Episode 559: Greenpeace Co-Founder Repudiates Organization

Guest: Patrick Moore

WOODS: Everybody is now interested to hear your story now that I've set it up for them. Before I let you tell them that story, though, a story you've probably told 8,000 times, I want to ask you a question that maybe a sympathetic interviewer hasn't asked you up to now, which is, do you ever get the feeling in your life now that by, let's say, making a video for Prager University or appearing in certain circles you are lending credibility to people who really despise some of the things that you've stood for?

MOORE: Wow, I hadn't thought of that actually. Tell me more. Like who?

WOODS: Well, in other words, I can imagine there being people who, honest to goodness, couldn't care less about the environment one way or the other. Now, I'm not one of those people, but I can imagine people feeling that way, and they think, ah, well, we'll trot out Patrick Moore, and he'll make our case for us.

MOORE: I see what you're saying. Well no, you won't catch me saying anything about the environment or ecology or the need to make sure we look after nature, have parks and wilderness areas, learn how to garden this earth more carefully is one way I would put it, because there are over 7 billion of us, and we really don't have any choice but to take our food and our materials and our energy — those are the three categories I kind of sum up the things we need to live every day, and as do all living things — we have to take those things from the environment, because that's the only place we have. We have to build our buildings from materials that are taken from the earth. We have to make our energy from what is available on this planet and the solar energy that comes in, which is converted to most of the different kinds of energy we use on this planet, including fossil fuels, which, most people don't think of fossil fuels as solar energy, but they are stored solar energy.

So I always make sure to let people know that they can't deny that. They can't say, oh no, we'll get our energy and our food from somewhere else besides the environment, because there is nowhere else to get it from, and that's why we have to think very carefully about how we do that and do it in a way that doesn't result in long-term damage, and that's a bit of a value judgment, because some people think just cutting a tree down is damage, when in fact if you cut a tree down, use the wood for energy and food and then replace it with a new tree, you're not really doing any damage. And someone is running a chainsaw nearby, so I'm going to move.

WOODS: Well, it goes to show that you have nothing against chopping down trees, per se, right? We hear it.

MOORE: That's right. Someone's cutting a log on the house that's being built next door.

WOODS: (laughing) All right, as if to amplify your point. Now, it's interesting that in reading about you in getting ready for this, I learned something about Greenpeace that I hadn't known. I hadn't realized that it was "green" and "peace" on purpose, because a great portion of the message was a peace message initially. It wasn't exclusively an environmental message and that there was a lot of emphasis early on on trying to stop nuclear testing, and there was some success there, and I think that was a good thing. Then there was a shift somehow in the direction of the organization where the "green" overwhelmed the "peace." How and when did that happen?

MOORE: Well, you really got it there, Tom. We actually began, there were two, even three elders who were actually in their 40s, because the rest of us were actually in our 20s and 30s. Jim Bohlen and Irving Stowe were both Quaker American expats living in Vancouver. They had variously brought their sons there to avoid the draft and had become peace movement people while they were in the States, and so they brought that legacy to Canada. And so Greenpeace really started more as an anti-war peace organization than as an environmental group, although the young bucks among us — Bob Hunter, myself, and others — were more oriented towards the environmental issues, because it was just at the beginning of the emerging consciousness of the global environment and the fact that we were making a mess of the place. And so that is how it came about.

At the end of one of our early meetings, Irving Stowe said, "Peace," which in those days was basically saying "Ciao" or "Hasta mañana" or "See you later," and Bill Darnell, a carpenter in the early group said, "Why don't we make it a green peace?" And that stuck. So we named our boat The Greenpeace. Our organization at that time was called the Don't Make a Wave Committee. The organization Greenpeace didn't exist until after our first campaign against U.S. H-bomb testing in Alaska, which was really a resounding success in that we were right there at the cusp of the height of the Cold War, and just as President Nixon cancelled those H-bomb tests after our protest voyage, we sort of made it look like we had really won a major victory, but we were actually just sort of the tip of the spear.

But we did sail a boat across the Pacific Ocean. Most other people were just marching in the streets. We did something big, and it paid off. And that's when the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks began between the United States and the Soviet Union, just after that, so we emerged into the public consciousness with our campaign and a small band of hippies thinking they could change the world — and proving you could — just at that time.

Now, why we turned into "green" instead of continuing with "peace" is because after the first campaign, we chose French atmospheric nuclear testing in the South Pacific. France had not signed the Limited Test Ban Treaty, which Russia, the United States,

and Britain signed, meaning no more atmospheric nuclear tests. But France continued with atmospheric nuclear tests into the '70s, into the mid '70s it turned out, but in 1972, David McTaggart, who we recruited, sailed his boat into the nuclear test zone at Mururoa Atoll in French Polynesia to protest those tests, and again in '73 he sailed in there, and that really caught world attention. We started to become actually fairly well known at that time. And France then in 1974 agreed to stop atmospheric nuclear testing and go underground, so we won there as well.

Then Paul Spong paid Bob Hunter and I a visit and told us about the plight of the whales. He said you guys are the only ones who know how to go out in boats and protest on the ocean, just because that's what we'd done for the nuclear testing issue. And he said you guys have to help us save the whales, because they're being slaughtered into extinction. And Bob and I saw that that was really a good avenue to pursue, that it would put a different flavor on what we were, and certainly we were "Greenpeace," and that fulfilled the green part, which we'd already fulfilled the peace part, and the rest was history.

We confronted the Soviet whaling fleet off California in '75, came into San Francisco like conquering heroes and made world news, and that's what really launched Greenpeace into the organization, the size that it is today. And we never looked back. The Cold War was winding up not long after; you know, the wall eventually came down, and so Greenpeace became "green" rather than "greenpeace," in a way.

WOODS: Now, that leads me to the question, when you did make the decision to leave — and of course I'm jumping sort of to the end of the story — at that point did you feel like they had changed or you had changed or both?

MOORE: Well, it was kind of both. I like to think of it as a divergence of thinking. I, for one, never accepted the idea that humans are the enemy of the earth, and that's where it had got to by 1985. We started with a strong humanitarian orientation, and as you know, when I left Greenpeace, I dubbed myself the Sensible Environmentalist, sort of meaning the opposite of the kind of sensationalism, misinformation, and fear tactics that had crept into the movement over the years, partly I think because we had kind of picked all the low-hanging fruit over the years, and once the majority of people agree with all the reasonable things you're saying — like stop the bombs, save the whales, stop toxic waste from being dumped into the oceans and rivers — once they agree with you, you can't fight that anymore, because the laws get changed and you win.

But a certain number of people just were not able to deal with not having anything to protest anymore and were, like, going to be lifelong protesters against the establishment. And that causes you to drift ever further into extreme positions, what I call zero-tolerance positions. Like today we have the crazy situation where, even though most of the environmental community thinks we're causing catastrophic climate change, which you probably already know I'm not convinced about, they are against hydroelectric and nuclear energy, which are — you know, there's no doubt about the fact that they are the two main technologies that are already in existence

that are proven to be reliable and cost-effective and 24/7, and they're proven to work and they are working all over the world. They provide between the two of them pretty close to 30% of the world's electricity, and yet the Greens are opposed to them, even though they are a perfectly good substitute for coal and gas as producers of electricity.

So you've got this kind of religious or ideological element that came into the movement. That's why I left. I'm not that way at all. I'm a much more practical person. Growing up in a country environment where you had to make do and where everybody saved every nut and bolt that there was, because you might need it some day, because it was a long ways to the store.

So I think what happened was two things. First, the political, and second, the extremist element in terms of positions of what you're for and what you're against. But there's no doubt that the radical Left basically hijacked Greenpeace and the environmental movement in general. Once it had power, it was a target for people who seek power for its own sake. And secondly, the positions that were taken at that point — like, I left after four years of thinking about leaving, because I'd heard the term "sustainable development" in Nairobi at a conference of environmentalists, and I realized that was the next challenge for me in my life, was not just pure environmentalism, but trying to figure out how to balance the needs of people with the protection of the environment, and that is what to me sustainable development is, is balancing environmental, social, and economic priorities. Not an easy task. Much more difficult, in fact, than just focusing on the environment as if the people don't matter. So that was one aspect of it.

The other aspect was that I don't believe environmentalism should be Left or Right politically. There's no sense to it. It's not an obvious Left-Right, workers against the bosses kind of issue. It's an issue of all of us living on the planet, and however we are organized socially and politically — not that that doesn't matter — but we all need to take food, energy, and materials from the environment in order to survive. And some people want to live like monks in a cave, and that's fine, but other people would rather have a nice car and eat good foot, gourmet food, and all that sort of thing. So we have this whole range of tastes and flavors amongst what people want.

So I just recently actually on Twitter, I've been calling myself the Sensible Environmentalist for nearly 40 years, and I'm changing my name to the Humanitarian Environmentalist, because I think people have to get with that program, that we have to care about human beings, and we cannot adopt this attitude and teach our children that the human species is the rogue enemy of nature, that we are the only evil species on earth, and that's what a lot of the philosophy comes down to now.

And the climate change issue really exemplifies that, that we are the enemy of the planet, and to me, that is just stupid. I mean, that's not very intellectual. That is definitely not the right thing to teach our kids. I remember being in a school in New York where a beautiful young woman in Grade 12 said, Dr. Moore, how long is it till the earth will be dead, thinking for sure that it would be within her lifetime, from

what I could tell. And that's just a terrible thing, to saddle young people with the idea that we are killing the earth and that we're the enemy of the earth, and I want nothing to do with that. So those are kind of why I left Greenpeace.

WOODS: Sometimes critics of environmentalism will say that the whole movement is at its root radical, that yes, it sounds like they just want clean air and water, but when you peel it back, it's Bill McKibben everywhere. But that doesn't seem entirely fair — or is it?

MOORE: Well, that's a very good question, Tom. Yes, it is, but on the other hand, there is such a thing as humanitarian environmentalism, sensible environmentalism, a practical approach to this issue of the humans needing food every day and water every day and energy to survive. So I think there are lots of people who are humanitarian environmentalists, but the political aspect — you know, take the climate meeting in Paris. You've got the central cult of warmist thinking that dominates the media completely, as, you know, Greenpeace and Bloomberg are at the present time conspiring to make China look like the angel in this whole thing, which, God knows why. Maybe they just are attracted to totalitarian government structures or something. And there are all kinds of fellow travelers along with them who are saying that China's the good guy in the climate issue, when actually, their CO^2 emissions are higher than the United States and the whole European Union put together and are increasingly rapidly, and they are building vast numbers of coal plants.

You see, I'm not against this, but I just find it unbelievable that the people who are saying that we need to stop putting CO^2 into the air, which as I know is actually good for the environment, they're saying that China's the good guy, even though they're putting more CO^2 into the air than anyone else. And Obama's explicit deal with China, called the historic deal between the United States and China, is that China is exempted from any restrictions on its CO^2 emissions until 2030, which might as well be the end of time. And then, you know, Shell Oil congratulates Obama for making that historic deal with China, as if they care about the climate issue and are worried that too much CO^{CO2} might go in the air, when really in the back of his mind, I'm sure the CEO is going, oh great, now I don't have to worry about any restrictions on my sales of fossil fuels into China until 2030. So that's really bizarre, isn't it? And I can’t get my head around it. I understand it, but I find it to be like something out of a fairytale or a bizarre science fiction that has no relation to what's going on in the world.

So I'm finding myself now incredulous as to the fact that people call the Paris agreement historical, as if it was something magical that was going to save the planet, when in fact, it was an agreement to not agree on anything that anybody had to do, but rather everybody for themselves to decide what to do. So China was happy to agree to it, because there's no restriction on their continuing to provide energy to their citizens, and same with India where Modi, who I actually admire more than any other leader in the world today, he is a traditionalist in one sense but also a modernist in that he believes in science and technology, and he wants to give the 300 million people in India who have no electricity some electricity, and that requires building coal and nuclear power plants, which I'm happy he is doing.

WOODS: Patrick, naturally with the course that you've taken, you've attracted a lot of enemies, and I want to ask you what you would tell them if you could have their attention for a little while. I want to ask you what some of your former colleagues have said, and maybe not even people who know you personally, but people in the environmental movement who would view you as the most appalling and horrifying apostate imaginable, and they have said thins about you that you are all too familiar with, no doubt, about your motives, and you must be in the pay of industry or the nuclear industry or whatever it is. If you could sit them down and talk to them, what would you say to them?

MOORE: Well, I'm not sure there's much you can say to people who have that point of view. I mean, they all know what I'm saying. I'm trying to make sense. I have nearly 9,000 Twitter followers who are engaged in conversation with me, and every once in a while, someone comes in and says "you sellout, you," so there's lots of ad homonym involved. I was early on by my best friend, Bob Hunter, who turned out in the end to also be my best enemy, because he was a very smart guy — he's gone now, but a brilliant person and fellow leader in Greenpeace in the early days. He dubbed me the "eco Judas," which was a fairly harsh thing to say in the Christian world.

But it's mostly name-calling, as I can see, and if people disagree with you on the subject of policy, of philosophy, of science, unless they're willing to engage at a truly intellectual and honest level, I don't really have much time for it. I am not a sellout. I am a pure science philosopher all my life. My mother introduced me to Bertrand Russell, the great British philosopher, when I was 15, and I never looked back. My parents bought me the *Books of Knowledge* when I was eight, and I studied the solar system and the planets and the earth and the elements and all that, so I'm steeped in science all my life, and it saddens me to see the scientific method being destroyed by this climate cult, this movement that's overtaken the world, which says the science is settled, as if that has any information content or the argument is over, the debate is over.

There's zero information in those statements, and when you say what science, show me the science, write it down on a piece of paper as to where the proof is that CO^{CO2} is causing warming, there isn't any. I know that from my understanding of science. So you end up with people who simply believe that CO^{CO2} is causing a warming. They don't really have much science generally, and coming back to Bill McKibben, to me Bill McKibben represents the pure propagandist ideologue of which there are many who are making the news these days, and of course, a long time ago he found his fame by writing an essay called "The End of Nature," which basically said that and has started this whole idea that we're no longer in the Pleistocene ice age, we're no longer in the Holocene interglacial period; we're no in the Anthropocene, the age of humans. In one hand, it kind of belittles the whole idea of the millennia. You know, the ice age is 2.5 million years on now, and we're still in it. This is the Pleistocene ice age, and we are in an interglacial period in the Pleistocene ice age called the Holocene, and any glaciations and interglacial period within the larger Pleistocene ice age.

And hardly anybody even knows that, and it's the most recent history, geological history of the Earth is this ice age we're in, which is very unusual. And our kids are not being taught that. They're being taught that the Earth is frying from carbon dioxide, and Bill McKibben plays into this, and now we're in the Anthropocene, which on the one hand makes humans seem more important than they really are, and on the other hand similarly belittles the magnitude of the time this earth has been here and all of the things that have happened to the climate and the asteroids hitting it and, you know, ice ages and greenhouse ages, and who knows, how many kids know that 3.5 million years ago — which is a blink in nature's eye, really, compared to the 4.6 billion years of Earth history — that 3.5 million years ago, giant camels were roaming subtropical forests in the Canadian Arctic islands, which are today barren and cold, freezing cold? But then it was warm.

And as a matter of fact, we are at the tail end of a 50 million-year cooling period since the Eocene Thermal Maximum. Anybody can look at this on the Internet. It's there for all to see that one of the warmest periods in the Earth's history, at least in the last billion years of the Earth's history, was during the Eocene Thermal Maximum, when the Arctic and the Antarctic were forested — the Arctic where there's islands; the Antarctic is actually a continent underneath all that ice, and it was forested and full of animals roaming around in it, and that gradually we went into a deep freeze. 30 million years ago, the Antarctic started to get cold, and 3 million years ago the Arctic started to get cold. The Antarctic went into an ice age long before the northern hemisphere did.

But then since then, for 2.5 million years, we've had successive glaciations coming all the way down to Chicago and a whole northern half of Russia and all of Scandinavia and England covered in a sheet of ice for 80,000 years at a time, and then these 10,000-year interglacial periods, which we appear to be nearing the end of one now. And if all else goes according to plan, we will now begin a gradual 80,000-year descent into another full-blown glaciation, which is coincident with the Milankovitch cycles. Just Google " Milankovitch cycle," folks, and find out about the 100,000 year cycle of glaciations, which is well documented in the Antarctic ice cores, the Vostok core, which goes back 400,000 years, and the two European cores, which go back 800,000 years. It's there for all to see. We know approximately what the CO^{CO2} levels and what the temperature levels.

And those cores were used by Al Gore in *Inconvenient Truth*. He said it proves that CO^{CO2} causes the temperature to go up and down, because they are highly correlated in those ice cores. But what he didn't mention — maybe it was found out later, but I think he could have found out at the time — there's actually a lag where it's actually temperature that moves first, and then CO^{CO2} goes up with temperature and down with temperature. And that only makes sense, because the Milankovitch cycles are solar cycles. They've got to do with the elliptical orbit of the Earth and the tilt of the Earth. There's three different cycles in this 100,000-year procession, and that would more likely cause a change in temperature than a change in CO^{CO2}. How is the ellipse of the orbit of the Earth going to cause a change of CO^{CO2}? That's not very likely. It's likely to cause a change in temperature, though, because of differences in solar radiation.

And so that change of temperature, when the temperature goes up, the oceans warm and give off CO^2 back into the atmosphere, because warm water holds less gas — not just CO^2, but oxygen and all the other gases — holds less gas than cold water. And then when the Earth cools, the ocean absorbs CO^2. The ocean contains nearly 50 times as much CO^2 as the entire global atmosphere, so a small change in oceanic CO^2 makes a big change in atmospheric, in terms of percentage.

So that's the real truth of what's been going on for the last couple million years, and none of our children are being taught this anymore. The carbon cycle is being taught as if it's pollution when we put CO^2 into the atmosphere, when in fact, when we burn fossil fuels, we're just returning carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, which plants removed from it in the first place. It was there before it got made into fossil fuels. It was in the atmosphere. And through most of the history of life, CO^2's been much higher than it is today, and during the last glaciation when the oceans absorbed a lot of CO^2 out of the atmosphere, it went down to 180 parts per million, which is only 30 PPM above the death of plants, because not only does life require carbon dioxide in the environment to exist — this would be a dead planet if there was no CO^2 in the Earth's atmosphere — it requires a certain level, just like we need a certain level of oxygen to breathe. At 10% oxygen in the atmosphere, we would more or less be asphyxiated, because we need the 30% that's there. We need above 20%, really.

And so plants need above 150 PPM CO^2 to survive, and as the way things are going, and I'm just publishing a paper on this now, CO^2 has been going down for 140 million years in the global atmosphere due to the deposition of calcium and carbonate from marine organisms that build shells to protect themselves, the coccolithophores at the very low level of the plankton, very tiny things, but they produce millions of tons of calcium carbonate by using carbon dioxide that's dissolved in the sea. And over the years, CO^2 has declined to a level where it's becoming dangerous, and here we come along, and if you use the metaphor of the atomic clock, we've come along at 34 seconds to midnight and put some CO^2 back into the atmosphere again, thus replenishing the carbon cycle. So we are actually saviors rather than destroyers of life on Earth, and it's an amazing story, and it needs to be told, and that's what I'm going to spend the rest of my life doing.

WOODS: Well, that as a matter of fact, leads to the very thing I wanted to close with, even though I'd love to talk to you for five hours. Believe me, I've got a lot of questions I'd like to ask. But next year marks 30 years, in my understanding, since you left Greenpeace, so I guess I'd like to know two things: what have you been doing specifically, like institutionally and in your activities, what kind of turn did your life take at that point, but secondly, what did you do in 1986? This organization you'd help to found has left you, in a way, ideologically and spiritually, and you're just out there on your own. What was the first thing you did, and what have you been doing?

MOORE: Well, I didn't mention earlier, Tom, the specific reason that I had to actually leave Greenpeace was because my fellow directors — I was one of five international directors with David McTaggart as the chairman — none of those people had any formal

science education. They were political activists, social activists, entrepreneurs looking for a career in the now-emerging environmental movement.

But I had a PhD in ecology and a Bachelor of Science in biology and forestry and life science, and they decided among themselves that because DDT and dioxin and PCBs are chlorinated hydrocarbons, that the real solution was to ban chlorine worldwide — in other words, ban everything that has chlorine in it. And I said, like, first off, you guys, chlorine is one of the elements in the periodic table. That is one of the building blocks in the universe. It is the 11th most common element in the Earth's crust, and you just can't ban an element.

But I get what you mean: you want humans to stop using anything that has chlorine in it. And what about public health and medicine? Chlorine is the most important element for public health and medicine. Adding it to drinking water is the biggest advance in the history of public health, and the majority of our synthetic pharmaceuticals — i.e., medicine, such as antibiotics — are made with chlorine chemistry. And even if you look at your cold and flu medicines, you'll see a little Cl after a lot of the ingredients in there.

And it fell on deaf ears, Tom. They would not listen to me. They would not nuance their position towards chlorine. It had to be a zero-tolerance campaign, of course, because Greenpeace and the movement in general works best with banning rather than some kind of policy that might say, oh, we'll restrict this for that and we'll ban this for that. They have to just ban everything outright, like nuclear energy and hydroelectric and other of their main banning campaigns. And so I had to leave. I could not be in an organization that took that position.

Before I left, I had gotten involved in the idea of sustainable development, and I read a book called *Seafarm* by Elisabeth Mann-Borgese. The Borgeses are one of the eight long traditional families of the island of Malta. And she was independently wealthy, had worked with the UN on the law of the sea and traveled all around the world, and had witnessed the emerging practice of seafarming or aquaculture in the ocean. Now, people have done freshwater aquaculture with carp and other fish species for thousands of years, back into the Chinese history, but the farming of the ocean is quite a recent phenomenon, although shellfish like clams and mussels have been farmed for some time. Farming finfish began really with the Norwegians with salmon in the '70s.

And I saw that, and I come from a small village on the north end of Vancouver island, where my grandfather and his three brothers were salmon fishermen, and I decided to start a salmon farm with my brother and my brother-in-law Peter, my brother, Michael. And we started a small salmon farm in 1985, and when I left Greenpeace in '86, I took on full time the job of building and running this salmon farm. I was soon elected president of the then fledgling BC Salmon Farmers Association, with about, you know, 10 or 12 members of people in the province who were beginning to emulate the Norwegian success in farming salmon in the sea and growing them in hatcheries in freshwater, because they are a species that spawns in freshwater and then goes to sea

for their life, and then comes back and spawns in freshwater again. And we did that for eight years.

But it was only two years after I left Greenpeace that I found myself being attacked by Greenpeace for daring to farm salmon, which I had seen as a sustainable development, because it takes pressure off the wild stocks in the same way that if we hadn't farming animals on the land, we would have killed every wild animal on the planet long ago. It takes pressure off the wild stocks, so that's an environmental benefit. It provides full time employment to people in remote coastal communities, where the fishing industry is like two or three months a year, and then you're on unemployment insurance for the rest. And it provides one of the most nutritious and heart-friendly, brain-friendly foods in the world in the form of salmon for dinner.

And so I thought I was doing something good coming out of Greenpeace, and there Greenpeace to this day has done everything in their power to destroy the salmon aquaculture, shrimp aquaculture, and many other forms of aquaculture, which is really just doing the same thing we did on the land 10,000 years ago by farming the land, and now we're farming the sea. And that's why I say we have to learn to be better gardeners of the planet. There are so many of us; we have a big impact in what we take from the environment, we have to do it in a very careful and methodical way, and that's what salmon farming to me was all about.

So I did that for quite some time, and then I became interested getting back into thinking about the environment, and I was invited to joint the British Columbia Roundtable on the Environment and the Economy, which was all over the world at that time, people were reading the Brundtland Commission Report, *Our Common Future*, out of the United Nations Commission for Environment and Development. And in that book, it said "sustainable development." For the first time, that term was popularized, whereas I'd known it for five years by that time inside the movement. But it now popularized that term. It said that 12% of the Earth should be turned into parks and wilderness with no commercial development — I totally agreed with that — and it said roundtables of multi-stakeholders from around the world should get together to advise elected people in government how to do sustainable development, so it had the three major elements in it.

And British Columbia, along with every other province in Canada, because of Marie Strong and Jim Neilson being in the international environmental leadership for many years, Canada really took up the call, and every province created a Roundtable on the Environment and the Economy and recruited citizens from all walks of life, and some of them had members of government on them; some of them didn't, but they were all constituted in order to meet regularly to develop sustainable development thinking and plans. So I was on that, so that got me back into kind of an international headspace of environmental thinking, but not from a confrontational but from a problem solving, finding solutions perspective.

And then I was invited by the forest industry of BC — which my family's been in for 100 years. I didn't mention that. On my father's side, we've had a forestry company on

Vancouver Island for over 100 years, and it's still operating today. We cut trees and grow more, and it is actually the most sustainable of all the primary industries that provide us with the materials and energy we use in order to survive every day, because when you replant a native forest with native trees, you continue the habitat that all the species there need, and so people who grow trees don't mind if there's deer in there, whereas people who grow food, they don't want any other species, especially insects and predators and deer and the things that'll munch the crops. They don't want those there, so agriculture ends up being a monoculture, whereas forestry with native species, like almost all of all North American forestry is done, continues the habitat. So that's my background.

And when I joined the Forest Alliance of BC to help the forestry industry improve its environmental performance and come into the 21st century — well, it was actually 1990, so it was still the 20th century. But you know, like all industries had to consider the environmental aspects, instead of just chopping trees and planting new ones, to consider the streams and the salmon that are in the streams and the wildlife and biodiversity and all those issues, the soils, etc. I came into the Forest Alliance to help the forest industry get with it in the new age of environmentalism. I was branded a traitor. That's when my friend Bob called me the eco Judas, because they considered me helping the forest industry as going over to the dark side. You know, that Satan was there and that I had sold out to the evil ones.

And so that is why there is such a divide between my thinking and their thinking, because they actually think that the most sustainable of all the industries in this world, which basically recreates the habitat that was there in the first place, whereas cities — like, I say there's four kinds of culture. There's agriculture, where we grow food. There's silviculture, which is another word for forestry, where we grow trees. There is aquaculture, where we grow food in the sea and in lakes, or in water, in other words. And then there is urbanculture, where we grow people.

And urbanculture and agriculture both pretty much destroy the original ecosystem in order to exist, whereas aquaculture and silviculture do not completely destroy the original ecosystem. You float a net out into the ocean, into the water — and in fact, the net becomes a floating reef, and everything imaginable tries to grow on it. One of the biggest problems for fish farmers is to keep their nets clean from all the species that want to use it as a substrate, like as if it's a reef. And in silviculture, you grow the same trees back that were there in the first place, and you only cut them every 50 or 60 years in most cases. In the south where it grows faster, you might get a crop in 35, 40 years, but only 1/40th of the area of trees is cut each year, so the rest of it is in growing forest at various stages.

And actually, there are species that are adapted to new forest, old forest, and medium-aged forest, so a managed ecosystem, if it's thought out correctly in terms of biodiversity, can actually have a higher biodiversity than a natural forest, which is, say, all one age, because it all got burned down in a forest fire that was natural from lightning and then grew back all even-aged. Forestry can do it differently and actually

provide a mosaic of all age classes across landscapes, and we are actually capable of gardening the Earth.

The oil sands in northern Alberta, which everybody loves to hate — even though for some reason they're not attacking Nigeria, Venezuela, or Saudi Arabian oil. They're attacking good old Canadian oil, where we have really good environmental regulations, good human rights, good labor laws. We employ First Nations people by the thousands in those operations. And every square inch of it when the mining is finished must be put back to native boreal ecosystem forest, and that is being done. And not only that, you can put it back to a more biodiverse landscape than was there in the first place by creating hollows where lakes and ponds can form, where there was just flat before. And where those lakes and ponds are, you attract birds and ducks and herons and different plants that like growing near water or in water.

We can garden the Earth much better than we have been doing through the past, and that would seem to me where our emphasis should be placed now, rather than this complete — I just don't understand how this fanaticism has occurred over demonizing fossil fuels and CO^2 when CO^2 is actually the most important food for all life on this planet, and we've got to change the way our kids are being educated, or they will grow up being ignorant of what they're made of, never mind what we should be doing in order to make this world a better place.

WOODS: Well, I do need to ask before letting you go, the general subject of sustainable development leads to a visceral reaction in my audience, because the way we've heard about it through Agenda 21 — and we've read what the texts say; we're not making this stuff up — does seem like we're talking about a world with much greater government controls over the use of private property, a move toward modifying people's diet in light of what are said to be the demands of sustainable development, and people have felt like they need to fight against this. I mean, yes, we want to do sensible things for the Earth, but it seems like the people pushing this are the very sort of people you described in this very conversation, people who like to wield power, and boy, changing people's diets and telling them what they can do with their property, that's ready-made for somebody who wants to wield power.

MOORE: Yeah, except they're taking the term "sustainable development" and hijacking it, Tom. That's a problem with words. I mean, they're basically turning it into a propaganda term, when in fact it was initially meant to mean sustainable development. Most people don't — you know, a lot of people think that sustainable development was some kind of compromise between industry and the environmentalists, but actually it was a compromise within the environmental movement. It happened in Nairobi in 1982, where the term was coined, because this was a meeting that included lots of environmentalists from developing countries. And you can't be against development in a developing country, whereas the first world environmentalists from industrialized countries were basically against all mega projects, and they continue to be. They're against all pipelines, all dams, all nuclear plants, all coal plants, pretty much everything.

So the compromise was, well, we'll use the word development, but we'll put the adjective sustainable in front of it. Immediately, Greenpeace rejected the concept, we joked because the developers got the noun and they'd only got the adjective. But eventually it turned into "sustainability," which is also misused by both sides of the equation, and I realize that a lot of the Right rejects sustainable development as a propaganda term connoting world government, etc. It was never meant to mean that. It is meant to be a neutral descriptor of a concept where you think about the long term, rather than just thinking about the short term.

So sustainability, I mean, in the final analysis, nothing is eternally sustainable, but we could think in terms, like the Japanese do, of 20 years, rather than just thinking in terms of six months or, you know, even two years, which in our world, in North America, not many people think long term. Europeans tend to think in a little bit longer term than we do here, but the Japanese and Chinese think in more like 20-year horizons.

So it wasn't mean to be a power tripping word in the first place. I don't know of any term that is more suitable to describe the idea of, yes, we will do development, we will try to eradicate poverty through providing people with electricity who don't have it and with healthcare and clean water and all those things. Those are sustainable developments.

So for want of a better term, I do use it, but my definition of it is trying to balance the environmental, social, and economic priorities. No one can argue that there are not priorities int hose three areas that we're trying to solve, trying to accommodate, and balancing those three is not always an easy task. Sometimes it is nigh on impossible, and you have to cut some babies in half, as they say.

But most of the time, if you put a group of people together who understand the various aspects of the idea of multi-stakeholder roundtables or that are facilitated by people who understand how to get to "yes," most of the time you can improve upon the us against them approach to moving forward. You can find accommodation among environmental, social, and economic priorities. You can find win-win-win situations.

The rice fields of the Sacramento valley are a classic example, and I probably don't have time to explain that whole thing, but people should look up the rice fields of the Sacramento Valley and see how a roundtable came together 10, 12 years ago and figured out a better way to skin the cat so that there wasn't smog for a month from burning the stubble on the rice fields every year. They turned it into a model environmental, social, and economic solution.

So I will continue to use the term sustainable development and sustainability, but I always make sure people understand what my definition of it is first, and it's certainly nothing to do with world government or political control. It has to do with a thoughtful and methodical approach to looking at all the aspects of environmental, social, and economic issues that are involved in making decisions, right from our personal decisions on a daily basis as to what to buy and what to do, where to go, and all those

things, all the way up to large scale policy decisions at national and international levels. And to me, it is a useful term, as long as you don't hijack it for propaganda purposes.

WOODS: Patrick, on my show notes page, which, this being Episode 559, is TomWoods.com/559, I'm going to link to your book, *Confessions of a Greenpeace Dropout: The Making of a Sensible Environmentalist*. Where else can I link people if they'd like to follow what you're up to?

MOORE: I'd like them to go to AllowGoldenRiceNow.org —

WOODS: Jotting that down, okay.

MOORE: That's our Golden Rice Campaign to help the 2 million kids who are dying every year from lack of vitamin A, and there Greenpeace is the enemy. And then EcoSense.me — www.EcoSense.me.

WOODS: All right, I'll put that — I'll also put your Twitter account.

MOORE: Please, it's @ecosensenow.

WOODS: Okay, we'll do that and try and get you some more followers over there. Well, you've been very generous with your time, and it's a very, very interesting story you have to tell, and I hope people will check out all the resources you just mentioned, and we're going to collect them and put them up there at TomWoods.com/559. Thanks again.

MOORE: Thank you very much, Tom.