

A Climate Counternarrative

The Science is Wrong: It's Soil, Not Oil

Abstract

The rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide is chiefly tied to land stewardship.

Farmers and loggers have removed the plants that, until the industrial era, kept the soil fungi alive, kept soil emissions nearby by breaking the wind, and soaked those up. The result is plumes of carbon dioxide.

Putting plants back in would curb these emissions. Farmers and loggers could address biodiversity loss in the process.

Auditing the deceitful carbon accounting shows that these emissions are the only ones that matter. A chicanery hides them from view while fueling dubious activities.

The contribution of fossil fuels to atmospheric carbon dioxide is small. It likely comes from emissions sources with no nearby plants, like industrial smokestacks. Bio-sequestration could curb that wasted carbon dioxide.

This topsoil loss is fueling desertification. Better land stewardship would reverse the latter. Desertification, natural variability, and other man-made decisions can easily be confused as climate change.

The climate solutions on offer are fueling green imperialism in developing countries. The calls for climate justice are set to be met with sustainable injustice. Communities could end oppression locally. Legal jiu-jitsu can thwart misguided environmental actions until then.

Put together, the carbon accounting framework is like Orwellian newspeak. Nature conservation is more of the same. Debunking or dismissing them will not move their demoralized believers. Empower them instead to give them hope.

The ecofascists who fund the green movement are scheming to reorganize society as a new age dystopia. Modern education and The Science are a conditioning program and scripture to that end. They are cult organizing storytellers who have been iterating on controlling society for millennia.

This spiritual war can be the last. Take out the minions to make the head powerless. And know to let go when your heart tells you to.

Author: Denis de Bernardy <ddebernardy@protonmail.com>.

Keywords: climate change; nature conservation; soil, topsoil loss; carbon accounting; carbon sequestration; desertification; land stewardship; green imperialism; social justice; contractual promises; reciprocal promises; food sovereignty; permaculture; local currencies; propaganda; ecofascism; cult.

Introduction

Land stewards often understand that topsoil loss contributes significant amounts of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. Soil emissions dwarf industrial ones [1], after all. But farmers have been disturbing soil since long before the industrial era, so they're hard pressed to precisely explain what changed around then.

Topsoil loss is a concern irrespective of the climate narrative. It matters if you value healthy food grown in thriving ecosystems. It makes sense to promote gardening, urban agroecology, and regenerative farming on that basis alone, in fact. Climate activists would be more effective promoting these, because doing so has no downsides and depends on no one.

Prompting climate activists to promote these activities is also a great way to make them (unwittingly) work against those who advocate eating bugs. Activists are typically on board with gardening and regenerative farming already. Teaching gardening at schools or getting into urban or peri-urban farming are very effective ways to promote using less fossil fuels. Simply bring that up. More food sovereignty won't hurt your community. And as we're about to discuss, regenerative farming is enough to turn around the rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Canopy Loss

At the same time, regenerative farming can build soil without addressing the key reason topsoil ends up in the atmosphere. Research on forestry emissions inadvertently reveals what that is.

Briefly, a cleared forest releases a slow-motion plume [2] of carbon dioxide as forestry waste decomposes. Researchers detect these using instruments that monitor net flows above the canopy. This continues until the new canopy has grown enough to soak that up. By contrast, thinning a forest leaves the canopy intact. That avoids these releases [3] to begin with.

This highlights three things that happen when you clear a field. (1) You remove the canopy above ground. (2) You leave behind organic waste that decomposes. (3) Plants soak up the resulting soil emissions.

Land stewards have been removing the plants that offset these soil emissions since the industrial era.

Loggers adopted clear-cutting at the turn of the 20th century. A cleared forest is a wide open field. The soil fungi, which need plants for sugars, eventually die. The wind takes the soil emissions up in the atmosphere before nearby plants soak them up.

From the 19th century onward, farmers began managing ever larger fields as family farms vanished, land changed hands, and factory farming took off. They removed hedgerows that limited tillage erosion while keeping the soil fungi alive, breaking the wind, and soaking up the soil emissions.

Changes also happened in places that had little or no tree canopy to begin with. American settlers moved West just as steel plows made it practical to till the Great Plains, for instance. Wide open farm fields and overgrazed paddocks soon replaced large swaths of prairie. Dead waters might also be emitting their soil carbon in shallow areas — if only as methane.

Curbing these plumes of carbon dioxide is straightforward. When you clear a field, leave plants around to soak up the soil emissions. A simple way to do that is alley cropping. The alleys can be wide enough to not block sunlight, if the ancient fields that dairy cows continue to graze in Normandy are an indicator. Planting directly into clover and other well designed intercropping systems would work too.

It follows that farmers could stick with planting rows of coppice trees on contour to avoid these plumes. Doing so offers many benefits [4]. Trees act as windbreaks, which slows down pests. Trees on contour help water soak in, which reduces the need to irrigate. Leaves and tree roots release

nutrients when they decompose. Short-cycle coppicing ensures the trees won't burden nearby crops. Biomass is a renewable energy source. The diversified revenue and the lower input costs typically make alley cropping profitable. And it's a stepping stone for farmers to go regenerative.

Better yet, farmers could restore wildlife habitat by semi-managing narrow bands around these trees like roadsides. There are better ways to address biodiversity loss, like food forest gardening, syntropic agroforestry, or mob grazing. At the same time, rewilded gardens, roadsides, creeks in logged areas, and other examples show that small patches and narrow bands left to nature, while far from ideal, are good enough. They're the ecosystem equivalent of feeding a caged animal just enough to not starve.

Accounting Chicanery

You can tell that plumes of carbon dioxide tied to canopy loss are the only ones that matter by auditing the deceitful carbon accounting.

The salient point to know about the carbon accounting framework is that it mirrors what goes on in a financial statement. Emission sources such as fossil fuels are like the expenses you'd book in a profit and loss statement. Carbon stocks [5] such as forests are like balance sheet entries.

Would-be carbon income sources could not have been better designed to benefit the few at the top while crushing the many at the bottom. They'd include allowances (the cap in cap and trade), rewards for putting energy from sanctioned sources on the grid (like solar buyback programs), and carbon offsets (indulgences). Those are chiefly sold by large landowners, the conservancies who run their hunting estates [6], and fossil fuel giants [7].

Carbon stocks get little attention beyond the upsetting realities that green finance is fueling. Noteworthy plays include the 30x30 plan [8], which is set to become the biggest land grab in history [9], and the ongoing efforts to turn nature into an asset class [10]. Chris Lang's REDD Monitor [11] and indigenous rights defense outfits like the World Rainforest Movement [12] chronicle the failed projects, the land grabs, the forced evictions, the human rights violations, and other harrowing realities that occur behind the scenes.

These distract attention away from the fact that carbon stocks work like subsidiaries would on a balance sheet. They sport a value that fluctuates over time while keeping what goes on inside them out of scrutiny. The vast majority of carbon emissions occur inside these black boxes.

This creates a double standard. Cherry picked sources like fossil fuels and cow burps get vilified as reducible flows. Other sources get flatly ignored by non-experts. Charts and visualizations intended for the public have fine print to exclude them, track carbon stock changes, or expressly discuss industrial emission sources. Experts track carbon stock changes instead as proxies. Those rely on long-term estimate models that mostly capture land use changes while silencing internal dynamics.

Biomass energy is a good window into how these models work and what this arrangement allows. Loggers practice rotational harvesting with no land use changes. Patches of old trees soak up carbon dioxide while patches of saplings release some in their first few years. Loggers claim that this balances out over time, and thus that their overall carbon stock is constant on average — give or take what they file under Land Use 4.A.1 “Forest land remaining forest land.”

This enables biomass energy producers to argue that burning wood pellets made using forestry waste produces no (extra) carbon emissions. To wit, forestry waste emits carbon dioxide while decomposing. There is no land use change, so these get counted in carbon stock models. Counting the emissions from burning that waste would be double counting. It follows that burning biomass is a low carbon energy source. The bean counting checks out. The framework does not.

Soil Emissions

Tracking emissions using the carbon accounting framework makes sense if and only if an important condition is met: avoidable carbon emissions that disappear inside carbon stocks are negligible compared to those that appear as reducible flows. The contrary is like analyzing a household’s budget and cutting expenses while ignoring big ticket items like revenue and rent.

Forestry emissions research shows that these hidden sources of carbon emissions are anything but negligible. A cleared forest releases kilograms

of carbon dioxide [2] per square meter into the atmosphere before the canopy recovers enough to soak up the slow-motion decomposition beneath it. A thinned forest, which retains a canopy, produces no such net emissions [3].

Kilograms of avoidable emissions per square meter is on the order of 10 tons per acre. Loggers clear over 60 million acres [13] each year. So that's on the order of a German economy worth of trivially avoidable emissions. These ballpark numbers are no doubt off by a wide margin, since not all forests emit like boreal forests. The point stands irrespective: the long-term models used to track carbon stocks keep avoidable emissions that rival industrial ones out of view. At minimum, this is sketchy accounting.

Reduced-impact logging [14] makes this accounting objectionable. It shamelessly proposes to make carbon stocks more effective by (among other activities) reducing such forestry emissions. And loggers stand to pocket carbon offsets paid by guilt-tripped consumers for their trouble.

Farming emissions are much larger. The plumes are such that you can tell [15] when farmers are clearing or burning fields on NASA visualizations. The carbon accounting framework invites asking how much carbon soil can sequester. But this ignores the elephant in the room. The question that actually matters is how to not lose soil carbon to begin with.

Industrialized Bio-Sequestration

Fossil fuels contribute atmospheric carbon dioxide too, of course. 12% of the total [16], according to a paper that got criticized over unfortunate remarks in it. 2020 inadvertently revealed that this number is in the right ballpark. Atmospheric carbon dioxide increased like clockwork [17] despite the drop in fossil fuel use [18] tied to economic lockdowns.

12% is high. It is much higher than what industrial activities contribute to the carbon cycle. But then, the latter is misleading too. Consider how fast plants soak up the spring plume of carbon dioxide in NASA visualizations [15]. Contrast that with how the autumn plume persists. A farm field has little carbon dioxide around it in the summer. The carbon cycle's stock and flow modeling silences these dynamics. NASA's OCO-3 mission [19] ends up looking for mystery sinks instead of relevant sources. The 12%

number likely comes from sources with no nearby plants, like industrial chimneys.

Curbing that waste is straightforward. Capture the smokestack output using a setup like a rocket mass heater. Put the heat to good use, like drying wood pellets made using short-cycle coppice harvests. Pipe the output towards hemp fields. Use a drip irrigation like system reminiscent of those used in open field experiments [20]. Use alley cropping on contour to help break the wind and keep the water from running off. The plants will know what to do with carbon dioxide and water. Hemp soaks up toxins, so there is little need for filtering. It has many industrial uses, like paper.

Bubbling this output in pools to grow duckweed is another good option. Startups are already looking into using captured carbon dioxide to grow algae. Duckweed grows fast and has a great nutrient uptake. Growing it is a good way to process sewage while producing protein-rich chicken feed and potentially biofuel [21]. The former would likely require filtering out toxins first. A hydraulic trompe might be enough to do that. It would separate toxin-laced water from pressurized gas that would be needed anyway. Irrigate nearby hemp fields using the toxin-laced waste water.

With this being said, addressing topsoil loss would quickly reintroduce the problem that plants were struggling with before the industrial era. Namely, too little carbon dioxide. Stalactites, stalagmites, shell producing animals, and other processes have been mineralizing carbon dioxide for millions of years, with occasional spikes that break this downward trend. Plants have had to adapt to having ever less carbon dioxide to work with. The recent uptick made our planet greener. Therefore, leaving the carbon dioxide up in the atmosphere makes sense too.

Man-Made Desertification

This discussion has avoided the merits of the climate narrative until now because it would have distracted. Curbing plumes of carbon dioxide tied to poor land stewardship is straightforward, and per above those are the only emissions that matter. Atmospheric carbon dioxide varies during the year. The seasonal bottoms are around where [17] highs were years earlier. Better land stewardship could soak up atmospheric carbon dioxide quickly, so any effects of carbon dioxide on climate would be no

cause for concern. With this being said, topsoil loss genuinely affects the climate.

Essentially, soil with less carbon holds less water [22], as does soil with less cover. Runoffs lead to erosion, bare soil, and ponds. The first means more topsoil loss. The other two fuel water evaporation. Water vapor is the greenhouse gas that actually matters, so climate modelers may want to mind soil management more. The real concern, however, is rainfall.

Inland water evaporation contributes to [23] inland rain. Water that has run off downstream cannot produce downwind rain. Drying landscapes become drier and drought prone over time, with intermittent floods tied to runoffs. Droughts and floods fuel yet more topsoil loss. And with it, this cycle.

Topsoil loss is fueling desertification, in other words. Or more precisely, the two are the same. Plantations, overgrazing, and infrastructure like roads that channel water downhill compound the above issues and habitat loss. Those are unequivocally man-made. Anthropogenic climate change could be renamed man-made desertification. It is being counterbalanced by other man-made processes. Human activities are diverting entire rivers and depleting underground water reservoirs. These will eventually run dry, because soil evaporation and runoffs also reduce water infiltration.

Desertification is straightforward to reverse. Harvest water, slow it down to help it soak in, and limit soil evaporation using a combination of plants, mulch, and windbreaks. That will rehydrate a landscape [24], as evidenced by the restoration of the Arvari River, the Loess Plateau, and other projects. It can also re-green a desert, as has been done in Al Baydha [25] and Niger [26].

We can even do that at scale with bulldozers and seed pellets. The Great Depression era swales near Tucson, AZ [27] show that abandoned mounds are enough to re-green a desert. Homesteaders and guerrilla gardeners routinely use seed pellets to plant fruit trees. Soak the pellets in strong tea to repel the animals that might eat the seeds. Add temporary fencing to keep grazers from eating the saplings. Bulldozers, drones, and fencing could rapidly transform entire landscapes.

Disputable Science

There could be more to the story than desertification being construed as runaway climate change, but the evidence for anything else is slim.

The would-be effects of climate change seldom impress those who work with nature for good reasons. Land stewardship and natural variability can usually explain what gets attributed to climate change. California's Central Valley, for instance, illustrates how sun-exposed, irrigated soil acts as a dark body that heats up the water vapor it releases. Like Death Valley, it is surrounded by hills and mountains. Thrown in a drought, a high pressure zone that lingers over the area, and a Colorado river worth of water, and the conditions are set to get scorching heat — no climate change needed.

The would-be extinction crisis is another good example. Nothing is less convincing that there is a problem than a scientist who elaborates about how low insect populations are, and then explains how to turn a garden into an insect haven. Would-be endangered species just need toxin-free habitat. Patches and bands are enough as discussed earlier. We could be managing habitat into our growing systems, at that, as is being done in permaculture circles. Overfishing is not a problem either. We could be creating fish habitat, as is being done in marine permaculture circles.

The shoddy decisions that amplify natural calamities can explain a lot too. Floods, for instance, are largely man-made. Properties that make active efforts to harvest water show that most heavy rain events can be tamed [28] [29]. Contrast that with California, where 95% of the early 2023 rainwater just washed away. Modern landscapes are effectively designed to channel water downhill. Roadsides, paved riverbeds, farm fields where little efforts are made to harvest rainwater, and more lead to runoffs. Homes built inside flood catchments in hurricane prone cities are not helping either.

Wildfires are largely man-made too. Beyond the accidents that start them, loggers tend to grow forest edge species that are adapted to prairie fires. These grow fast to quickly outgrow the occasional flames on the ground. They also burn like matches (explosively so, at times) so fires move past before killing them. Growing plantations of such trees in drought-prone areas is dubious. Doubly so by logging roads that channel water downhill, with unburnt scrubs and forestry waste near poorly maintained electricity lines. Ignite the canopy and you get a raging inferno.

Model predictions are another issue. Scientists create and test climate models using data from the past. Two key caveats are data quality and overfitting. Temperature readings in urban heat sinks or near plantations full of bare soil are dubious at best. So are reconstructed data. Poor data would not matter if the predictions checked out, but they do not. Using historical data to gauge a model's accuracy invites making it fit so well it looks accurate while having no bearing with reality. What matters is how accurate predictions made on the record are a decade or two from now.

The cherry picking and massaging of data to make it fit the narrative has been so thoroughly picked apart [30] [31] [32] that it warrants a passing mention only. In defense of the scientists, the would-be consensus doesn't hold either [33]. Speak out if you're in the shrinking group of experts that hasn't yet done so.

Green Imperialism

Given the misdiagnosis at the heart of the climate narrative, and how little data supports it, there is simply no case to track, tax, offset, sequester, or curb the carbon emissions tied to consumption or industrialized activities. That could have been the takeaway from this discussion, but the solutions on offer are so egregious that they warrant getting called out too.

The calls to phase out fossil fuels make no sense. There are good reasons to not like energy or mining corporations. These include the pollution, the environmental destruction, the foretold calamity of deep sea mining, the water use, the military ties, the way they fuel imperialism, or the way they empower sociopaths. But then, industrial food depends on natural gas, diesel, coal, nitrates, phosphorus, and phosphate. Blind calls to phase out fossil fuels will just dislocate economies and create food shortages. Cities could end up eating algae and bugs grown in their own sewage.

The efforts to sequester carbon underground make no sense either. The need to build pipelines strips farmers from productive lands, and plants could soak up the carbon dioxide anyway. The actual stake is that fossil fuel corporations stand to pocket carbon offsets [7] for pumping this carbon dioxide underground. Oil comes up when you pump pressurized gas in wells, so this is a subsidy in disguise. Anticipate demands to end other fossil fuel subsidies in retaliation. The retirees who depend on winter fuel payments will not be impressed.

Green tech doesn't make sense even when you take the narrative at face value. To wit, even the International Energy Agency is fully aware [34] that the logistics don't add up. Or perhaps amused staffers were just trolling the controlled opposition forces who hope petitions will stop the mining. The carbon signatures leave out costs, too. Some omissions are in good faith, since not all green tech waste can be recycled. But what of the long-term health costs tied to living near a landfill, a polluting facility, or a mine? Or of the militarized efforts needed to impose a mine on locals to begin with?

Green tech makes far more sense when you look into the link between it, mining, and military imperialism. Mining fuels military operations to secure access to mining resources, and the military are mining's best customers [35]. Mining conflicts are unique in that you cannot open the mine elsewhere if locals don't agree. Locals need to get evicted, and locals further out who deal with the environmental destruction need to be kept in check. Miners use militarized guards because these conflicts can become violent.

Conservancies make more sense in that light too. They acquire land using eminent domain laws or by tricking locals. Affected locals then get cleared out and kept in check using militarized park guards. These areas become tourist parks, so the guards sometimes leave huts behind for authenticity. Parks double as big game hunting reserves [6] for rich elites. Parts of these nature reserves get set aside for afforestation projects [36] (palm, rubber, and teak plantations) and mining projects [37] (green-tech, or other). "Protecting" nature is lucrative even before the grants, donations, or carbon offsets.

Conservancies are a continuation of imperialism through different means, if anything. In the past, imperialists would use military conquest to clear out locals, move out resources, and move in finished products. Corporations do the same using the legal system. The World Bank and the World Trade Organization are key. The first's explicit mandate is to replace subsistence farming with industrialized activities. The other puts unsubsidized small farmers in poor countries out of business. The two are transparently about controlling land. And so are conservancies [38].

Sustainable Injustice

The green movement's calls for less exploitation of the natural world and more social justice are just as perplexing as the technical solutions.

The degrowth and doughnut crowds, for instance, make valid points about natural limits. But then, they invite producers and consumers to fit inside of those instead of pushing them out. Holistic management [39] enables land stewards to do the latter. It yields less than top down management for a given yield, but more abundance overall. Essentially, it revolves around function stacking and reducing input and waste, instead of single-purpose cogs to maximize output. This promotes autonomy, resilience, and lower energy use as side-effects. Scarcity is not inevitable. It is a choice.

These economic solutions make more sense when you remark that human societies mirror their food systems. Tribespeople hunt animals that freely roam lush landscapes. "Developed" societies prefer to live in concentrated animal feeding operations. Going by China's automated, multi-story pig facilities, the outlook for urbanites is grim. Their calls for climate justice and lower carbon footprints will get them hacked, tracked, packed, and stacked in communal hutches run by algorithms. The ultra rich will be laughing while enjoying their lavish lifestyle in that new age dystopia.

The main beneficiaries of oppression won't be the losers of top down wealth redistribution that climate justice advocates are calling for. The ultra rich are stashing billions in nature conservancies that stand to control a chunk of the planet [8] and pocket carbon offsets. Trusts are a great way to shield your assets from activists who want to tax the rich out of existence and put a carbon tax regime in place. Safely bet that these tax-exempted non-profits will escape wealth clawbacks and curbs on private property. Their beneficiaries will have the last laugh, make no mistake about that.

This invites asking how to instead address inequalities from the bottom up. Violence begets violence, and revolutionaries only produce new elites, so nonviolent options are the only sensible ones. What more, no one has quibbles with hard working people getting ahead. The assets that actually matter are those that burden or plunder communities. Polluting activities and non-resident landlords in particular. Communities occasionally find

ways to tax and regulate those to more tolerable levels. But that leaves unwanted mines around and the top down control apparatus in place.

Sovereign communities that run their own affairs would emerge if the top down control apparatus got defanged. They could redistribute assets as they see fit and return the stolen commons. They'd no doubt organize in confederations for self-defense while the control apparatus decays into irrelevance, and focus on regenerating their communal watersheds. The latter are more sensible administrative units than the borders that power struggles between control freaks have jammed communities into.

Dismantling Oppression

The top down control apparatus depends on power, and that derives from promises. A legal contract, the social contract, or the word you give are all promises. Consent arises from believing the promise. Believers commit to the obligations that the promise creates. Power and authority arise from these obligations. Privileges arise because promisers are not bound by the obligations that they create for others, and because promises commit those who believe them only. You can't print money, but central bankers can. They can even give handouts to buddies while you eat the inflation.

Interesting subtleties can arise from consent itself. It works exactly like sex. You can say yes or go along with the flow without objecting. Both are consent. Your other options are to consent conditionally, for instance by asking for money, or refuse. The latter two can invite other promises. This matters because conditional acceptance is a valid way to deal with unwanted procedures. It allows you to constructively comply while being a thorn. It's unclear how the control apparatus would handle a barrage of citizens who condition filing paperwork on getting paid. Try it to find out.

Modern promises are mostly contractual. Contractual promises introduce power levers that can get abused. Coercion is the main one. Coercion can arise when a party controls access to resources (food, water, energy) or entitlements (pension, healthcare). Or compromising information. A transaction's context usually adds two others. One is the governing law. You can exploit wage slaves and destroy the environment because the law authorizes it. The other is the currency. Currency commands whatever value its issuer authorizes by modulating how much of it is in circulation.

Other promises are reciprocal. Contractual transactions hinge on giving what you promised after taking what was promised to you. Reciprocal ones hinge on giving what you can, on the (implicit) promise that others will offer what they can when you need it. It's give then take, instead of take then give. It otherwise works the same, with the power relationship flipped around. You still have to consent. There still is power. And there still is privilege. To wit, you can opt to not give back after taking the gift.

A gift economy would void power levers outright by building on reciprocal promises only. Such a trust based system builds on the notion that others will help you the best they can. It is solidarity, not charity. Tribal societies work this way. So do well functioning couples, families, friends, neighbors, work relationships, and countless mutual aid groups. Disasters show that mutual aid comes naturally to us [40]. It comes naturally to other animals too. What sets humans apart is the use of contractual transactions — scripture is a mere corollary. It is a choice. A gift based society is plausible.

The strongest lever to dismantle until then is coercion. Henry Kissinger infamously quipped that you control nations with energy, and people with food. Oppression thrives on abusing this power, so food sovereignty is essential. A community that is autonomous for food, water, and energy can't be coerced to do much without force. Permaculture is an excellent primer on those. Learn it [41], teach it, and get schools near you to teach it. Victory gardens, Cuban urban farmers, and bio-intensive gardeners show that communities can quickly grow lots of food in very little space.

The law is a weak lever because you can often call out the bluff. Statutes can be unenforceable, because of procedural problems or demonstrably wrong assumptions. Many are tort based, and depend on a disgruntled party reporting you. Many more are procedures away from uselessness, for instance because of loopholes that elites penciled in for themselves. Also, statute enforcers answer to who they work for, so make sure that's your community. Nudge the others out — tax them, regulate them, start never ending public works, anything legal goes. Lastly, precedents that don't enforce laws make laws unenforceable, so use jury annulment.

The control of money, which enables corruption, is weak too because you can switch to using local currencies. The latter make far more sense than options that shift money creation to new authorities, like commodities or proof of work. A meal would make a great unit. It would promote cooking,

food sovereignty, and local trade. It is fungible and relatable. Anyone can issue a meal, so it's democratic, self-regulating, and lame to forge. Best of all, you get to meet those who redeem your meals. Join (or start) an app that helps keep meals redeemable to help. Or just use paper.

Social justice will become reality when your community can bring it about on its own terms. So organize your community to become ungovernable. The sticks are the law and its many enforcers. The carrots are entitlement programs. Reject both unless they're under your community's purview.

Legal Jiu-Jitsu

The only real emergency in the end is stopping misguided environmental actions. Debunking the climate narrative has yet to stop them. Pulling the rug from under it might. Crowdsourcing is needed for the activities that follow to succeed, because there are too many moving parts for a single person or a small team to stay on top of.

Defanging the narrative in court makes sense. The accounting chicanery that this work brings up is straightforward to understand and verify: read the treaties; the rest is basic accounting, biology, and common sense. The corruption, the profiteering, the environmental malfeasance, and the racist land grabs that the narrative is fueling likely make it indefensible in court. This work is therefore set to be of interest to a number of environmental lawsuits. I've reached out to an anecdotal sample of such cases, and the strategy to use when reaching out to them varies with the type of lawsuit.

Some lawsuits are transparent legal charades. These are the cases that aim to vilify and defund fossil fuel corporations. You can find these using [climate change litigation databases](#) [42]. The court filings invariably reveal the law firms. Anecdotally, I've yet to come across a single case where either side wanted to get the case dismissed. This is not surprising, since the same interests tend to fund both sides of these cases. File amicus briefs that bring up this work to help spoil their party.

A subset among these lawsuits aim to force governments to take climate actions. They make use of statutes or precedents to that end, like those in Germany or the Netherlands. These are especially interesting in that they could backfire spectacularly. A no-nonsense judge with a sense of humor

could well rebuff the narrative and force governments to have farmers and loggers clean up their acts.

Other lawsuits are defending against land seizures tied to carbon offsets, nature reserves, carbon dioxide pipelines, mining, or green tech projects. You'll usually hear about those through defense groups, non-profits that help them, and occasional news articles. The difficulty is that defending parties tend to shut down upon hearing climate change (farmers) or reject the idea of dismissing it (environmental and indigenous groups). So stick with saying that you've information of use to their lawyers when reaching out. That will usually be enough to put you through.

The last batch is looming. It is tied to liberty restrictions. The defending parties in these cases typically welcome any help sent their way. But the modus operandi seems to be to justify movement restrictions and social credit scores using health or social benefits. Those justifications should be straightforward to pick apart because unconstitutional or because the would-be benefits build on shaky foundations.

Sending cease and desist letters to enablers makes sense too. This builds potential liability, in that the recipients can no longer claim that they did not know. If you're an attorney, help draft sample letters that others can send. (Include instructions.) These don't need to be thorough. They just need to sound scary enough to prompt their recipient to check out the references.

Confronting green investment funds about their misleading claims about environmental friendliness is not a stretch. Doing so would be a good way to defund misguided climate activities. There might even be jurisdictions where the carbon accounting chicanery can be construed as accounting fraud. Get standing if needed (for instance by investing in one), and join, threaten, or start a lawsuit. At minimum you'll get the legal department's attention and trigger internal discussions.

Confronting academics, leaders, administrators, and other puppets about the neocolonial violence [43] [44] that they are enabling would likely be a stretch for a court case. But it might bring them to think about what they're a part of — unwittingly, no doubt. So send them polite if firm snail mail as well.

For the rest, rural communities could make a mockery of The Science by turning the carbon hockey stick around. Talk to farmers near you. Invite

them to put in hedges on contour. Narrow bands of prairie species will work too if they don't want to hear about trees. The point is to put plants in to soak up those soil emissions. Talk to agribusiness corporations. They could ask farmers who work their fields to do this. And talk to legislators. Tree cover can affect farm subsidies, so get those changed. Or repelled, since their main use is to put small farmers out of business.

With this being said, have no doubt that the climate narrative will continue unabated until public awareness terminates it. As such, share this work to help change the conversation, organize your community and those around it to grow food, promote food sovereignty, and care for your watershed.

Scheming Ecofascists

Put together, the climate narrative illustrates the adage that propaganda is as much about controlling what people think as it is about controlling what people think about.

It is fair to describe the carbon accounting framework as a textbook case of Orwellian Newspeak. It is shaping conversations in specific directions without its users noticing. So do the carbon cycle, other stock and flow like models that silence internal dynamics, and predictive models that do without reality checks. The result is an expensive train wreck.

The only thing that keeps the narrative going is the fact that debates stay inside the perimeter set by the carbon accounting framework. Detractors need to be mindful that factual information does not matter to demoralized people [45]. The only thing that will move them is hope tied to promises. The problem-reaction-solution model [46] hinges on this. Debunking or dismissing The Science point blank merely creates cognitive dissonance. If you are currently doing that, try empowering the believers instead. Put solutions in front of what they fear. Prompt them to act. Doing so will give them hope.

Believers will see the light eventually, because the climate narrative is self-defeating. It prompts those who take their destiny into their hands to reconnect with nature. In doing so, they learn how to turn our planet into a paradise, become one with it, and escape the clutches of servitude. Their numbers keep growing. The question is not if, but when those who want

only to live life as they see fit stop being mischaracterized as alt-right, anti-science fascists or backwards tribespeople.

Climate science is not the only field whose language has been captured, at that. Conservation is another. As critic Mordecai Ogada points out, white ranchers explore and hunt game, whereas black herders encroach and poach bushmeat. The field oozes of cultish, patriarchal language. To wit, replace Nature with God in conservancy discourse, and you'll often get a decent sermon for a puritan parish. Nature doesn't need to be protected, much less locked up or defended against invading species that could sully its purity. It needs only to be loved, nurtured, and embraced for its fertility.

The treatment reserved for those who dare go against the climate narrative deserves nothing but contempt. Jeff Gibbs must have struck a chord for calling out the profiteering of those who are funding the green movement in his Planet of the Humans documentary. Mischaracterizing his deep green take on climate change as that of a closet ecofascist was straight out of the propaganda playbook [47]. The actual ecofascists in this story are the schemers who funded the coordinated charge against Gibbs' work [48].

Doomsday Cult

The green movement invites comparisons with a doomsday cult because of the apocalyptic end of the world predictions and the cult-like pressures to follow The Science. But there is in fact far more to it.

Modern education is squarely to blame for enabling pseudoscience like climate science to proliferate. In the early days of Christianity, farmers mocked elites for believing the miracles that preachers told them about. Their modern peers mock elites for believing what experts tell them. This echo from the past betrays how unfit for purpose modern education is. Docile deference to authority gets drilled into kids from kindergarten. This conditioning makes educated elites the least equipped to spot if or when The Science is the new scripture. Keep your kids out of these places.

Devout students of The Science go on to become its priests. Their rite of passage involves writing their own scripture. In the final ceremony, a circle of judges assess the scripture's quality and that of its lineage. New priests then get worthless sheepskin. These priests spend their lives sheltered in

ivory towers, from which they symbolically fight heresies from competing truth parishes. They gauge their self-worth by how much scripture they've written, and how often it gets cited. Sophisticated jargon use in scientific scripture all too often betrays its vacuous vanity.

The Science teaches to marshal, surveil, and destroy because modernity itself is a control, fear, and hate based cult. It serves the imperialists who fund the military, mine the earth, and grow grain. Grain is a storable war food. It is more dependable than grass hungry grazers or fresh fruits and vegetables that rot. These cult organizing storytellers have been refining how they control society for millennia. The only changes from an iteration to the next are the narrative, the tools, and the circuses. Fanatics take out heretics within and heathens without all the same.

Elite conditioning is amusing to watch in many ways. Herds of educated elites heed expert calls to follow The Science. They expect uneducated commoners to join their culture crusades in lockstep to avert apocalyptic doom. They trust authority approved experts only. Not commonsense platitudes that commoners blurt out. Much less themselves. They don't believe their own eyes when told to look up [49]. They despise the deplorables who call out their clown show. The cult organizers are mocking cultists at this point. They're inverting reality and values nakedly [50].

Two issues make elite conditioning objectionable. One is that the cultists cheer when authorities decide to take out heretics and heathens. They do so symbolically, using peer review, its pedantic format, cancel culture, fact checkers, tech giants, or financial institutions; and at times physically, in camps. Ominously, nazis and marxists educated their fanatics, and used medical experts to vilify those who they sent to camps as subhumans and lunatics. The other is that pied pipers [51] are marching the cultists [52] towards a new age dystopia [53].

Spiritual Revolution

This spiritual war can be the last. One side wants to salvage oppression. The other to end it. It is warfare all the same. Strategy without tactics is the slowest route to victory, Sun Tzu explains, and tactics without strategy is the noise before defeat. My sense is that debunking or dismissing The Science is the latter, because it leaves the cultists in fear. Try my earlier

suggestion if you are doing that. Empower the cultists instead, to give them hope. A Natural Language [54] and this work put forward tactics to do so. I'd like to leave you with three more in closing.

The first is that you don't need to behead an animal to make it harmless. You can also declaw it. Taking out the limbs makes the head powerless. The control apparatus depends on minions who execute decisions and communicate information to and from the top. The lower ranks will likely depend on following orders to feed their families. Seeing to it that your community is paying or feeding them might be enough to take them out. The middle and upper ranks can be a different story.

If the minions are unresponsive when you confront them about their role in enabling malfeasant activities (send a cease and desist letter), shame them into non-compliance. Spread the truth about what they're enabling around them. No one sane is able to endure disapproving stares around them for long. So tell their family, friends, and colleagues; the places they hang out at; and so on. Stay polite, keep it legal, and leave their kids out of this. If they hide behind their kids, let the kids enjoy some parental attention. Go for their underlings if needed.

The next point is that they're replacing their minions with algorithms and robots. It takes minions to do that, so prioritize those. Reach out to the engineers and technicians who build them, and to those who supply the parts, data, maintenance, or infrastructure. Artificial intelligence might be too advanced to stop this replacement entirely. But that will buy us time.

The last point is to heed nature's most difficult lesson. African shepherds like the Maasai peoples teach it. They love and protect their sheep, but only so much. If a sheep chooses to escape their watch and gets eaten by a lion, then good for the lion. Nature needs its share too.

Contrast with modernity, which is the vanity of wanting to control without letting go of meaningless things. Doing so invites us to rationalize what serves no purpose out of existence. That leaves no room for context. It destroys, when context is nature. It also alienates us, when context is the other. Context is what breathes meaning, emotions, love, and life into us. It is thus fair to say that modernity drains life out of everything it touches, and out of those who serve it.

in the end, a simple maxim captures the shepherds' teaching. Live, love and protect the living, and let go of the dying. Or die, serving the dying.

There is more to this teaching, but the rest will wait. For now, just know to let go when your heart tells you to.

Disclosures: This research and this article were funded out of pocket.

Support the Author: This work is free. Giving back is at your discretion.

Acknowledgements: Andrea Widburg edited the earlier version of this article that appeared on American Thinker.

Translators: Crowdsourcing will lower your burden if you'd like to translate this work. Find (or create) a translation document by editing the original in reviewer mode or using source control. Contribute as much as you want. Automated translation tools can help. Then invite others to review your translation, contribute as much as they want, and invite yet others. Once done, replace these instructions with the list of translators who didn't ask to remain anonymous, and send a pull request to share your translation.

Downloads: You can download this work from distributed source control repositories. To help ensure that this work stays resilient, save and print a copy, or clone and host a copy of a repository.

Re-Use: You may re-distribute this work at no charge to you or others on a non-exclusive, non-rescindable basis, provided you do so as is, in full, and under the same terms. This work includes its title and content, these re-use terms, and other meta-informations until these terms. Amend the navigation links as appropriate.

About the Author

Denis de Bernardy is the author of A Natural Language. His work exposes environmental big lies and puts solutions in front of the actual problems.

Bibliography

[1]: Powers, Matt. A New Look at the Carbon Cycle & Climate. 2022. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pjnxDRvACGI>.

[2]: Korkiakoski, M., Tuovinen, J.-P., Penttilä, T., Sarkkola, S., Ojanen, P., Minkinen, K., et al. Greenhouse gas and energy fluxes in a boreal peatland forest after clear-cutting. *Biogeosciences*, 16 (2019), 3703–3723. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-16-3703-2019>.

[3]: Vesala, T., et al. Effect of thinning on surface fluxes in a boreal forest. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 19 (2005), GB2001. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004GB002316>.

[4]: Marshall-Chalmers, Anne. The Edges Matter: Hedgerows Are Bringing Life Back to Farms. Civil Eats, 2023. Available from: <https://civileats.com/2023/02/14/the-edges-matter-hedgerows-are-bringing-life-back-farms/>.

[5]: Land Use, Land-Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF). UNFCCC. Available from: <https://unfccc.int/topics/land-use/workstreams/land-use--land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf>.

[6]: Corry, Stephen. The World Wildlife Fund, hunters and Donald Trump Jr. Survival International, 2017. Available from: <https://www.survivalinternational.org/articles/3457-the-world-wildlife-fund-hunters-and-donald-trump-jr>.

[7]: Valle, Sabrina. Exxon sees carbon capture market at \$4 trillion by 2050. Reuters, 2022. Available from: <https://www.reuters.com/business/sustainable-business/exxon-sees-carbon-capture-market-4-trillion-by-2050-2022-04-19/>.

[8]: Forests, food and land can deliver 30% of solutions needed to tackle climate crisis by 2030. World Wildlife Fund (WWF), 2018. Available from: https://wwf.panda.org/wwf_news/?329190/Forests-food-and-land-can-deliver-30-of-solutions-needed-to-tackle-climate-crisis-by-2030.

[9]: Open statement from Survival International on the biggest land grab in history. Survival International, 2022. Available from: <https://www.survivalinternational.org/news/12732>.

[10]: Webb, Whitney. UN-Backed Banker Alliance Announces “Green” Plan to Transform the Global Financial System. Unlimited Hangout, 2021. Available from: <https://unlimitedhangout.com/2021/11/investigative-reports/un-backed-banker-alliance-announces-green-plan-to-transform-the-global-financial-system/>.

- [11]: Lang, Chris. REDD Monitor. Available from: <https://redd-monitor.org>.
- [12]: WRM Bulletin. World Rainforest Movement. Available from: <https://www.wrm.org.uy/bulletin>.
- [13]: Dashboard. Global Forest Watch. Available from: <https://www.globalforestwatch.org/dashboards/global/?category=summary>.
- [14]: Muller, E., Linhares Juvenal, T., Animon, I, Beyer, G., Braatz, S., Canova, N, et al. Forestry for a Low-Carbon Future. FAO, 2016. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305315610_Forestry_for_a_Low-Carbon_Future.
- [15]: A Year in the Life of Earth's CO₂. NASA Goddard Space Flight Center's Global Modeling and Assimilation Office, 2015. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x1SgmFa0r04>.
- [16]: Skrabale K, Chabot G, French C. World Atmospheric CO₂, Its 14C Specific Activity, Non-fossil Component, Anthropogenic Fossil Component, and Emissions (1750-2018). Health Phys, 2022 Feb 1;122(2): 291-305. PMID: 34995221. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1097/HP.0000000000001485> Subscription required.
- [17]: Trends in Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Global Monitoring Laboratory. Available from: <https://gml.noaa.gov/ccgg/trends/>.
- [18]: Global Energy Review: CO₂ Emissions in 2020. International Energy Agency, 2021. Available from: <https://www.iea.org/articles/global-energy-review-co2-emissions-in-2020>.
- [19]: Science. NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, OCO-3 Mission. Available from: <https://ocov3.jpl.nasa.gov/science/>.
- [20]: What is FACE? Free Air CO₂ Enrichment. Available from: <https://facedata.ornl.gov/what.html>.
- [21]: Yang, G.-L. Duckweed Is a Promising Feedstock of Biofuels: Advantages and Approaches. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2022, 23, 15231. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms232315231>.

[22]: Rawls, W.J., Y.A Pachepsky, J.C Ritchie, T.M Sobecki, and H Bloodworth. Effect of soil organic carbon on soil water retention. *Geoderma* 116, no. 1-2 (2003): 61-76. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7061\(03\)00094-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7061(03)00094-6).

[23]: Allen, S.T., Keim, R.F., Barnard, H.R., McDonnell, J.J. and Renée Brooks, J. The role of stable isotopes in understanding rainfall interception processes: a review. *WIREs Water*, 4 (2017): e1187. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1187>.

[24]: Millisson, Andrew. 5 Most Epic Earth Healing Projects. 2022. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpozW1CAxmU>.

[25]: The Story of Al Baydha: A Regenerative Agriculture in the Saudi Desert. Al Baydha, 2021. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T39QHprz-x8>.

[26]: How the Sahara Desert is Turning into a Farmland Oasis. Leaf of Life, 2022. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QXQrvT23rPw>.

[27]: Powers, Matt. Greening the Arizona Desert - The Tucson Swales. 2016. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8mDvtj8tJmQ>.

[28]: Lawton, Geoff. The Power of Water. 2018. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gytyQS6cyjA>.

[29]: Lawton, Geoff. Zaytuna Farm Vs the Flood of 2022. 2022. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xln00ihb3hU>.

[30]: Global Warming: Fact or Fiction? Featuring Physicists Willie Soon and Elliott D. Bloom. Independent Institute, 2019. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1zrejG-WI3U>.

[31]: Nelson, Tom. Podcast. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL89cjOtPeenLkWMmdwcT8Dt0DGMb8RGR>.

[32]: Corbett, James. Episode 427 - Remembering Tim Ball. The Corbett Report, 2022. Available from: <https://www.corbettreport.com/timball/>.

[33]: Stirling, Michelle. The Myth of the 97% Consensus. Friends of Science, 2017. Available from: <https://blog.friendsofscience.org/2017/04/14/the-myth-of-the-97-consensus-hey-theyre-fooling-you/>.

[34]: Clean energy demand for critical minerals set to soar as the world pursues net zero goals. International Energy Agency, 2021. Available from: <https://www.iea.org/news/clean-energy-demand-for-critical-minerals-set-to-soar-as-the-world-pursues-net-zero-goals>.

[35]: Selwyn, Daniel. Martial Mining Report. London Mining Network, 2020. Available from: <https://londonminingnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Martial-Mining.pdf>.

[36]: Counsell, Simon. Anatomy of a 'Nature-Based Solution': Total oil, 40,000 hectares of disappearing African savannah, Emmanuel Macron, Norwegian and French 'aid' to an election-rigging dictator, trees to burn, secret contacts, and dumbstruck conservationists. REDD Monitor, 2021. Available from: <https://redd-monitor.org/2021/04/16/anatomy-of-a-nature-based-solution-total-oil-40000-hectares-of-disappearing-african-savannah-emmanuel-macron-norwegian-and-french-aid-to-an-election-rigging-dictator-trees/>.

[37]: Botswana government lies exposed as diamond mine opens on Bushman land. Survival International, 2014. Available from: <https://www.survivalinternational.org/news/10410>.

[38]: Ogada, Mordecai. Decolonising Conservation: It Is About the Land, Stupid! The Elephant, 2019. Available from: <https://www.theelephant.info/culture/2019/06/27/decolonising-conservation-it-is-about-the-land-stupid/>.

[39]: de Bernardy, Denis. Holistic Management. A Natural Language, Chapter 10. 2022. Available from: <https://ddebernardy.substack.com/p/holistic-management>.

[40]: Solnit, Rebecca. A Paradise Built in Hell. Viking, 2009. Summary available from: <https://aworkinglibrary.com/reading/paradise-built-in-hell>.

[41]: Mollison, Bill. Permaculture Designers Course. 1994. Available from: <https://odysee.com/@brendanolen:e/bill-mollison-permaculture-designers-6:4?lid=d2e7052d0caf91e791c92c7cca78226d28a80321>.

[42]: Climate Change Litigation Databases. Available from: <http://climatecasechart.com>.

[43]: Ogada, Mordecai. A Dark Truth: The racist dynamic at the heart of Kenya's conservation practices and policies. The Elephant, 2018. Available from: <https://www.theelephant.info/features/2018/09/13/a-dark-truth-the-racist-dynamic-at-the-heart-of-kenyas-conservation-practices-and-policies/>.

[44]: The Violence of 'Conservation'. Survival International, 2020. Available from: https://www.survivalinternational.org/articles/violence_conservation.

[45]: Bezmenov, Yuri. The Four Stages of Ideological Subversion. 1984. Available from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yErKTVdETpw>.

[46]: Corbett, James. Episode 344 - Problem Reaction Solution: Internet Censorship Edition. The Corbett Report, 2018. Available from: <https://www.corbettreport.com/episode-344-problem-reaction-solution-internet-censorship-edition/>.

[47]: Cudenec, Paul. Fascism Rebranded: Exposing the Great Reset. Winter Oak, 2021. Available from: <https://winteroak.org.uk/2021/07/10/fascism-rebranded-exposing-the-great-reset/>.

[48]: Blumenthal, Max. 'Green' billionaires behind professional activist network that led suppression of 'Planet of the Humans' documentary. The Grayzone, 2020. Available from: <https://thegrayzone.com/2020/09/07/green-billionaires-planet-of-the-humans/>.

[49]: Wigington, Dane. Our Most Comprehensive Climate Engineering Presentation. Geoengineering Watch, 2019. Available from: <https://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/geoengineering-watch-our-most-comprehensive-climate-engineering-presentation/>.

[50]: Cristián, Ryan. The Daily Wrap-Up. The Last American Vagabond. Available from: <https://www.thelastamericanvagabond.com/>.

[51]: Cudenec, Paul. The Great Racket: the ongoing development of the criminal global system. Winter Oak, 2023. Available from: <https://>

winteroak.org.uk/2023/01/13/the-great-racket-the-ongoing-development-of-the-criminal-global-system/.

[52]: Morningstar, Cory. The Manufacturing of Greta Thunberg – for Consent: The Political Economy of the Non-Profit Industrial Complex. The Art of Annihilation, 2019. Available from: [https://www.theartofannihilation.com/the-manufacturing-of-greta-thunberg-for-consent-the-political-economy-of-the-non-profit-industrial-complex/.](https://www.theartofannihilation.com/the-manufacturing-of-greta-thunberg-for-consent-the-political-economy-of-the-non-profit-industrial-complex/)

[53]: Corbett, James. How & Why Big Oil Conquered The World. The Corbett Report, 2017. Available from: [https://www.corbettreport.com/bigoil/.](https://www.corbettreport.com/bigoil/)

[54]: de Bernardy, Denis. A Natural Language. 2022. Available from: [https://ddebernardy.substack.com/p/a-natural-language.](https://ddebernardy.substack.com/p/a-natural-language)