Interview The Living Planet

(Done with Mark McGovern for the newsletter of the Canadian Anthroposophical Society)

1. What is the main thesis of the work in a few sentences?

To put it succinctly we have two worldviews facing each other. On one hand a closed system view of the Earth in which the law of conservation of energy rules all climatic correlations within our planet. The planet is seen as a closed system in relation to the solar system. This is the view that applies to climate computer models. In relation to this we can state emphatically that Steiner and most of Goetheanistic/phenomenological scientists see this law applicable to physical/non living systems alone. The second law of thermodynamics is denied the moment you enter the realm of the living.

Additionally, most of conventional science posits, in spite of ample proof to the contrary, that the solar input is a constant. In this realm both the best of modern scientific research, resting on the record of millennia (tree-rings, boreholes measuring sediments' thickness, ratio of oxygen or carbon isotopes) and the Goetheanistic approach meet in proving that solar activity, solar irradiation and deriving climatic effects have varied in cyclical fashion over centuries and millennia and continue to do so.

2. This is a very large topic Luigi, what background work did you do to undertake this project?

To be honest I found the topic of climate change daunting and had no desire to tackle it, nor the feeling that I could. To start with I felt equidistant from the predominant ideas of the link of climate change to CO_2 and the complete denial of any disruption of climate and global ecology. In essence the left-right dichotomy. But this left me with no real middle ground, nor with any means of approaching the topic. What came accidentally to my rescue was the work of Viktor Schauberger, whom we could call a phenomenological student of Nature and admirer of Goethe. His work fascinated me as it does many within our circles, and I had in mind to study him since the 90s but kept postponing it. Approaching him is not easy because he speaks his own language, to convey realities of the etheric realm that he could perceive. I had to approach him through others, such as Callum Coates, Alick Bartholomew, Jane Cobbald,… in order to prepare the ground, then go directly to the source. Adding one element to the other a whole coherent picture emerges about how centuries of misunderstanding of Nature have

wreaked havoc on rivers, forests and farmlands. The crisis only came to an acceleration in the last century, but it was there all along as Steiner challenges us to understand.

I felt satisfied with keeping the work circumscribed to Schauberger who already saw changes in climate patterns in the 1930s, decades before conventional science. He pointed to the predominant role of water and the disruption of its cycle through the mismanagement of rivers, forests and farmland. He also showed the way out in what we could call remediation and production of etheric energy. In fact his ingenious inventions could and should find a place in the present.

A friend who knew what I was attempting to do invited me to look at the work of Gunther Pauli and the so-called "Blue Economy." This is a little detour in the book, but a short one and worth its while. It shows how much modern technology can move in the direction of what Schauberger and the Goetheanists predicate: "Capieren and Copieren" (comprehend and copy Nature). Nature produces what human beings do at great pressures, temperatures and expenditure of energy in a completely opposite way: low temperatures, low pressure and small amounts of energy. With technology after technology it is now possible to do exactly that and drastically reduce energy consumption, not to mention pervasive, systemic waste at the basis. But the obvious question emerges as well: do we have the political will to do it?

Before bringing the book to an end I was challenged by my publisher to look at the work of Peter Taylor—who wrote the book *Chill: A Reassessment of Global Warming Theory*. And something surprising came out of it. I saw how much the science that has evolved alongside the climate computer models has come to the conclusion, from a thorough multi-disciplinary effort, that climate is modeled from the interactions of the Earth with the planetary system and even beyond that. Science is starting to recognize the cosmos! The work of Peter Taylor mentioned a certain Theodor Landscheidt and I was puzzled by his distinct scientific approach.

3. Were anthroposophical ideas central to the thesis or were there also enough other sources to make your case?

Anthroposophical ideas certainly. To start with it was a Goethean approach to Earth ecology and Earth-solar system interactions. All of it fell within the realm of phenomenology. The work of Schauberger proves itself because everything he sees as problem he can counter with solutions that work. I decided to add myself to those who have tried to 'translate' his work in term of Goethean science and anthroposophy. In my mind it's only a

beginning. On the other hand while I find the work of Landscheidt and other modern researchers looking at the Earth-solar system relationships equally fascinating, I don't feel qualified to 'translate' their findings in terms of anthroposophical understanding. I just offer the findings and the facts.

4. In terms of how people now come to understand the nature of climate change, what would you say is the most important insight with which to anchor ourselves amid the plethora of research being done?

If I have to abstract something from the whole I would say the work of Theodor Landscheidt and others who have followed after him. Localized climate predictions in terms of years and decades are much more accurate when one refers to so-called "harmonic cycles" between Earth, Sun and planets than to any of the existing climate computer models. Examples of it have to do with solar eruptions and geomagnetic storms, droughts, temperature minimums, El Niño cycles, precipitations, etc. Landscheidt came to surprisingly correct results contradicting prevailing predictions and accepted "common sense" solely on the basis of these correlations.

5. What was your most surprising discovery?

At the end of the work I found that I had looked at climate from the level of Earth and from the heights of the cosmos. There is a convergence between both sides in showing that we really are dealing with problems or drastic changes within the water cycle. And the largest question that emerged and that I can only approach tentatively and in fragmentary fashion is the wondrous mystery of the Sun that lies at the intersection of the two approaches, leading me to conclude that we obviously still know so little!

You can find the book at https://www.clairviewbooks.com/viewbook.php?isbn_in=9781912992683