

David Clode

email: daveclode@hotmail.com

5/451 Severin Street, Manunda

Mob: 0407 431 733

Cairns, Queensland 4870

25 May 2011

The Honourable Julia Gillard MP

Prime Minister

Parliament House

Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Ms. Gillard,

Re: Reafforestation, soil improvement, climate change and request for funding.

The possibility of catastrophic climate change is considered by many people to be one of the biggest problems facing humanity, and many believe that increasing anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions are the major cause of this potential problem. This belief is created, strengthened, and maintained by the statements and actions of influential leaders in society. For example, the Hon. Kevin Rudd, on numerous occasions, between 2007 and 2009, stated that "Climate change is the greatest scientific, economic and moral challenge of our time", or slight variations on that theme. Sir Richard Branson is so concerned that he held a competition to try to find solutions to climate change, with a prize of 25 million pounds. More recently, on 03/05/2011, you stated that a carbon tax was "the right solution for a big problem". And last but not least, Al Gore, who spreads the word with religious zeal.

Personally I do not believe it is anywhere near as simple nor as big a problem as it is made out to be, however if relatively cheap and effective options are available that would reduce the potential problem, it may be better to hedge our bets and act on those options. Setting aside for the moment:

the effects of solar activity (the elephant in the room), (1), (2),

that water vapour and not CO₂ is by far the dominant greenhouse gas, in spite of deliberately misleading attempts to brainwash the public with repetitive footage showing water vapour coming out of cooling towers (CO₂ is invisible), taken with an orange filter or at sunset to make it look warmer, and from an angle that makes it look as dark and dense as possible,

that the cooling effects of low-level clouds are consistently ignored in computer models,

that there is evidence from past climate indicators that an increase in CO₂ follows rather than precedes a warming period,

that anthropogenic CO₂ is a small fraction of the CO₂ cycled in the biosphere,

that Australia's CO₂ emissions are around 1.5%, a miniscule amount in terms of global climate systems and the biosphere,

that in the seventies we were facing the impending doom of an ice age, and then global warming, later changed to climate change/disruption/volatility (a bet every which way),

that some of these impending global catastrophes are hyped-up, at great expense to tax payers, and then turn out to be red herrings, such as the Y2K bug, all of which is rarely or never mentioned,

it may nevertheless be wise to attempt to sequester excess CO₂. In particular, the fact that the build up or "legacy" of CO₂ from past worldwide deforestation and land degradation, which may be more than six times that which has been produced by burning fossil fuels (3), needs to be recognised and prioritised (estimate by Walter Jehne, former CSIRO scientist). This fact is also conspicuous by its absence in statements made by most scientists, politicians, and in media reporting. Thus, in addressing the possible CO₂ aspect of possible climate change, it is logical to place at least six times as much emphasis on reafforestation and soil improvement, including sequestering carbon in soil, compared to reducing emissions from burning fossil fuels.

A cost-effective reafforestation and soil improvement system, if it were available and implemented, would at the very least mitigate against possible catastrophic climate change, and also buy time for more research and development into making alternative energy as cheap and reliable as fossil fuels, if that is possible, and more time for a phased and less painful changeover. In fact, since increased CO₂ increases plant growth, a CO₂ enriched atmosphere provides favourable conditions and an opportunity for massive, worldwide reafforestation, as well as an opportunity to improve soils for generations to come, by storing carbon in them.

The alternative of a carbon (dioxide) tax on present day emissions should be considered on the basis of its costs and benefits. If Australia had zero CO₂ emissions, starting tomorrow, it would make no statistically significant difference to the global climate decades from now. Therefore, instituting a carbon tax to reduce Australia's emissions by, for example, 20% in 20 years, would be all pain and no gain, and importantly would do nothing to address the build up from deforestation in the past. It is not the best or "the right solution", and is akin to fiddling while Rome burns. A carbon tax is almost certain to result in numerous painful consequences for Aussie battlers, and still more bureaucracy for compensating battlers is not what most Australians would want. An increasing number of Australians believe or at least suspect that the idea of anthropogenic climate change, the carbon tax, ETS, etc. is yet another money-making artifice (the banks want it (4)), and/or that the real agenda of the extreme greens, and others, is to hobble Western, democratic, industrialised, capitalist, sovereign nations, and promote global government (5). The New York Times (25/10/2009), for example, reports Ban Ki-Moon as saying "A climate deal must include an equitable global governance structure". No doubt a socialist redistribution of wealth is another angle.

Regardless of whatever the reasons are for the blinkered focus on CO₂ emissions from developed nations, reafforestation and soil improvement are much better options for dealing with the perceived problems, without the negative consequences, and provide numerous, multi-generational benefits for nearly everybody.

It is laudable that the Australian government is spending hundreds of millions of dollars on reafforestation and forest protection in Indonesia, on the soil carbon research program, the National biochar initiative, and climate change fast-start finance. This pales into insignificance, however, compared to Norway's one billion just to Indonesia, and more importantly to the ten billion the world spends on Kyoto per month, for minimal return (6). Moreover, Copenhagen cost around thirty billion, and since 1989, the U. S. government has spent about seventy-nine billion on policies related to climate change. Given the much greater importance, and the much greater return on investment with reafforestation and soil improvement, the world would be better spending billions per month on worldwide reafforestation and soil improvement, and perhaps hundreds of millions over years on reducing emissions from fossil fuels. Even millions spent over years is an opportunity cost, and the money could be better spent on agricultural and medical research, for example.

If the world/Australia is to spend money on reducing emissions, it would be much better to prioritise emissions that have minimal negative economic or social consequences. For example, needlessly burning coal seams in China produce nearly as much CO₂ as all the cars and small trucks in the U. S. A. put together. In addition, this is also a major problem in India (7). In Indonesia, fires burn simply to speed up the drying out of deep, peaty soils before the establishment of oil palm plantations, producing more CO₂ than deforestation in Brazil, the world's largest deforester (8). These two facts should ring loud alarm bells. Why are these two facts not generally known, and why are these obvious problems ignored and not prioritised? Why is it that the only "solutions" considered or acted upon, are those that harm the economies of Western nations, or are detrimental to their sovereignty, or are profitable to the already rich and powerful? Any other solution, and the spin doctors weave their web, calling evil good and good evil, with their half-truths, casuistry and guile, or it is cursorily dismissed, or just ignored. All this is yet more evidence exposing other agendas.

Improved soils are like a capital investment, now and for future generations, and obviously lead to increased agricultural productivity and profitability. A healthier environment, including soils with increased water infiltration rates and water holding capacity, reduces the severity and impact of droughts and floods for example. This produces a combination of benefits, increasing government income, and reducing the costs/losses to government associated with natural disasters. Probably one of the best things any country can do is to improve its soils, and to restore or preferably enhance its forest/vegetation cover. No less a person than Theodore Roosevelt said: "The nation that destroys its soils destroys itself" (1907). This is the case regardless of any possible catastrophic climate change. In fact living soils and vegetation should act as a buffer against any changes to the climate. It would be gross dereliction of duty, even treasonous, if those able to do something about this failed to do so.

I have developed a system of cost-effective and energy-efficient solutions for reforestation, soil improvement, and for mitigating climate change. It should be noted that the relatively low expense and low-tech simplicity of these solutions makes them better, not worse. Please see the attached article, which should be read from start to finish, and the references and websites read, for it to be thoroughly understood and to fully appreciate its potential. Its value could amount to billions of dollars around the world.

Many of the innovations in the article should work even better if they are implemented in conjunction with the proven land restoration techniques demonstrated by Allan Savory in his holistic planned grazing (9). This includes bunching large groups of livestock together, so that their hooves press seeds into the soil, and break up a surface crust which may be on the soil, which allows water and air to penetrate. High numbers of concentrated stock quickly recycle standing vegetation, such as dry grass, into organic matter and nutrients, in the form of large quantities of manure and urine. Importantly, the area is left for months for grass to regrow, or it could be for a few years to allow trees to establish, before regrazing/browsing. Instead of poorly managed livestock causing desertification, he has reversed desertification.

I have called my system the Animal Improved Dung (AID) plus seeds treatment. Simplified, soil improvers such as biochar, beneficial micro-organisms, deficient nutrients, and tree/grass seeds of desirable plant species, such as those that increase soil fertility through nitrogen-fixation, have deep roots, and high carbon-fixation rates, are fed to animals to disperse in their manure, and further dispersed by dung beetles and earthworms, producing better soil structure, with nutrient availability increased by earthworms. Combining these innovations almost certainly provides the most cost-effective, cutting edge, synergistic system for reforestation/grassland restoration and soil improvement/carbon sequestration available.

I would like to see Australia leading the world in reforestation and soil improvement, through its technical ability and actions such as funding research, both here and overseas. The innovations in my article could be an instrumental part of this. I would like to continue my work in researching and developing humanitarian and environmental innovations, hopefully for the next fifteen to twenty years. If I had funding I could do much more - for example, I could go to Indonesia (and all around the world) to give lectures to forestry and agriculture university students, so that the new generation can implement my system/techniques (I have the experience and qualifications to do this). This would massively increase Australian tax payers' return on investment in reforestation in Indonesia (and multiple other overseas aid programs).

My work addresses the more important problems of deforestation and land degradation, and my innovations are likely to be at least twice as effective in reforestation/soil improvement as simply planting trees. This means that, for example, if Australian taxpayers fund a one hundred million REDD+ scheme in Indonesia, they should get more than two hundred million dollars worth of forests and improved soils, along with the climate mitigation effects, for one hundred million dollars. I am certain that the majority of Australian tax payers/voters would want this. Since my work is clearly worth many millions, and possibly billions of dollars to the Australian government, I would like the Australian government to provide me

with funding for the work I have already done, and to continue my work. The more I receive, the more I can do. Sir Richard Branson offered 25 million pounds. Since they would get such a good return on investment, with much more bang for their buck, I doubt that Australian voters would be impressed if their government did not provide me with funding to continue my work. If they were aware of what can be achieved, no doubt the majority of voters would want to see my innovations implemented with alacrity and integrity.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

David Clode, B. App. Sc. (Hort.), Cert. Permaculture Design, Cert. IV Training and Assessment.

I have sent similar letters to the Hon Greg Combet, the Hon Kevin Rudd, the Hon Joe Ludwig, the Hon Tony Abbot, and the Hon Tony Burke.

References and some internet resources.

- (1) Svensmark, H. and Calder, N. 2007. The chilling stars: a new theory on climate change. ICON.
- (2) "It's the sun stupid". Published by NASA, see <http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2010/05/21/its-the-sun-stupid/>, and http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/12/climate_change_its_the_sun_stu.html
- (3) Jehne, W. 2007. "The biology of global warming and its profitable mitigation". Nature and Society. Dec 2006 – Jan 2007. www.natsoc.org.au.
- (4) See www.joannenova.com.au, click on "Bankers", also pg. 5 of "The skeptic's handbook", "sub-prime carbon is coming".
- (5) See www.galileomovement.com.au, and www.joannenova.com.au, "Big Government".
- (6) Plimer, I. 2009. Heaven and Earth: Global Warming, the Missing Science. Connor Court Publishing Pty. Ltd. ISBN 9781921521198. Pg. 471.
- (7) White, M. E. 2003. Earth Alive!: from microbes to a living planet. Rosenberg Publishing Pty. Ltd. ISBN 1 877058 05. Pg. 40.
- (8) Gore, A. 2009. Our choice a plan to solve the climate crisis. Rodale. ISBN 978 07475 9098 9. Pg. 181.
- (9) Savory, Allan, with Butterfield, Jody. 1999. Holistic management: a new framework for decision making. Island Press. ISBN 1-55963-448-X.

See also: www.holisticmanagement.org, www.cornwallalliance.org, <http://dailybayonet.com>, www.climaterealists.com, www.galileomovement.com.au, www.co2science.org, www.climatedepot.com/, www.heliogenic.org.