit and not just say I'm a Republican so I support this, that and the other thing. Or I'm a Democrat and I support this, that or the other thing. It doesn't make sense to me. I understand that it's legitimate to have political parties. I just don't want to be in one and **I'd rather be a free agent so to say to make up my own mind.**

To study things I always say when I see a situation or a problem : I don't just look at it. From here **I walk all the way around it and look at it from every direction I can imagine to try to understand it better.**

Now we've got a situation where politics and science are being confused with each other. People are saying that there is a consensus

that humans are causing a global catastrophe, a global extreme weather and all this stuff. So, there is a consensus.

Well **that's not how science works**. If you look at any invention or discovery that's been done (*by individuals*), that's why there's a Nobel prize to it, it is given to individuals who have discovered something exceptional. Things aren't discovered by committees. Rules are made by committees after the discovery has been made.

Separate science from politics is absolutely essential and it's now being confused totally in the western world. You know I don't want to live in Russia or China particularly although Moscow is such a beautiful city. I don't want to live there particularly because of their political structure, but I think they do a better job in some ways of **discerning the difference between knowledge and politics**. Politics is really just about policy but if you make policy based on bad science, you get bad policy. You can even get bad policy based on good science if you're not smart enough.

But the truth of the matter is that **there is no hard evidence that carbon dioxide is causing anything to happen to the temperature of the Earth. There is none. It is totally theoretical.**

The reason I called my book '*Fake invisible catastrophes and threats of doom*' is because they are focusing on things that nobody can see and making up stories about.

Nadia : Don't disprove it! So it'll be the very hardest thing to demonstrate.

Dr. Moore : it's impossible because you can't see it and the first rule of science is observation. You have to observe something, it doesn't have to be with your eyes, it can be with a microscope or with a microphone or it can be with any tool you can imagine.

Radiation is the other one besides carbon dioxide. Those are the two main ones that are in the invisible category.

They blame everything on carbon dioxide practically and then the other category is remote. That's why polar bears and coral reefs are the icons. Again, hardly anybody can see them or go there. Who goes to the North Pole and counts all the polar bears?

Why is it that the media never mentions the *treaty* signed in 1973 among all 6 polar Nations to end the unrestricted hunting of polar bears????

Wildlife biologists went indeed to the governments and said it's too easy for rich people to go up there in a plane, hire a guide and get a polar bear or two. There was no restriction. They could take as many as they wanted. So that was ended and enforced and has been ever since. That's why the polar bear population has grown three to five times larger than it was then.

Nadia : all we see now is photographs of lone polar bears on sheets of ice that are about to melt.

Dr. Moore : yes, their common name is *sea bears*. When they jump off a an iceberg and start swimming they know where they're going. You know, it's not as if they're going to swim out to sea and drown. More people drown every year than polar bears do and it is ridiculous to suggest that a polar bear doesn't know how to figure out things. We know that polar bears can survive through much warmer periods than what we're in now.

The three interglacial periods that came before this one which is known as the Holocene -it's about 10 000 years into it now - and so it's about time for it to end, like in the next hundreds of years somewhere were in an ice age. The glacial maximums of which there have been 40 or more, have all occurred within the last 2.6 million years in the Pleistocene Ice Age.

We are now in an interglacial period but it's still colder than it was for the 250 million years prior to that.

They have put everything upside down, Nadia.

-They're saying there's too much CO2 when there's never been so little.

-They're saying it's too hot when it's actually colder right now than it's been almost the whole time of the Earth.

Because that's why all that ice is on the poles. There's a lot of it you know. They show you a picture of the ice in the summer after six months of sunshine 24 hours a day, but in the winter every square inch of the Arctic Ocean, plus the ocean down further south than that, is frozen solid. They never show you that one. It's still that way every winter and they've got people thinking that the ice is disappearing in the Arctic and the Antarctic, which it's not.

Nadia : One of the most doom and gloom predictions made by climatologists is that we are in the midst of an abrupt climate change and it's going to be methane from the Arctic which will lead to human extinction. Some scientists such as Professor Guy McPherson says it'll be by 2026 and you've recently said that this is so far from the truth. How is it possible that they are saying such conflicting theories? Is there not sufficient data and evidence that can be used to refute disastrous claims like that of Professor McPherson?

Dr. Moore : Yes there are. It's not difficult to explain the history of the temperature and the CO2 on the earth. To let people only go back to 1850 when industrialization began, it's like let them think the Earth began then, when it actually began 4.6 billion years ago.

Modern life emerged about half a billion years ago. Before that it had all been a little tiny unicellular plankton in the sea. Sexual reproduction occurred about 2.5 billion years ago. Photosynthesis

occurred even earlier than that, so life developed a lot of what we would consider to be very miraculous processes early on. When multicellular life emerged, which was called the Cambrian explosion about 540 million years ago, larger life forms came into being with organs and flippers. They didn't have any shells or backbones, they were all just like jellyfish at first and then gradually many of these multicellular organisms learned to combine calcium with carbon dioxide in the ocean and make shells for themselves.

A huge percentage of all marine creatures, including the corals, which is about 50 percent of all the calcium carbonate that is produced by marine life, and all of the limestone in the Earth's crust, were made by life. The marble, the chalk, the white cliffs of Dover, are made of the skeletons of coccolithophores which are unicellular plants that made a shell for themselves.

You can imagine how important that would be. instead of just being a naked blob of jelly, you now have a thick hard shell to surround yourself. It's like a knight in armor. That was a huge advance in the evolution of life. there's the crabs, snails and barnacles, clams, oysters and the coral reefs. It goes just on and on. So that was a huge benefit;

unfortunately, inadvertently, it meant that the CO₂ in the ocean and the atmosphere started to go down. They are connected at the surface of the ocean, the ocean and the atmosphere are in equilibrium with regard to their CO₂ content. The [ocean containing about 50 times as much CO₂ as the atmosphere](#).

So when these shells started pulling carbon dioxide (CO₂) out of the ocean to make their shells it started going down from about 5 000 parts per million at the time that that shell process was invented, to 180 parts. From 5,000 to one 180 at the peak of the most recent glacial advance. Twenty thousand years ago it went down to 180

parts per million which is only 50 parts per million **above the death of plants**. Plants don't just need CO₂ to live, they need a certain concentration of it and use 180 parts per million is only 0.18 percent.

Nadia : and we are currently according to most sources at 0.4 or 0.425.

Dr. Moore : **Yes we have increased the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere by about 50 % and this is one of the best things that has happened in the history of life**, and humans did it inadvertently. Just like the shellfish inadvertently caused the CO₂ to decline so drastically over half a billion years, we have come back and **saved life from a certain demise**. No other species could do this, could find the fossil fuels.

Nadia : It highlights our ability to adapt.

Dr. Moore : and we are also evil for doing this. It's a kind of death wish, I think. I don't know why these things come about?

There was a time when people burned women as witches with absolutely no evidence of what a witch even was. Right? Throwing virgins into volcanoes was fairly popular back in these days and all through history there have been pogroms, and you know the Germans murdered eight million people of a certain genetic extraction. I mean we can be evil.

With that thing about the climate it's the people who are calling us deniers who are actually the evil ones, because they are. When you call a person a denier, we're not denying that there are climate changes, so why don't they use straight language. You accuse us of what we are actually believing, which is that **CO₂ is a net benefit to life on Earth**. That's what we believe. We're just about to be joined by one of the winners of the 2022 Nobel Prize for physics in our *CO₂ Coalition* in Arlington Virginia which is right on the border of

Washington DC., of which I was a founding director along with William Happer and Richard Lindzen

Nadia : I interviewed Dr. Lindzen last week and Professor Harper last year. I actually wanted to mention earlier, when you referred it as a 'death wish', that Professor Harper said that this drive towards 'Net Zero' - is a suicide pact.

Dr. Moore : Correct

Nadia : Dr. London said last week that it's almost as if the environmentalists have decided to commit suicide.

Dr. Moore : if 'Net Zero' were actually achieved that is the end of net amounts of CO2 going into the atmosphere.

Nadia : How close do you think we are to that?

Dr. Moore : it's never going to happen. The only way it could happen is if we adopted nuclear energy on a large scale and that could be done. In a hundred years we could be basically get off at least 50 to 75% of the fossil fuels we are using today. Everything that is stationary can be provided by nuclear energy: heat and electricity.

Nadia : my concern here is where will we get our CO2 from?

Dr. Moore : we get our CO2 from the atmosphere and in the ocean. At this point in the history of earth it has been declining steadily for at least half a billion years. Up and down, just like the temperature goes up and down. We are now in one of 40 or more interglacial periods where it gets a little bit warmer than it is during the glacial advances. Canada was covered over a mile of ice from one side to the other during the most recent glaciation and so was it during all the previous ones of which there were 40. Then, in between, you get situations where Canada is halfway livable. 90% of the Canadians are living within 100 miles of the U.S border for a good reason. If you go further north the more inhospitable it becomes.

People forget that **humans are a tropical species** we are not an Arctic species, we're not polar bears or penguins. We evolved at the equator and if it weren't for fire, clothing and shelter we couldn't have moved out of Africa. It's the only reason we were able to do so. Those are all three very important things in our lives : fire, shelter and clothing, especially if you live in a cold place. You know I'm in Baja California which is part of Mexico right now and it's a beautiful warm day but it gets cold enough here in the winter, down into the teens and tens. If people came here and didn't have fire, shelter and clothing, they would die out very quickly, even here.

Again I'm at the Tropic of Cancer. Humans could not live at the Tropic of Cancer without fire, shelter and clothing. Even at the equator there are nights that are cold enough that you want to have a big animal skin on you while you're sleeping. Yes, you could call that clothing.

I would like to talk about coral reefs for a bit because there is this **myth that they're going to die if it gets too hot.**

Funnily enough though, the most biodiverse coral reefs in the world are in the warmest ocean of the world which is the Indonesian archipelago. There are over 600 species of coral, over 2 000 species of reef fish, and is by far the most biodiverse in the world. The Caribbean is the next most diverse and it happens to be the second warmest ocean in the world. So the truth is, if the world warms, the corals will expand to a much larger range than they occupy today. That's the truth!!

Even the people who study coral try to avoid saying that because if you say that it means you don't believe that global warming is going to destroy the coral. Right? And if you don't believe that global warming is going to destroy the coral then you're not on our side and then you won't get any more money from the politicians through the bureaucrats into the universities. That's where the quiet side of this

whole thing is. Everybody hears the commotion from the media and from the 'Greens' and from the World Economic Forum (WEF) and all these people.

Where the real business is taking place is where politicians are instructing their bureaucrats to give scientists money in the universities. 80 % of all the research in the United States is done in universities and if you're a professor in a university and you don't go along with the 'climate thing' you're not getting any money, period. There are few exceptions, very few exceptions. So this is the consensus, **there is being paid for**. Right? **Bought and paid for**. That's what's going on.

So then all the noise comes from the scientists, from the media, from the 'Greens' and they're all together making a whole pile of money out of this. There have always been '**doomsday scenarios**' and yet for some reason '*Doom*' has never occurred. I mean like the end of the Earth you know, it just never seems to come about, no matter how long, how often you predict it. You just feel like come on - "wake up people, wake up", you know. **Nothing like a good disaster to make the news**.

Nadia : yes, yes! It's human Nature's latest thing.

Dr. Moore : if everything is fine today we would have nothing to say.

Nadia : that is one of the arguments that the very devoted to the narrative in terms of 'climate change' argue when it comes to scientists that disagree with the consensus. They're not going to be around for long enough to have their predictions and advice end up killing people. It's not going to upset them.

Dr. Moore : most of the people who, like myself, are willing to tell the truth about this **are not in the clutches of some economic necessity**.

If you're working for a living and you defy the narrative of consensus about 'climate disaster' you're going to be shunned. I am shunned by these people and they call me names, that's all they can seem to come up with is calling me names. I don't see what that has to do with science because I've never worked for the fossil fuel industry in my life.

Nadia : but everyone else says you do.

Dr. Moore : Well, there's no record of it. I haven't hidden anything in my life. I've been a very open person all my life. I've never told a lie and that is the truth. I don't tell lies. Some people do, I think, and some people I think they know they're lying. I'm not sure. You can't see inside a person's brain but the truth of the matter is that **there is no evidence of a climate catastrophe**.

All they're talking about now is **extreme weather events** which have been going on since the beginning of time and **forest fires**. For goodness sake most forest fires are caused by people carelessly failing to put out campfires and throwing cigarette butts out the window and that sort of thing is a lot of them. Lightning has been here forever and lightning causes forest fires but the reason that these fires are so severe today is **due to mismanagement**.

Can you imagine, back in the days when all energy was from wood? Every end of every summer the people went out from cities and towns and gathered all the dead wood in the forest; that's the first they would take because it's the easiest to take and it's already dry. So this really reduces the chance of a catastrophic wildfire going up into the crown of the trees and starting the whole place ablaze.

If you look at the United States : in the west a huge amount of land is owned by the federal government, national parks, national forests and Bureau of Land Management. So it's controlled from Washington where most of the politicians are from the east of the Mississippi, but

most of the federal lands are west of the Mississippi. Idaho is 70% federally owned and they don't care really what happens there. The forests in the east of the country, down along the more southern states like Georgia, Mississippi and Louisiana are covered in forest. They almost never have forest fires because they're managed properly, because the people who own them want to get the wood, not to have a charred forest left behind. The people who are owning the federal lands in the Western United States don't really care that much and so they can use that as a way of saying : *look what the climate has done to our environment. It's causing these forest fires.*

No, **you** are causing the forest fires because you won't let people manage them properly.

Nadia : Look what temperature changes IPCC reports. Dr Lindzen said that there's really, actually just one working group that deals with science, and no, they did not actually come up with anything that posed an existential threat. Scientists will look at data, they won't come up with *doomsday predictions* but they'll leave it open-ended and let the politicians to do what they want with it.

Dr. Moore : Now the IPCC's reports don't say that there's a doomsday coming, they don't say that. They say the **temperature has risen one degree in the last 250 years**, which is true. We're in a warming period, it's a slight warming period. We've been in cooling periods and warming periods all through the Holocene. The Holocene was warmer than it is now. 8 000 years ago until about 6,000 years ago it was warmer than it is now, even though it's getting warmer now than it was 200 years ago. It goes up and down but sometimes it goes up and down downwards and sometimes it goes up and down upwards, that's just a fact. It wobbles and it dips.

There are cycles on cycles on cycles and there's El Nino and La Nina and all of these **short cycles**.

Then there are **longer cycles** and still longer cycles, and then there are things we just don't even understand at all. Like why the Earth went into another Ice Age 2.6 million years ago when there was no ice on the earth at all for the 250 million years before that when the Karoo Ice Age ended which had lasted for 100 million years during the Carboniferous period.

Extreme weather is one thing but damage caused to people is another. The number of people being killed by extreme weather has gone down by 98% in the last 200 years. It's actually just in the last 100 years, since the 1920s. It's been proven that this is the case and most people who died from the weather in those days was by starvation because of what the weather did to their crops. It's unbelievable how much less danger there is for people today than there was just a hundred years ago, much less danger. A lot of it is because of fossil fuels and nitrogen fertilizer. I mean it's only 100 years they have to look back to see that there's definite proof that on a per capita basis there's been a 98% reduction in death from extreme weather. That includes all extreme weather of every kind.

It's just been published and it is not being carried by the mainstream media. I mean they should have because this is their top story.

Nadia : in 2010, this is 40 years after you've co-founded Greenpeace, this organization comes out with a statement saying that you were in fact not a founding member. What is it that you observed in the organization that's led to you walking away. I mean, it must have been a really difficult decision to walk away from something that you in fact were sincerely passionate about?

Dr. Moore : It was an easy decision to make because I had no choice. I had no choice for two reasons.

First, we started out, with a fairly strong humanitarian orientation to save civilization from nuclear war - that must mean you care about

people, at least a little bit – until it came to the point where the *environmental movement*, including *Greenpeace*, was basically *characterizing humans as the enemies of nature*. We were the enemies of the earth. It was as if human beings were the only evil species on the planet and even cockroaches were better than we are. So this is the high philosophical level of this judgmental idea that human beings are the enemies of Nature.

Then came a campaign proposal from people who had no science education. *I was the only one who had a formal Science Education on the international Board of Greenpeace for the whole of those 15 years*. My fellow directors, none of whom had any formal Science Education, decided that Greenpeace should start a campaign *to ban chlorine worldwide*, that was the slogan.

I said to them : you guys, you got to be a little more nuanced than that because *chlorine happens to be one of the most important elements for human life that there is*.

Table salt for example is sodium chloride and it is an essential nutrient. Chlorine is one of the 5 halogens which includes Fluorine, Bromine, Chlorine, Iodine and Astatine. This group of chemicals is one of the most reactive group of chemicals in the whole Periodic Table. It's aggressive and of course we know that Elemental Chlorine Gas can kill you really quickly because it combines with everything. The reason there's no *chlorine gas* around is because it's combined with something else like *sodium*. It cannot exist freely in the atmosphere, it has to get attached to something. It gets attached to lots of things, some of which are the most important things in medicine.

85% of all our Pharmaceuticals are made with chlorine chemistry and 25% of our medicines actually have chlorine in them. Table salt (sodium chloride) is an essential nutrient for all life. The reason

Gandhi marched to the sea was **to make salt** because the British were taxing the poor people in India for something that was essential. This making of salt by the sea was one of his greatest achievements.

In addition to that was adding chlorine to drinking water which is the biggest advance in the history of Public Health and also in swimming pools and S.P.A.S.. You don't have a hot tub without chlorine or bromine pucks floating around in it. You don't, because you don't want to spread disease.

So, I asked them : *you're still going to do this, to have a campaign to ban chlorine worldwide?* Yes, we are going ahead, they answered.

Once you come to the issue of toxicity and chemicals you need to have some science. You don't need any science to want to stop nuclear war, you don't need any science to save 30,000 whales from being killed every year. You don't have to be a whale scientist for that. But if you're going to deal with chemistry you have to have some science because the first rule of chemistry in many ways is that the toxicity is **in the dose**. So table salt is essential at a small dose, you can take too much of it and it still doesn't hurt you, you don't need that much of it but it doesn't hurt you. It starts to hurt you if you take a cup of salt and put it in your stomach. Then you're dead.

Also in the final analysis, Greenpeace was hijacked by the **Political Left** because they were smarter at politics than we were. We weren't really politicians. We were campaigners and we knew how to do that. We knew how to get people's attention, we knew what the real issues were and all of a sudden these guys were saying that chlorine should be banned. It was just a fundraising program **based on an incorrect information**.

How could I be involved in that? There was no choice, I had to go. I always say I blame David McTaggart. He became our chairman, he was a very interesting person. He was friends with the Aga Khan and

with the head of the science division in Moscow for Russia and all kinds of high-level people like the person who founded CNN. He was a real mover in society but **he had no science** and he **really believed that everybody was going to be poisoned by chemicals**, by modern civilization and all the plastics.

You know how people act as though plastic is toxic? Well, is that why we wrap our food in it? Go on the internet and look for "*plastic in the stomachs of Albatross chicks* " and you'll see these made up pictures of a dead Albatross chick sliced open full of plastic.



This does not happen in the world.

It is true that the parents of Albatross chicks bring bits of hard plastic and other such materials in the nest and give it to the chick to grind its food. Birds don't have teeth, so plastic is actually performing a useful function for seabirds. They have two stomachs. One has hard objects in it because when the chicks are in the nest they cannot go out and get it for themselves. Then for the rest of their lives all birds ingest hard objects of a certain size and shape to put in their gizzards to grind their food. They have no teeth, they can't chew their food. So if a mother bird gives its chick a squid 8 inches long, it goes to the

gizzard where it gets ground up except for the beak of the squid which is retained as a hard object to continue helping digest the food.

This is all well understood for 60 years.

Scientists at first when they saw that birds were using plastic as one of the objects that they gave their chicks to digest their food, were worried about it. But they came to realize that it causes no harm. As a matter of fact it works just as well as pumice stones, pieces of wood and nuts that fall off trees. It's hard to find those hard objects in the sea, there are no pebbles in the sea, whereas on land birds just use pebbles about the size of a marble and smaller. So this is **all just total fake** and the other thing that plastic does in the sea is that it acts as a substrate just like driftwood does for marine life to grow on. And then for other species to eat the marine life that's growing on the piece of plastic, it's like a little floating Reef.

Did you know that **there is no such a thing as the 'Pacific Garbage Patch'**, which I'm sure you've heard of.

There isn't such a thing because it's invisible. It's in the middle of the Pacific Ocean where no one can look out the window and see whether it really exists. So they made it up and made paintings of it. You go on the internet and look for *Great Pacific Garbage Patch*, you'll find all these made up cartoon-like things which show this is the 'Pacific Garbage Patch' or they take a brush and paint a big blob on a map of the Earth **that they made up.**



De vijf gyres

The only thing that is a real picture that claims to be part of the 'Pacific Garbage Patch', is the one where right underneath it says this is part of the 'Great Pacific Garbage Patch'. I looked at it. It's a big sea of debris in the ocean, a huge sea of debris and I looked and in the background there were mountains. I thought there's no mountains in the middle of the Pacific Ocean! It turned out that it was

debris that was washed off of Japan during the tsunami that killed 20,000 people. It was all the towns that were just destroyed and that's why there were mountains in the background, because that was Japan. They pretended that it was the 'Pacific Garbage Patch'. It's on the internet. Just go on the internet and say 'Pacific Garbage Patch', twice the size of Texas they say and growing. It is growing faster than we ever imagined.

But it's not true.

Most of the plastic in the sea is discarded fishing gear and that is an issue that should be addressed. But the problem is that fishermen want their boats to be used for putting fish in and nets that work, not discarded ones. It is not necessary that's why they want to get rid of them, they are damaged. Which happens a lot with nets so they just throw them overboard. Maybe somebody should get together with the fishing industry and see if they can't help them figure out a way maybe to hang them off the bow so that they're not taking up room in the boat because they want the boat for ice and fish. Fishing boats have a limited amount of room in them so that's why they throw it away.

It isn't as though people are out there shoveling plastic into the ocean. You know it's true that plastic gets into rivers. Especially in Southeast Asia. It was really quite awful to see all of the people who are selling vegetables and stuff. They are often on the bank of a river and they just throw everything that they don't want away : rotten food and plastic wrappers, the whole thing goes into the river.

Nadia : do you also wonder what the possible end goal could be? Do you think that the motivation is purely about profits because only very few people are benefiting from this? Do you think it's control?

Dr. Moore : I'd say it's more control than money. Yes, I do. I believe it's basically a **communist kind of approach to the situation** and I am

not joining, I'm afraid. It is just how I see it. I think that many people are innocently being pulled into this fear, but that many people are doing it on purpose and exaggerating it to such an extent. The Earth is actually doing quite fine right now. The human species can be immensely proud of itself in retrospect. Not because we did it on purpose but because [we have reversed the decline of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere](#) - which no other species could have done - and this is a good thing, this replenishment. Every molecule of CO₂ we emit came from the environment in the first place and was turned into fossil fuels or turned into limestone which we used to make cement which produces 10% of our CO₂ emissions. The other 90% is almost all fossil fuels. And all of that CO₂ that we are emitting from the fossil fuels came from the atmosphere in the first place. We are just putting it back where it came from and when it was there life flourished. So, that's all you need to know, you really don't need to know anything more than that.

End.