



Oasis Forestry Discussion Paper

Preamble 3

Introduction 4

Oasis in a Nutshell 5

Form of Implementation (commercial) 7

Land Requirement and Locations 9

Balance of Trade Issues 10

Current Industry Employment 14

Farming, Palm Oil, and Charcoal 15

Arid Forestry 16

Soil Enrichment 17

Water 19

Electricity 20

Creation of Towns 21

Cost of the Reform 22

More Money for the Industry 23

Oasis Corporations' Income 26

Government Involvement 26

Environmental Impacts 28

Conclusion 30

Preamble

We cannot solve any of our biggest problems unless we have the enthusiastic participation of those with 99% of the power in this world (or is it only 98% or 95%). It is the politicians and the corporations who have this power. In global scale actions **they get to decide whether we do a thing or not**, so if you are not making them happy then all you're going to get is a fight and/or empty promises, such as what we've had over the last fifty years of the environmental debate (forget about what they deserve or we'll never fix anything). This approach is roughly the opposite of what you're used to; not merely addressing or mitigating, actually solving the problem by making money rather than the problem costing money to fix (not a single penny and we create massive economic surpluses right at the beginning). Shouldn't this be the gold standard for what we've been trying to accomplish for the last fifty years; a genuine solution that those in power will want to do even more than greenies. Just because this solution gives those with 99% of the power in the issue what amounts to everything they want doesn't mean I'm actually on their side. I'm firmly entrenched on the side of what's good for the majority; I'm on the side of fixing the problem and this WILL do that. There are no holes in these discussion papers and these reforms will all work "as advertised" (Green, *liberté, égalité, fraternité*), but they are discussion papers, NOT White Papers. There are no holes in these reforms; just ask.

Introduction

The Oasis Forestry Reform is a global initiative that is designed to solve the issue of deforestation completely, and be a part of the solution to Climate Change. **I strongly recommend that you read the Conclusion first. The second last paragraph is the most important thing you need to know about Oasis at this early stage.**

There are two different versions of the Oasis Forestry Reform. What you're getting in here is the basic version with a few elements from the more advanced version added throughout. In the advanced version many of the financial elements are different and the massive plantations in arid regions in Africa have a lot more meat on their political bones. Inside the advanced version Oasis will almost certainly be seeded via ANSR (details in the CC discussion paper). We're going to have this massive resource inside ANSR and the funding of Oasis would be a drop in the bucket; far less than one percent of the ANSR resource; it will be possible to use it so we probably will. It is also less likely that an arid forestry plantation will be established in Australia if we use the advanced version even though it has been included in here; it was always going to be a "heavy lift" no matter what.

Keep in mind as you read through that we're talking about solving a major global problem, so the scale is going to be much bigger than what you're used to seeing.

If you cannot get your head around the size of this as arid forestry in Africa (very few will be able to) then there are two things for you to know: The first is that in the matter of solving Climate Change the Oasis Reform is not necessary. 200 million hectares of plantation forest (about the size of Mexico) sounds big and of course it is, but in the matter of absorbing carbon this would barely move the needle by one percent per year, if that. FISCIL, ANSR, and the technology picture are the three critical components in the H3 approach to Climate Change. The second thing to know is that it is better for the world if we do Oasis in Africa, but we could do Oasis just as easily by spreading the plantations over a wider area (US, Mexico, China, India, Australia, and some in South America) and not having to resort to arid forestry at all. On reflection, I should have written this discussion paper without the arid forestry, but I'm in the middle of pushing it forward so I'm not going to rewrite it now and this note should be sufficient.

Oasis in a Nutshell

The point is to solve deforestation in such a way so that those who hold all of the power in the industry, politicians and corporations, will desperately want to do it, and if they desperately want to do it, then it's a safe bet that it will be done:

- Commercial re-organisation of the global forest industries inside a single massive multinational.
- This includes capitalisation of the entire global forest industries; some of it already is but nowhere near all of it.
- The industry is formally monopolised under the Oasis umbrella through international agreements and national legislation in all relevant jurisdictions.
- This multinational is seeded either through the markets or via one of the other avenues mentioned in this document.
- The current owners in the industry own the Oasis Corporation in direct proportion to their current economic interest in the industry.
- The current owners will need to navigate a few changes in how they operate but they remain as independent entities, and the biggest change for them will be that they'll be planting a hell of a lot more than they're cutting down in the areas they currently operate. They DO NOT become business units of a larger corporate entity.
- Creation of 200 million hectares of new plantation forest in a few different places around the planet is established to solidify their control of the industry and create a massive asset base.
- The Oasis Corporation develops and manages these plantations and controls the global market for forest products.
- We wean ourselves off native deforestation over the first twenty years of Oasis operations; in practice about year ten to year twenty, with no doubt some small amount of use after that if it is ever needed.
- We're able to do this before the better trees in the Oasis plantations start to come on line because there are already a significant number of plantations currently in place and managed by the existing players in the industry. We'll essentially be "using them up"

with increasing frequency in that ten to twenty year time period and beyond.

- Significant moves will be made to change developed world attitudes to certain wood products, and new technology will be introduced to facilitate greater use of what would be viewed today as lower grade wood product (younger trees, chips).
- Obviously all of this is codified inside a public trust document and controlled by international agreements and national legislation that greatly limits the range of action the larger entity is permitted to take. And because they are a monopoly and therefore have no need for secrecy, every document and action is open to the public; like a FOIA system in the most open government in the world.
- Because there is so much to it (all of this and some of the other elements in this discussion paper), it would be natural to think in terms of why would they go to all of this trouble: The current players in the industry get to increase their power base both upwards and sideways. Because this is likely to be funded via ANSR they get a \$200 billion injection into the industry to undertake all of these activities, which means the Oasis Corporation is worth a lot more to them (not having to dilute their interest by going to the markets). They are currently portrayed and often tend to behave as though they are the bad guys and that will no longer be the case; I'm sure they're not going to hate that. There is a floor and a ceiling to the upside for those currently in the industry if they take this path, and from an economic point of view, a power point of view and a public perception point of view the floor would not be any lower than double what they have today if this is funded through ANSR. The Balance of Trade section coming up, where I confuse the hell out of you, adds a lot more to the industry than most will be able to imagine, and I'm not taking that into account when making my estimates in this point.

So we establish Oasis, and after a few hiccups and small implementation issues we have it running smoothly; as smoothly as something this new and this big can. Here's the main thing you need to take on board. We implement first generation Oasis and it runs smoothly for a time, but people are people and something happens to take it off the rails and

we have a problem that's not so easily fixable, perhaps even because of a design floor in the original (my design). Somebody or some group "comes to the rescue" with a second generation Oasis Reform that makes it operate better, and we become even more accustomed to sourcing wood only from plantations. This dance could well happen another once or twice, and by the time we get to the fourth generation Oasis Reform, anything from forty years to eighty years down the track, it no longer even occurs to us to source wood products from our native forests; and the 200 million hectares is no longer just 200 million hectares. Implementation of Oasis is only the start of the process. It's big, some of it is complicated, but it's only the first step in a hundred year process.

Form of Implementation (commercial)

It has never occurred to anybody that we might solve a major environmental problem by making money; not a million here or a billion there, but hundreds of billions or trillions of dollars as we solve the thing completely. Such major issues have been institutionalized in our thinking as being on one side of the ledger (the side that costs money). The H3 agenda, which includes Oasis, puts them onto the other side.

The financial model for the Forest Industries inside Oasis will allow us to create over one trillion dollars in assets using legislation and fairly standard accounting practices (we get over two trillion in assets with the newer or advanced version of Oasis). The accounting principles we will use to do this have a long history in every developed jurisdiction, they've just never been used in the way we will use them.

In the basic version of Oasis there are two separate projects:

The first will "raise" \$60 billion through different forms of equity (not debt) to establish Oasis Australia and its thirty-five to fifty million hectares of plantation forest in outback Australia.

The second will "raise" \$100 billion, again through different forms of equity, to establish Oasis Africa and its 150 million hectares of plantation forest; very near to and infringing upon the Sahara; Mauritania to Sudan and then down to eastern Ethiopia and Somalia; Yes Sudan and Yes, Somalia (the issue of removing forestry from the countries that currently do it and establishing forestry in countries that currently don't is in the Balance of Trade Issues section below). Nothing in the H3

agenda is going to be simple, but most of the issues people will think to be the most difficult, are not going to be the most difficult. There is an alternative if we can't make this region work for Oasis Africa, but we almost certainly can make this region work, especially with H3 agenda elements like ANSR, CODIN, POINT and ONE HQ coming in to complete the picture. Any reference that is not fully explained in this document can be found in the H3 books.

The accounting principle I alluded to above does a lot of the heavy lifting in the basic version of the reform, and although I wasn't going to say what it was (and we may not use it in the more advanced version, depending), I might as well: We can apply a ten year budget cycle to this reform if it's done in a certain way, and when we do that, we can book assets at the beginning using their developed value in ten years (and then start the work to make it so). Even though I don't think anybody's ever done it using a ten year cycle, we've been using this little trick in governments for a very long time, and there is no law that says we can't make it ten years. We do, after all, fiat everything to suit our purposes these days, and it's not as if I'm suggesting we do something that hasn't already been done a thousand times before. Anybody else think that just might help the process along a little; governments around the world underwrite the process but in a way that doesn't cost them a cent, nor does it saddle them with a massive potential liability in the future. To further assist in funding this, we can use the large international trade organisation I touch on briefly in the Save Steps book (and in the CC discussion paper). Inside the advanced version we can create the money for this in the way we do it for the ANSR resource (again, mentioned in the Save Steps book and CC discussion paper), we can just choose to take the money out of the ANSR resource, we can find the money inside the process we structure for the international "takeover" of the industry mentioned above, and there will be other options that I either haven't come up with or have slipped my mind at the time of writing this; this is a discussion paper, so, investigate, Discuss!

However we organise the funding for this, it won't cost governments or rich people a cent and that is the nature of all but one or two of the H3 agenda reforms.

The model, for both the basic version of Oasis and the more advanced version, calls for a drastic reduction in competition, preferably to the extent of its elimination. When

there are substantial environmental imperatives eliminating competition is a must. Of course when money is the only object and there are no environmental imperatives competition must be encouraged. In the basic version of the reform either a central market could be established, or all the big players in the industry could be given the means to takeover all of the smaller players; a central market with ruinous penalties for trading outside the central market would probably be enough. Maintaining a fragmented industry (with no central market and pricing all over the place) would ensure the continuation of a fragmented focus; no focus at all other than destruction for enrichment interspersed with a few shrugs.

Land Requirement and Locations

An important thing to understand when apprehending the elements of Oasis is that Oasis is one of more than two dozen global reforms designed to alter the way in which we deal with our biggest problems; altered in such a way so that those in charge will want to deal with them (because they will make more money and get more acclaim by dealing with them). It is doubly important to apprehend this with regard to the African references in this discussion.

Without the impact of the other global reforms in the H3 agenda, Oasis Africa would be a very risky financial proposition. It is not so when we add in the H3 reforms agenda.

About fifty million hectares of outback Australia will be “acquired” for the Oasis Australia operation, and about one hundred and fifty million hectares will be required/”acquired” for Oasis Africa.

The Australian requirement is likely to be in the region east of Alice Springs and west of Quilpie, although needless to say this could change.

The African requirement is variable at the moment for many reasons, some of which are obvious. Most or all of the requirement will be obtained from within the band that stretches from Mauritania to Somalia and includes Sudan (again, yes Somalia and yes Sudan). The “most or all” equivocation is because Angola and Namibia have been part of my thinking on Oasis from the very beginning, and although we will partition Oasis up near the Sahara into large plantations separated by twenty to one hundred kilometres,

locating a quarter of Oasis forests a half a continent away satisfies my innate desire for redundancy in anything I design; it is one of the main reasons Australia was included as part of Oasis at the beginning.

The addendum to this is that if we didn't want to include knowledge of the rest of the H3 agenda as we talk about the implementation of Oasis, which means we wouldn't be talking about Africa, then we have other options that are not as good but would be acceptable in a pinch. We'd still have Australia and we could push up the size of Oasis Australia to about twice of what is currently planned, we could put America down for about ten million hectares, Madagascar would welcome at least twenty million hectares, and I feel pretty confident that Saudi Arabia would put up their hand for the rest of it. For a wide variety of reasons Africa is a far better option than all of this, and because of the rest of the H3 agenda we don't actually need an alternative to Africa for Oasis, but this is only the introduction to the H3 agenda and balancing reforms, so we need to include an alternative for the sake of the reader at this point.

Balance of Trade Issues

As indicated in the sections immediately above, a key element in Oasis is removing forestry from the countries (or areas in the case of Australia) that currently do it, and establishing the "entirety" of the Global Forest Industries in two or three areas where we've never done it.

How we're going to allow for this is the part of Oasis that cannot be related simply, and I'm not going to even try at this early stage. The H3 agenda of reforms are all based on something new called The Prince Principle, and The Prince Principle is essentially a new language for how to deal with our biggest problems. This part of Oasis takes you into some of the most complex "grammar" of this new language, and most people would not be ready for that yet. When introducing a new language you start with "the ball is round" and "see the dog run", and FISCIL, Kyoto II, and most of Oasis is The Prince Principle equivalent of that, which is why they are being introduced first. This discussion paper is a hybrid between the two different forms of Oasis that have been developed, and when the final discussion paper for Oasis arrives according to the schedule in the back of the Eden book there will be more detail on this part of it, and then of

course it will all be laid out in the White Paper when that arrives.

The way I'm going to address it in here is firstly to say that those currently employed by the industry will continue to be employed by the industry, and there will even be limited options for them to have either temporary or permanent (high paid) postings in areas where we are building up the Oasis operations. People are not going to be out of work because of this, and they won't need to rely on the goodness of those they work for in order to remain employed. I touch on this a little later in this document. The other way I'm going to address this in here is to illustrate why it would be difficult to introduce these elements to you at this early stage by unintentionally (maybe intentionally) confusing the hell out of you like this:

This part of Oasis introduces too many new government and industry ideas and processes that we're not used to seeing. They are things we can absolutely do, and those in charge will want to do them, but they are too difficult to parse inside a small space or a simple conversation. Firstly because they are in areas of society that almost nobody ever delves into because it's too boring; things like international trade, government budgetary processes, semi-government corporations, regulatory systems and privatisation. And secondly because everything we use from these realms are all adapted to serve the Oasis Reform; with the exception of one of these being seconded almost directly out of government budgetary processes, the rest of what we take from these areas end up as Picasso versions of what we're seconding into service.

There is an atypical international trade organisation for example, that will be a massive economic entity that is designed to facilitate eccentric or atypical trading that will also be used as a stabilisation tool for the global economy. It is something that is part of Oasis, but it will also be part of another H3 agenda reform. For its use inside Oasis, Brazil and Indonesia and The Congo will stop cutting down their native forests (yes I'm well aware of the specific and very different dynamics in each of those locations), and they don't lose a cent in the process; the local corporations don't lose a cent, the local workers don't lose a cent, and governments don't lose a cent either, and mostly through this trade organisation.

To extend forward into the complexity a little, this trade organisation will operate as (part time) slave to another huge

economic entity that will be created out of the regulatory framework of a certain group of countries (a huge entity but much smaller than the trade organisation). This economic entity created out of regulatory entities will be a newly created multinational corporation that both regulates the industry, with a lighter hand than what they're used to, and participates in it at the top; part of this will be the establishment of a massive common market for all forest products; a common market that is a hell of a lot closer to a single market, but with price eccentricities that will address the primary balance of trade issue mentioned above; the relocation of primary forestry operations into new countries.

This then leads back into the need for the international trade organisation because we need an atypical trade vehicle through which to trade products because it's a peculiar type of common market for a "narrow range" of products rather than everything, and there's far more to be gained in this part of the picture than just the "free" trade of goods. Part of the trade organisation's function will be to adjust the price of goods being traded from country to country, constantly booking surpluses and deficits, because every country is not at parity, but everything is traded through the single market at single worldwide prices even though not everybody pays the same price, and in the bigger picture outside of Oasis it does this for more than just forest products; that's when it really gets complicated.

Just to digress for a minute, the multinational corporation that I just mentioned starts its life as a number of government entities that then merge together to form a single "multinational semi-government" entity that is funded either through the markets in two or three stages, funded to the tune of over \$100 billion, or through one of several other avenues which I mentioned earlier.

That multinational is then privatised but in a very different way, and the governments who are relinquishing direct control of this multinational don't get any of the direct privatising return for this; they get other benefits: prestige for solving a problem, greater involvement in the international trade organisation, better international relations and some with countries they've had little to do with previously, and of course the thing they will value more highly than all of this; the tools to help them stabilise their economy if it is ever needed via the trade organisation mentioned in this part of the picture.

At the very beginning, the business operations part of Oasis is a governments owned and backed enterprise, but not for long, and because it doesn't cost governments anything, when they give it up to those in the industry it is given rather than sold. So it is not, Not, NOT (inter)nationalization of the industry; it is a takeover of the industry of sorts, but it is not a takeover of the corporations in the industry. It is not entirely accurate to put it this way but think of it as corporatizing and commercializing some regulators around the world, and then making them part of the industry in a way that adds over \$500 billion of capital wealth to the industry that those in the industry will own (within a relatively short period of time). This happens in conjunction with the \$1 trillion worth of new assets we create for the industry (in the more advanced version we add an additional, ADDITIONAL, two trillion dollars worth of assets from a different source). All of what is in this paragraph takes place before we commence operations in Africa, and how we do what is mentioned in this paragraph is what creates the bridge from the current timber sources to the new timber sources. It's an ownership bridge, an economic bridge and something that could be called a GDP-mirror bridge through the new trade organisation I just mentioned.

This all sounds very complicated and it is, but it's not complicated inside the framework of a White Paper, and it's not complicated inside the framework of establishing a massive global economic reform. When you have the space to stretch it out into a detailed explanation, and when people have become accustomed to the new language of The Prince Principle, it really isn't as complicated as it sounds inside a brief stopover.

The final point to make in this section is that just like every other big thing we put together on the world stage, there will be a lot of hiccups, a lot of high level activity, unless you're in the middle of it you'll be oblivious to it going on, and big things like this take time. We don't even get to Abuja and Addis Ababa to negotiate border treaties (Abuja), and land use and transcontinental infrastructure (Addis Ababa) until after we're at least six months into discussions with South American, Asian and Congo region forest interests, and we don't even get to that point until after we're at least six months into discussions with Brussels, Beijing and Washington about creating the new trade organisation I just mentioned. Because of the dynamics of it and what it will be

able to do, it will happen a lot quicker than you're imagining at the moment (they are really going to want this trade instrument for the global economy), but there is a process, and big things like this take time.

Of course the United States have made it more difficult to formulate anything on the world stage now because we can no longer rely on them to act in their own best interests, nor to use reason before they act, and we must now assume that sabotage on a whim is always just around the corner (whenever Republicans grab the White House). When including America in any international agreements in the future, said agreements must be structured so that they do not rely on America being a dominant part of the picture; they can and will be a part of many agreements, but they can no longer be relied upon as a key player or linchpin to hold it together. The bottom line in this matter is that Republicans in America have gone off the rails, and any major international agreement that is put together for the foreseeable future needs to be designed so that the United States cannot blow it up on a whim whenever they next grab the White House; it's not just trump, it's that wing of the party who seem to want to see the world burn; if they don't want to see the world burn then they're doing a very good job of making it look that way (Iran nuclear deal and trade wars they're all happily singing along to); Republicans are not going to be better after trump leaves. I have not currently redesigned the international trade organisation with this in mind, but I have a decent idea of how to do it so I'll get to it long before it's necessary. America will still be able to use this entity, but they won't have the power to blow it up by excising themselves from it.

Current Industry Employment

This is going to be a relatively brief entry because it is not possible to properly elaborate some of these details without clarifying some of the details I've just confused you with in the section above. How shall I put it? Part of the picture is tied up inside the thing I mention above called a GDP mirror bridge. There will be a massive ongoing process of replanting deforested areas, and further afforestation of the areas surrounding them. These new treed areas will not be treated as assets in practice, but will be booked as such for the sake of using them in calculations inside the new trade organisation I've just been talking about (and inside GDP calculations for

the countries in question as well). There is a not insignificant amount of money to be made by doing this and using it inside the trade organisation using this GDP mirror bridge. One of the other places we find employment for those who will no longer have employment through local forestry is through utilising some of the ANSR commerce. The options available can be found on a list in Appendix V of The Prince Principle. These options were created as alternative commerce to deliver to fossil fuels corporations as “compensation” as we wean ourselves off fossil fuels (imagine how big those numbers must be), so obviously there will be plenty of options for use inside this part of Oasis. That’ll do for this section.

Farming, Palm Oil, and Charcoal

This section title is a reference to the three biggest problems that beset the three largest tropical forests in the world. This section could have taken two different paths, and because I’ve already confused the hell out of you once with the Balance of Trade Issues section above, I decided to go for the simple and quick option this time. This section is not going to satisfy anybody familiar with the issues.

It’s not practical for me to elaborate on this part of the fix for deforestation because part of it is connected to the intercontinental commerce transfers alluded to in the Balance of Trade Issues section (the international trade organisation part of the picture, but not on the Oasis side); it’s even less practical for me to elaborate because it is primarily a part of another H3 agenda reform called CODIN, which is talked about in two of the H3 books. It’s the reason why these three significant causes of deforestation in this world only get this little section. Inside the framework of a solution that is only for deforestation it is actually impossible for us to solve this part of deforestation, unless as I mention a little later, we *deus ex machina* the situation with the ANSR reform, which we don’t need to do (it doesn’t work as well if we just shorthand it with ANSR and it doesn’t work at all for some of it).

I could just spit out in plain language how we fix the palm oil, farming, soybeans, and charcoal and fuel wood part of deforestation, but without a proper understanding of the Balance of Trade Issues mentioned above, and until you get a quasi-primer on CODIN by reading the twenty or so sections about CODIN in one of the H3 books called Save Steps (and

then the CODIN discussion paper when it emerges), it wouldn't make much sense to you, and more importantly, you wouldn't be able to see how it's possible.

Allow me to give you some small amount of satisfaction on this part of the fix for deforestation. It would be possible to use part of the ANSR reform to move future expansion of palm oil, farming, and soybeans in Asia and South America to locations where deforestation was not required, but the Africa part of this equation is going to require CODIN to fix it. Think of ANSR as the eagles in the Lord of the Rings and Hobbit movies; it can *deus ex machina* almost anything if you ever need it to. ANSR is not used very often in the H3 agenda but it can be used to plug any hole that needs to be plugged. ANSR will not be used for this part of Oasis, but it could be.

Arid Forestry

There is so much that could be said in this section but I've decided to limit this passage because there are a lot of people out there who know more about arid forestry than I do, a lot more.

On the scale being suggested here desalination will obviously be used to source water, and with a view to stretching what we pump into the region as far as it can go, there are more efficient methods of delivering water than by standard irrigation canals.

Tree types are certainly an issue but not as much of an issue as one would initially think. There are some extremely thirsty species that would need to be excluded at first but most species, and certainly plenty of every category, can be used. What are the different uses for trees and other plants in a forest environment, and what are the different types of wood required for commercial purposes; this is what is meant by category.

Soils are generally very poor in arid regions but there are many ways to enrich soil, and how it will be done in Australia is likely to be slightly different to how it will be done in Africa.

How big a difficulty are both mammalian and insect pests, and are there non-violent and fairly obvious ways to overcome them? This will be a part of the discussion. We do not destroy other species just because we need some more wood, not even so called pest species.

Water, water, water: There's a section called water a

couple of pages further in, and in addition to the unprecedented volume of water to be pumped into Oasis regions (unprecedented by factors), we'll be changing the regional climate dynamics as well to add even more water. I mention this in the Save Steps book, and apart from those mentions I'm going to leave this one hang for you to make of it what you will for the time being. Changing the regional climate dynamics in certain areas is part of CODIN, ANSR and the Global Environmental Repair reforms, and just like everything else you will find in the Eden is Burning book, it will all be unveiled in its turn according to the schedule in the back of that Eden book.

One needs to remember that we're talking about something on a scale that is even larger than the Russian agricultural developments in the fifties, and for those who are not aware of it, that was bigger than anything we've ever undertaken in the West before; so, big. The plantations in Africa will be the size of Mongolia and those for Australia (if we include Australia) will be the size of Iraq. There will be an impact on the regional climate dynamics in both regions, and we do more than just add trees and water to get this change. When conducting arid forestry on this scale there is more than a little chance that what starts as arid forestry will not stay arid forestry, and if we take positive steps to make it so then it certainly won't remain arid forestry. We already have the ability to change regional climate dynamics, "we" just don't know we have the ability to do it yet because it's on such a scale it's something we've never considered.

Soil Enrichment

The original soil enrichment strategies for this operation were formulated in about 2001, but there will have been some new thoughts on the subject since then. And of course just like for the entry above, there are plenty of people who know far more about this subject than I do. I know a lot and have developed all of this and a hell of a lot more, but **when it comes to the finer details the experts don't bend to my choices and knowledge and understanding of the subject, I bend to theirs** (of course that's the way it must work). The finer details of soil enrichment will be developed during this reform's journey to acceptance, but the broad strokes of one possible option for Australia is as follows:

1. Treatment and use of all sewage produced in two of

Australia's capital cities, perhaps transported to site by rail, but pipelines are not out of the question. The sewage is to be applied with specialized earthmoving equipment that will deliver the fertilizer across the top 100 to 150 centimetres. It may be possible to source enough sewage from all the towns inside a one thousand kilometre radius of Oasis operations, and delivery would be easier if it could all come from this source.

2. Mixed in with the sewage during treatment will be a range of minerals where they are lacking, such as magnesium, manganese, zinc and calcium.
3. The treated areas will be moistened twice per week for about three months.
4. We create/enhance the zoological cycle in the region to ensure as wide a spread of the various nutrients and organic matter required.
5. A variety of legumes will then be planted and allowed to grow for a further three to six months.
6. The legumes are rolled and a tree seedling planted utilizing a single special earthmoving vehicle to do both.
7. Amongst other things, the legumes provide an ultra-slow nitrogen release and the rolled legumes provide additional protection for the seedling in its developing stages.

The biggest element and the key to it all is use of the sewage. It is probably the only cost effective method to enrich soil on such a scale. It will enrich the soil with Nitrogen, Phosphorus, organic matter and trace amounts of a wide range of other beneficial elements.

Ultimately it will be up to Oasis corporations to choose the soil enrichment method(s), and different soils will require different regimens based on salinity, clay and silica content, pH levels, presence of organic matter, in some cases toxicity, and a few other considerations.

Although H3 operations will control/manage/supervise Oasis corporations (control Australia, supervise Africa, partially manage both), micro-management of the specific enrichment regimen (inside a wide range that must include sewage) is not something we'll get involved in. We will bring on the best people in the world and let them do their jobs.

Water

How much water is required for such undertakings? Oh boy! I did the calculations once and people are not ready to see the numbers. Clearly it will be necessary to build the infrastructure in stages.

The only option in Africa is desalination and ultimately the African operation could end up desalinating more sea water than that which is done everywhere else in the world combined in about ten years.

In Australia people have proposed taking advantage of the huge amount of rainfall in northern Queensland with ideas to pipe it out of the region and into regions that have low rainfall.

It would be within the budgetary availability of an operation like this, and in fact it would be cheaper than desalination and may even provide more water. Is it something to be considered? It is mentioned because it has been floated in the past and some people seem to think it's a good idea (silly little children). It will not be considered inside Oasis operations, and after H3 begins I will fight any attempt to pipe water out of northern Queensland for any purpose. I'm for action to change a regional climate dynamic, but to increase rainfall, not reduce it, and that would be the result of piping masses out of northern Queensland, and obviously so.

We build the water infrastructure in stages and an important question is at what point is the regional climate dynamic affected? What volume of water could we expect after it has been substantially affected? And as I said earlier, the action we take to change the regional climate dynamic is considerably more than "pump water in and plant trees".

Desalination is currently not cheap, and although my early thinking was that we would need to resort to the existing technologies for the first stage desalination implementation (for several reasons), I don't believe this is still the case.

Knowing what I know and my experiences of the last dozen years leaves me with no doubt that we will be able to find technology that costs less than half of the existing technologies to build, and much less than half of what it costs to run them. I will not be the only one who has been sitting on a gold mine for years. We just need to know where to look and what to look for; and to know what we're looking at when we're looking at it (new techs frequently have elements that can be applied much further afield than what its creator

intended).

There are also some ancient ideas that will help us out with our water requirement and in more ways than one. For example, we can second sand dams into service and tweak them to get our required scale, and we may be able to use the general idea of the sand dam for other things too. More efficient technology (or solutions) needn't always mean more mechanized. Sand dams won't be the only old or ancient ideas we'll be able to use that are much better than a mechanized option. Slow down and don't try for more complexity for complexity's sake just because it's fun. In Africa we may end up improvising more than one major element for Oasis that have never been done in modern society, but were in common place usage by the Tuareg or Hausa fifteen hundred years ago.

When calculating the water requirement it is important to realize that we will not simply use standard irrigation ditches. When doing something on this scale, what is the best delivery method? There are more than a few methods for us to consider.

Manmade lakes will pepper Oasis regions. How many and how deep is the most efficient configuration? How much is wise to lose to evaporation? And which methods do we use to limit said evaporation? Again, on that last one go simple rather than technology and complexity. We need to get away from this complexity for complexity's sake when there are so many good options, in everything, just lying around on the floor.

This is an important place to reiterate that this is a discussion paper and not a White Paper where it is all laid out with no ambiguity. We have many points of discussion here so let's investigate and then do that shall we?

Electricity

It is obvious that Oasis operations require a significant amount of electricity.

It would be a very inefficient use of resources if we were to produce millions of tonnes of greenhouse gases in order to absorb millions of tonnes of greenhouse gases. But it would also be a very inefficient use of resources to use any of the existing alternative energy technologies; they are more expensive and they suffer from intermittency.

If we were to use any of the existing alternative energy

technologies we would need to install over two or three times the capacity in desalination plants (because of the intermittency), which then means that we require two or three times the capacity in power plants as well. So in addition to the existing suite of alternative energy power generation costing more than fossil fuels power plants, we will need more capacity installed as well. The cost equation is actually much worse than this if we wanted to run it all at 24/7 capacity, which is something we need to do.

If this version of Oasis is to be done then none of the existing technologies are acceptable options to produce electricity. So what do we do?

Zero emission technology called Water Tower has an info-doc on this web (in the discussion papers), and if something better does not emerge then we can simply use the Water Tower. Water Tower is suitable for base load electricity generation and it will be cheaper to build and cheaper to run than coal or natural gas power plants for large implementations. We need large power plants for Oasis so Water Tower would be usable “in a pinch”, but better technology will emerge soon so it shouldn’t be necessary.

Creation of Towns

Within about ten years millions of people will be working under Oasis operations.

Dozens of towns will be created in the target regions over the course of about ten to fifteen years. All towns will be created from scratch and manmade lakes will be situated around and inside these towns.

The design of the towns will not be that important in Africa because in the regions Oasis will operate almost any form would be a massive step up, but in a developed country like Australia people need enticement to move to hot arid regions, even if they can be convinced that it won’t always be like that.

In Australia the design of the towns and the specific design of the various facilities will attract many people to move to the towns. Each of the main towns servicing an Oasis region will have an area that will look somewhat similar to Sydney Harbour, and this will not be their only attractive feature.

In Africa the general design of the towns will not be that different, and the facilities will be roughly the same. The principal difference in Africa will be that the dwellings will

reflect the fact that it is Africa, and in constructing the dwellings we will use the construction materials traditionally used for dwellings in African towns, or maybe something a little better that may be longer lasting.

Increasing prosperity will alter this dynamic over many years, and if we get our approach to Africa right it will happen a lot more quickly, and to everyone's benefit whether they live in New York or Nouakchott.

Cost of the Reform

There is a cost of implementation but the operation produces a massive surplus as it is solving the issue of deforestation completely. The following in this section is the picture inside the original version of Oasis, but the size of the figures will be roughly the same for the advanced version where the references are applicable. For example, the primary funds requirement is about the same in the advanced version but funding will be acquired in a different way and under very different conditions, and the total assets will have a somewhat different value, disposition and make up also. Funding is not sourced from the market in the advanced version of Oasis, but it can be if the discussions take us in that direction.

The Oasis Forestry Reform is a commercial enterprise that will have annual revenues of over \$200 billion from forest products, and it will produce higher margins for the industry than it is used to. There will also be over \$30 billion more in annual revenues from other sources arising from the creation, "ownership" and "management" of dozens of towns.

The funds required to successfully implement the Oasis Forestry Reform will be raised in four to six separate rounds and will total around \$150 billion. What we will get out of this is annual revenues of around \$300 billion, corporations worth over \$500 billion, and total asset creation of over \$1 trillion. What we will get is a massive going concern that will solve deforestation completely and be a major plank in the solution for Climate Change.

The true "cost" of this reform is that we add over a trillion dollars to the global economy, and (together with FISCIL and ANSR which should also be early H3 implementations) we start down a path towards something called The Generational Effect. "We" will be doing this reform for the money, and we will be doing many other H3 agenda reforms for the money also, but what the next generation and the one after that will

see is that we solved our biggest problems; they mostly do not see all of the money that is being made. The generations after that only see the good example to follow of solving our biggest problems. That is The Generational Effect; no matter what we are really like or why we did a thing, we provide this “façade” example of higher behaviour in solving our biggest problems to the next and subsequent generations. The cost of the basic version or the advanced version of this reform is nothing (because it doesn’t cost us anything up front), and the upside is almost incalculable at this stage. In money Oasis is probably calculable to the nearest \$50 billion if we wanted to make that calculation at this point, but in the improvement of the human condition towards what we would like it to be, the value is higher than any sane person thought could be possible this century. The Generational Effect, which I go into in each of the three main H3 books, is how things start to get a little more than a little better in this world. To do a little cross-pollinating plagiarism, “this is how the world is fixed in the end; not with a whole lot of sound and fury amounting to nothing, but business as usual, with a slight bend”.

More Money for the Industry

So far I’ve said that the Oasis Reform is going to add a half a trillion dollars in capital wealth into the industry, and I believe you would have noticed that I’ve mostly just skipped over how that will happen. Let’s have a look at it now shall we.

Well first of all we are creating a massive asset worth over a trillion dollars that will be added to the industry, and in the advanced version another two trillion dollars worth of assets on top of that. We will be reorganizing and capitalizing the entire Global Forest Industries as part of this asset creation without negatively impacting existing corporations; a lot of it is already capitalized but a lot of it isn’t. In a similar way to how it is done in FISCIL we capitalize the industry with these additional assets as part of it and then calculate everybody’s share.

It is popular these days to try and summon ever more money out of vapour, but inside Oasis there is no revenue for the industry via some magical accounting tricks such as they use in the Finance and Banking Industries; well, there actually is, but I’m not counting that as part of the half a trillion dollars. That part of Oasis is how we deal with recalcitrant

farmers and “grey market” operators. And I suppose the international trade organisation I mentioned earlier that is touched on inside the Save Steps book could be viewed in that way as well, but again, I’m not counting that towards the half a trillion because that addresses other issues.

Unfortunately there is some but very little additional revenue to be had through “fixing” the supply chain such as what happens inside the FISCIL Reform of the Global Fishing Industry, so we don’t get a lot of joy there.

There will be diversified revenues from creating new towns and there will be the many opportunities that arise through leveraging the large assets I just mentioned. That’s where the first of it starts to trickle in (not to be confused with trickle down; we don’t do the trickle down thing in any H3 reform; everybody comes up at the same time, and the wealth burbles up, as it’s supposed to).

It’s time to get you to take a little leap of faith that is not really a leap of faith. You will no doubt view it as a leap of faith initially, but everything you need to convince you that it’s not is in the Save Steps book.

The H3 agenda of reforms, of which Oasis and FISCIL and Kyoto II and ANSR are a part, are designed to solve many of the world’s biggest problems with action that will add over \$50 trillion to the size of the global economy. For example Climate Change is solved in a way that will add over \$20 trillion into the economy, globalisation will be fixed in a way that adds over \$20 trillion as well (with about four or five trillion double counted between the two), FISCIL adds about a half a trillion and capitalizes another half a trillion, Oasis obviously, and there are a few more than a few others on the same scale as Oasis and FISCIL. Inside these reforms, the specific activity that makes the money is the exact same activity that solves the problems. This agenda is all based on a major breakthrough in social theory called The Prince Principle and nobody, Nobody, NOBODY will disagree with the basic premise behind it. Allow me to give you a test drive from the opening passage of The Prince Principle book:

If we can solve our biggest problems so that the richest and most powerful people in the world can make trillions of dollars as we’re solving them, then solve them we will. It’s not just the money. It’s the motivations and desires of those with money and power stretching right across the spectrum of their wants and needs. “What do the rich and powerful who are involved in a particular major problem want and need; right, now let’s find

*a way to give them all of it **packaged up** in a solution to that major problem”.*

Is there a sane person on the planet who disagrees with that premise? I'd be shocked. Of course this agenda of reforms needs to do what I say they do (actually solve), but because it is not ambiguous in the slightest that all of this money can be made (FISCIL, Oasis, ANSR to start with), it's not as if we're not going to do it whether it solves or not, and that's the material point in this section (making the money). Most of the H3 agenda is overviewed in the Save Steps book so you can judge it for yourself, and at 139,000 words there's plenty to sink your teeth into; in 122 separate entries.

The H3 agenda of reforms will push (mostly residential and small commercial) construction through the roof in developed markets, and demand for building materials in under developed countries is accelerated as well; and the furniture market, oh boy! MDF usage will go through the roof in under developed countries, and technology using wood pulp/fibres/chips for building materials and furniture that “perfectly” mimics cut timber will emerge in short order as well, so even “low quality” fibres can be utilized in high value added uses. The faster growing trees in the Oasis plantations, mentioned in these discussion papers (‘five years’, ‘fifteen years’), will be the primary source for this new technology, or I suppose tech and process is a better characterization.

Even if we assume that only a fifth of the H3 agenda is done, that's a hell of a lot of additional market for the Forest Industries (and what if all of it or most of it is adopted). We're going to need those two hundred million hectares of assets coming online in fifteen to sixty years time. This is the leap of faith I'm asking you to take, but it's not absolutely necessary that you take it at this point in time.

The bottom line on “More Money for the Industry” is that without the rest of the H3 agenda we capitalize the whole industry and all current stakeholders get a share commensurate with their position in the industry, which adds a mid to low double digit percentage to stakeholders pocket books; there is some small amount, perhaps ten percent, to be added to industry profits through supply chain issues inside Oasis; there is the revenue derived from the creation of a massive “captive” workforce to establish Oasis, and then there is the creation of the towns that will add tens of billions of dollars in diversified income for the industry. That's the floor, and as I indicated above, the ceiling is two or three times

more than what they have today.

Until you read the Save Steps book it is a leap of faith to believe the “two or three times more than what they have today”, but this is worth doing for the lowball estimate, and it’s not as if you need to take my word for that lowball estimate; the elements are pretty straightforward and relatively simple to calculate. Of course the likelihood that we will either fund this in the same way as we do the ANSR resource or just go straight to the ANSR resource for the seed requirement makes this a somewhat more attractive proposition for the current stakeholders.

Oasis Corporations’ Income

If you’ve already read the FISCIL discussion paper then this will seem very familiar, and it is because it is essentially a direct lift from FISCIL. How we organise the income of these massive “overlord” organisations is something to be defined during its pre-adoption. Oasis Corp income is yet to be determined and there are a few options, including one that wouldn’t make much sense in the current system but is probably the one to use. There can be licensing and through-flow markets, or there can be set prices for each country that the market purchases (virtually in this case) and on-sells or there can be a by weight market purchase that has a limited species specific price setting component, or as I said above, some other way. Establishing massive centralised plantations and changing over to almost exclusively plantation sourced within twenty to thirty years will change the dynamics of pricing and how easily harvesting is done, so some of the details are going to change in the process. Also to bear in mind is the fact that the vast majority of foresters who trade through the market will own part of Oasis Corp, so if we have a trading system that cuts their personal income by ten percent but doubles the price of their shares they may be inclined to go for that if the shares are worth enough. This may end up being even more of a valid consideration for Oasis than it is for FISCIL Corps.

Government Involvement

There are a number of activities and concessions expected from governments.

The most important to mention is the facilitation of fertilizer. It is the most important because it falls outside the

purview of normal government input.

A significant part of Oasis operations is the use of human sewage as fertilizer. We need so much of it that transportation becomes an issue. In Australia for example we will be looking for more than what Brisbane produces, and almost certainly more than even Sydney can produce (yes I see the joke too; it wasn't intended). It is possible that the towns around and inside Oasis operations will be enough, and if they are it would be cheaper to do it that way? Such a thing is by no means certain.

Some other requirements are the provision of interstate rail infrastructure, upgrading of port facilities at Darwin, and in two or three cities in Africa as well, management of national seedling programs, tax incentives for employees to encourage immigration into Oasis regions, and the development of town infrastructures just to mention those that come immediately to mind.

Obviously governments will be involved in the development and establishment of international treaties that allow us to bring the bigger economic picture of the Global Forest Industries under a manageable umbrella. The implementation of the Oasis Forestry Reform is designed to happen in stages and take every conceivable factor into consideration, including international trade. Governments like Indonesia and Brazil will only co-operate if there is an ongoing place for them inside the reform, and only providing that it does not impact their short term imperatives as well. It's a tightrope but it's a pretty thick tightrope.

An international treaty formalizing the continuation of regional "revenues" inside the Forest Industries at their current levels is a critical part of the Oasis Forestry Reform and this takes place as part of the establishment of the new international trade organisation mentioned several times in these documents; revenues not current activities. The issue is not explored in this discussion paper beyond its mention here for the same reason that all of the more complex elements in the H3 agenda of reforms are being withheld: The H3 agenda of reforms is a true opposite approach to our biggest problems, so it is essentially a new language to learn. No matter how smart a person is (even a "genius") they cannot properly parse all the complex grammatical formulations of a new language until they've gone through, "the ball is round" and "see the dog run". FISCIL, most of the basic Oasis and Kyoto II are "the ball is round" and "see the dog run".

The two different versions of Oasis deal with the issue of regional “revenues” very differently. In one it’s going to take five years before the subject is even broached, and the commercial realities of public corporations will substantially limit the parameters of the international agreement. In the other, the international agreement simply falls into place in the first year (in its best form) and the sweeteners for each participating country make it a *fait accompli*. Yes the latter is part of the more advanced version. This part of government involvement is briefly covered in the Save Steps book. It’s a little bit complicated to say the least. The word revenues used above is an inadequate word to use, but there are no better words to use without qualifying the hell out of it, so just know that it is a word to be interpreted in this usage.

Environmental Impacts

If Oasis were only to be considered as a commercial operation on its own with no environmental benefits, then it would still be a good idea to do it; money, money, money. The environmental impacts of Oasis have been very well considered, and its environmental benefits will be wide-ranging, long-lasting and unprecedented.

Positive Environmental Impacts:

1. Phasing out of native forest logging worldwide over twenty years.
2. Electricity and desalination will be delivered with zero emission energy generation technology, and so around two hundred million hectares of plantation forest speaks for itself in the issue of CO₂ sequestration.
3. There is a direct correlation between deforestation and rainfall; the greater the forest cover in a region, the more rain there is, and *vice versa*. Placement of over thirty-five million hectares of forest in outback Australia, and pumping huge volumes of water into the region every single day is going to have a hard to define but substantial impact on rainfall on the East Coast, and maybe even on the West Coast. Droughts can be pretty extreme in outback Australia, but they may not be in the future.
4. In Africa, Oasis will have many environmental and social repercussions, and an increase in rainfall that is also hard to define. It is possible and perhaps even likely that with a “little” additional geo-engineering we

may be able to take back a sizeable portion of the southern and eastern reaches of the Sahara.

5. In Africa Lake Chad will be returned to beyond its recent historical peak and maintained at that level.
6. Working sewage of some cities and towns into the ground rather than pumping it out to sea is probably the better option.
7. Groundwater sources in outback Australia were well on their way to being depleted before the drought broke in the 2000s, and Oasis will prevent them from ever getting to that point again.
8. Not only will existing groundwater sources in Africa be constantly replenished in the arid region south of the Sahara, but a few more will develop in the southern and eastern reaches of the Sahara.
9. Such a project developed under the new balancing reforms ideology will get people thinking about solving other large environmental problems by making money and creating commerce, rather than how it has been up to this point.

Negative Environmental Impacts:

1. We are going to have an impact on over two hundred million hectares of local ecology. Some species will not appreciate the change, but most will adapt and perhaps even prefer the new environment. We need to weigh up impacting one animal and one species for every twenty or fifty or one hundred animals and species we will be saving by discontinuing native forest logging all over the world. In a lot of cases many of the individual animals of the disrupted species will simply “move down the road” and the species will be preserved. This is not ideal and I don’t like killing things even by proxy (I even avoid standing on ants and I evict bugs out of my house rather than kill them), but we need to get out the scales and in that calculation the decision is easy. It’s a variation on the “Trolley problem” only in this case with a fifty or one hundred to one ratio.
2. We are going to interfere with local climate dynamics, and there is no getting away from that fact, but this time rather than taking out we’re adding back in. The secondary purpose of these large projects, of which Oasis is only one, is to attempt to negate the impact

we've had on the environment up to this point in time. This point is technically a negative, but it is a positive negative (not really a negative).

3. Desalination operations of the size incorporated into Oasis projects are going to have a noticeable coastal footprint.
4. Desalination does produce a waste product, and operations of the size incorporated into Oasis projects are going to produce a Mount Everest amount of it. Technology will be selected to substantially reduce the waste product, and what is produced will be dealt with so it will not impact marine or terrestrial ecology. I foresee no difficulty in using at least a third of the waste produced in Africa for construction. We don't need our thinking caps on for too long to work this one out. Having said that we do need to push most of it back out into the oceans, and I can see discussions moving in the direction of pushing it all back out to sea. Whichever way it goes it is an issue but it's not going to be an actual problem.
5. Obviously the impact of building towns where there were none is a negative impact, but they will be very green towns.

It is a question of greater good and trade-offs and we need to be willing to make our judgements and have direct guilt, rather than be guilty of intentional indifference or intentional ignorance (point one on the negative list). In 500 years things may not work that way (needing to make trade-offs), and obviously it would be ideal from an environmental perspective if we could just discontinue native forest logging without the need to offer reasonable commercial alternatives. That is not how the world works today. This is a world of commerce and the wheels must turn. Do you want to solve the problem, or do you want to fight corporations and governments on this issue in perpetuity?

Conclusion

Getting towards the end of writing the first draft of the current version of this discussion paper, six or seven years ago, an alternate implementation occurred to me for Oasis and I worked it through and defined it; as you would have noticed, I have since gone back into the body of this paper and inserted a few references to it.

There are two possible implementations for the Oasis Forestry Reform, and either will do the jobs of solving deforestation completely and being a major plank in the solution for Climate Change.

Whichever implementation of Oasis is used, it is a commercial enterprise that directly links improving environmental conditions with the making of huge sums of money. The greater the volume of plantation forests inside Oasis corporations the greater the value of the company and the greater the PE ratio; when future revenues are locked away with assets two, three or even four times the company's market cap, people are more comfortable with a higher PE. The Oasis Corporation will be the bluest of blue chip stocks with its high NAB (net asset backing), treaties to limit or exclude reckless or damaging behaviour, and internationally "legislated" monopoly.

Whichever implementation is used governments get to solve deforestation and make a big difference to Climate Change in one big "grand enterprises and setting a good example" initiative, so governments will be happy about it. Inside Oasis bureaucracy are happy because additional monitoring staff are required. Big business are happy because there is over \$100 billion in establishing projects and over \$100 billion more in ongoing projects. And environmental groups are happy because together with the other elements of H3's Climate Change approach, we solve Climate Change and deforestation completely.

There are several highlighted gaps in what I'm not telling you about the Oasis reform for the time being and I cover the reasons for withholding when I do, but the part of this underwriting all of it and sealing the deal is that we can fund this using the ANSR resource (again, details in the Save Steps book and CC discussion paper). After you accept that ANSR is correct then the details I'm not revealing at this time are utterly irrelevant to the point of whether we're going to do it or not. The information currently available for Oasis can be viewed as a barebones foundation inside which we need to add complex international treaties and trusts; these things are not simple but others would be able to put together simple versions of what I'm proposing if it were necessary; and of course you get all of what I'm proposing in the Advanced Oasis discussion paper when it's released according to the schedule in the back of the Eden book. Additionally, I overview some of the specific things we need the treaties and

trusts for in the Save Steps book so there are those barebones as well.

We're going to do something like this in the near future for the Global Forest Industries, so let's start talking about it shall we????

Sean Gallacher
Brisbane, Australia
0424 529 885
abc@h3hq.org
www.h3hq.org