



# Oasis Forestry Discussion Paper

*Introduction 3*

---

---

*Purpose of Oasis 5*

---

---

*Form of Implementation (commercial) 6*

---

---

*Land Requirement and Locations 8*

---

---

*Balance of Trade Issues 9*

---

---

*Arid Forestry 12*

---

---

*Soil Enrichment 13*

---

---

*Water 15*

---

---

*Electricity 16*

---

---

*Creation of Towns 17*

---

---

*Cost of the Reform 18*

---

---

*More Money for the Industry 19*

---

---

*Government Involvement 22*

---

---

*Environmental Impacts 23*

---

---

*Conclusion 26*

There are two different versions of the Oasis Forestry Reform. What you're getting in here is the basic version, and although we are far more likely to push forward with the advanced version, this is a valid and useable option and is therefore useful to illustrate the nature of the H3 agenda reforms. 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 is more closely aligned with CODIN and 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. Also, including Australia in Oasis was always going to be a "heavy lift" so it's more of a maybe in the advanced version.

## Introduction

The Oasis Forestry Reform is a global initiative that is designed to solve the issue of deforestation completely, and be a major plank in the assault on Climate Change. We said they were a big issue fifty years ago and it was a thing to laugh at. We did our studies, produced our data and showed the evidence (under their nose) thirty years ago, and they continually asked, "where's the evidence". We dumb the evidence down over the ensuing decade and show it to them again, and when it is clear and unmistakable and arranged so that a twelve year old can understand, it's now a conspiracy. And now, when we have forty years of satellite pictures and time lapse illustrations; evidence arranged so that even a five year old can see the problem..... What a long slow dance we've had, and some ninnies are still dancing. It's time to stop dancing.

The great Asian forests have been a primary source of wood for both building materials and woodchips, but they have been subject to unsustainable and unchecked logging for so long that they won't be able to fulfil this role into the future. When we add in the Palm Oil Industry on top of that...

Both anecdotally and through research, it has become increasingly clear that not only does rainfall feed forests, but forests feed rainfall. People in Brazil have been getting a firsthand taste of how closely linked large forests are with rainfall over the last thirty years. For the good of its entire

economy Brazil needs to stop cutting down its trees, and they acknowledge this, but alas governments can rarely get themselves to act on such things (I think the deforestation rate went up in Brazil last year or was that the year before, or both). They do want to stop logging and if they can do it without it costing them anything then they will do it. It's an issue in Brazil, but it's not only Brazil. If we haven't already done it I would be in favour of a massive ARC Centre of Excellence research operation on the possible connection between increasing deforestation in the Asian forests and the Asian monsoon irregularities we've been experiencing over the last couple of decades. Is there a connection; it's clearly inside the area of effect, and in the surface roots there appears some superficial correlation. Let's do a deep dive shall we???? Yes there have been studies that I haven't gotten around to reading; are they enough, I don't know.

With population on the rise and our perennial and "mystifying" march towards reducing the amount of arable land around the world (driven by corporations), we can ill afford consistently lower rainfall. We need to start leaving these forests where they are, and where possible, push them back up to what they were.

For so many reasons it is an ideal time to consider a commercial solution to the issue of deforestation. A company that establishes about two hundred million hectares of plantation forests now would dominate the industry in fifteen years, and although it could work like that (a complete takeover of the entire Global Forest Industries) there's no need to have that fight; it can be done for the benefit of all in the industry. And yes I know that the "good" trees take longer to grow than fifteen years.

The Oasis Forestry Reform is a financial model for the Global Forest Industries that will ensure the preservation of our native forests in perpetuity throughout the world. The protection is afforded because nobody will want to cut the forests down; there will be no financial incentive to do so from the point of using the wood; even in Africa. The disincentive picture looks very different for the grazing and "Palm Oil" deforestation that takes place, and how that is done is best saved for a few years down the track; after people have been introduced to the FISCIL, ANSR and CODIN reforms; especially CODIN. CODIN is for globalisation.

But all of that is focussing on the problem, and to brutally honest about the vast majority of the human race, they don't

really care about things like this in reality. We live in a society or civilisation where we have this mad drive to make money so we can live better, or for some of us in this world even just survive, and discussion of big problems we could have years down the track is too abstract when “we can’t see the evidence of it”.

The evidence is everywhere but in our mad drive for money very few will afford the time to actually read something that doesn’t serve them this month or this year, so let’s forget about the evidence, and even forget about the fact that we have a problem. I’m not being facetious. Let’s forget about whether deforestation is causing and will cause significant problems in the future and just make some money; again, not being facetious. The Oasis Forestry Reform will solve the problem of deforestation completely, but rather than do it for that reason, let’s just do it because it will add two trillion dollars worth of new assets and another \$500 billion of capital wealth into the industry. There will be a time in the future when we are taking global action for the right reasons, but for right now, in this very early stage of our introduction to solutions for major problems that actually make money (Balancing Reforms/solutions), it’s okay to do the right thing for the wrong reason. Doing it this way first is how we get to the better behaviour.

The H3 suite of reforms, of which Oasis is one, has been developed under a major breakthrough in social theory called The Prince Principle, which deals with our biggest problems in roughly the opposite way to how we always have. It’s time for us to start solving some of our biggest problems, and we can do these first ones, Oasis, FISCIL and ANSR, with the primary motivation of making the money there is to be made. Let’s just get together and make trillions of dollars as we solve deforestation, overfishing and Climate Change completely, and the better behaviour and “Generational Effect” of solving some of our biggest problems can come later.

### **Purpose of Oasis**

Its primary purpose is to stop native forest logging all over the world. At the present time logging of our native forests is carried out because it is more profitable to do so. If logging companies could be larger and more profitable by abstaining from native forest logging, then they would abstain from

native forest logging.

Oasis will ensure that we solve the issue of deforestation completely without negatively impacting those in the industry. But we take it that one step further by ensuring that those in the industry will be richer as a consequence of implementing Oasis; more money for the owners, more jobs and a more secure future, AND those damn pesky environmentalists won't be buzzing around your work sites anymore.

### **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 Oasis solution 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).

For those looking at these numbers and thinking to themselves, "absolutely impossible", allow me to introduce you to the twist in this part of it: It is a governments owned

and backed enterprise, but not for long, and because it doesn't cost them 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 the 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).

The accounting principle I alluded to above does a lot of the heavy lifting in this 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 this 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. As I mentioned in the Introduction, 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, as I’ve already indicated, 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 lose their jobs, and they don’t need to rely on the goodness of those they work for in order to keep their jobs. This part of it is touched on in the Save Steps book. 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.

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.

## 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 the 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) are 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.

## **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. 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 deposition 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 development 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 we will 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 H<sub>3</sub> 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.

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 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 times the capacity in desalination plants (because of the intermittency),



which then means that we require more than two times the capacity in power plants as well. So in addition to alternative energy power plants costing considerably more than fossil fuels power plants, we will need twice as many. 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, 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 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 around \$2 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. 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).

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. There are two other books coming out this year, one called The Prince Principle and the other Eden is Burning, and they'll probably help too.

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:

*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, 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 for yourself, and at 136,000 words there's plenty to sink your teeth into; even if there are 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 every scrap can be utilized in high value added uses.

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.

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, perhaps ten percent, amount 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 you 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 you 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.

## **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 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;

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. This particular part of Oasis are the things I confuse you with in the Climate Change discussion paper.

## **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 CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration. It

- will have a very noticeable impact on Climate Change.
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.
  6. Discontinuation of sewage dumping in the oceans around several of our capital cities is a substantial environmental benefit that will mostly go by unnoticed, if we do it that way. The outfalls have been placed further out to sea over the past decades.
  7. Groundwater sources in outback Australia were well on their way to being depleted before the drought broke a few years ago, 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 animals and species we will be saving by discontinuing native forest logging all over the world; this time we won't just be saying it, we will be solving the issue for real. 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, but we need to get out the scales and in that calculation the decision is easy.

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. It 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 this discussion paper, five or six 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 Save Steps and the CC discussion paper 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

0424 529 885

61 424 529 885

[abc@h3hq.org](mailto:abc@h3hq.org)

[www.h3hq.org](http://www.h3hq.org)