

*H<sub>3</sub>*

*www.h3operations.com*

Oasis

Oasis Forestry  
Discussion Paper  
H<sub>3</sub>

## Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Purpose of Oasis Forestry	3
Form of Implementation (commercial)	4
Land Requirement and Locations	5
Arid Forestry	6
Soil Enrichment	7
Water	8
Electricity	9
Creation of Towns	10
Cost of the Reform	10
Government Involvement	12
Environmental Impacts	13
The Proposer	14
Conclusion	16

Sean Gallacher  
57 Harden Street  
Acacia Ridge 4110  
Queensland Australia  
61 7 3277 2975  
[h3@h3operations.com](mailto:h3@h3operations.com)  
[www.h3operations.com](http://www.h3operations.com)

## Introduction

The Oasis Forestry Reform is a global initiative that is designed to completely solve the issue of deforestation and be a major plank in the assault on climate change.

According to figures coming from the Forest Industries themselves native sources for timber products will be exhausted some time between fifteen and thirty-five years, depending on which region is being discussed.

It is the perfect time to consider a commercial solution to the issue of deforestation. A company that establishes over one hundred million hectares of plantation forests now, will dominate the industry in 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; even that which is cleared for grazing will be protected under Oasis. The protection is afforded because nobody will want to cut the forests down; there will be no financial incentive to do so.

## Purpose of Oasis

Its 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.

In addition to the primary stated purpose, Oasis has many other positive consequences and goals:

The creation of a forest resource that we can begin to use as early as five years after its commencement.

It will introduce a new methodology for solving the world's problems; a methodology that says everybody really can win if we put enough thought into it; a methodology that addresses more than one major problem at a time.

Through Oasis millions of people will get a first hand taste of the new problem solving methodology; a taste that shows being green does not need to equal sacrifice, quite the opposite. They will get this taste through heavily discounted share offers in several Oasis companies, through an asset distribution plan, and through a range of regional initiatives that draws urban dwellers into the solution by doing things they would either already be doing or will be happy to do (employment programs, raising of seedlings, collecting seeds and more). Consider how big the global Forest Industries is, consider how many people are part of it. That is how many people will be exposed to this new problem solving methodology. Millions of people will be involved in Oasis around the globe. Tying together improving environmental

conditions with the making of trillions of dollars should not be underestimated as an agent for change.

Widespread exposure to such methodology is going to have a substantial and positive sociological impact on society. Amongst many other things, it will encourage people to develop their own solutions for other issues using this methodology. It will also encourage others into career choices in the humanities as they begin to view the humanities as viable capitalist career options, for this is the direction it is heading. And one should not underestimate the value of hope; hope that we really can solve our problems after all.

The perception of the Forestry Industry will change from that of destroyers to preservers. From Forestry Industry and from Logging, to Forest Industries. In this world, if one can make money from destroying, the greater majority will destroy, but if one can make even more money from preserving, then “everyone” will choose to preserve.

Merging the idea of preservation with capitalism on such a scale, and putting it into practice as a society will take us one more tiny step up the evolutionary ladder.

A likely side-effect of the Oasis implementations is a hard to predict change in the regional climate dynamics for Australia and Africa. The Oasis Reform has the potential to greatly increase rainfall on both sides of The Great Divide, and along the currently dry southern borders of the Sahara Desert. And so much so that it may be the major long term water supply solution we need for these regions. One thing that is certain is it cannot reduce rainfall along the East Coast of Australia, nor in the Mauritania to Somalia band in Africa.

There will be an option to channel over 100 megalitres of fresh water per day into the Darling River. Together with some relatively low cost work to prepare the system for such an input, this would do more for the system than anything that has been undertaken to date. There are several similar circumstances to this in Africa, the most notable of which will be the refilling of Lake Chad.

If the Australian Government gets behind it, implementation of the Oasis Forestry Reform will establish Australia as the world leader in environmental projects, and it is a reputation that Australians would very much enjoy having. Especially when all they need to do to get it is to sit back and make a whole lot of money whilst H3 goes about its business.

## Form of Implementation (commercial)

It has never occurred to anybody that we might solve a major environmental issue by making money; not peanuts from tourism or open plains wildlife parks, trillions of dollars and complete solutions.

Such major issues have been institutionalized as being on one side of the ledger (the side that costs money) and the Oasis solution puts it onto the other side.

It is important to point out that there are two different forms for an Oasis Forestry Reform implementation and most of the information in this discussion paper can be applied to either.

The specific option that is referred to immediately below is actually the one least likely to be used, but there is a reason not to give specifics about the other at this early stage. This is mentioned again in the conclusion.

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

There are essentially three stages to the Oasis process:

The first is to raise sixty billion dollars through different forms of equity to establish Oasis Australia and its thirty-five million hectares of plantation forest in outback Australia.

The second is to raise one hundred billion dollars, again through different forms of equity, to establish Oasis Africa and its one hundred and fifty million hectares of plantation forest in sub-Saharan Africa.

The third is to assist an existing international forestry operation in setting up something comparable to the Australian operation in the Americas.

It is reasonable for you to assume that any issue you can imagine relating to the Oasis implementations has been considered and dealt with; I've been soaking in this for a decade.

The financial model, for either of the Oasis implementations, calls for a drastic reduction in the number of major players in the industry. When there are substantial environmental imperatives, reducing the number of players in an industry is a must; such a thing should be avoided where money is the only or driving imperative.

All of the smaller operators (smaller Forest Industries corporations) will be acquired by the major players in the industry, and there will be no more than four, and perhaps as few as two, \*\*Weyerhaeuser probably being the other. Maintaining a fragmented industry will ensure the continuation of a fragmented focus; no focus at all other than destruction for enrichment interspersed with a few shrugs.

Obviously there needs to be substantial income streams to make up for the lack of one out of principal ops in the first five years, and this is touched on in The Cost of the Reform section; regardless of which implementation is undertaken, substantial forest assets are acquired in the early stages and Oasis corporations derive income from more than just forest operations.

\*\*Weyerhaeuser has nothing to do with this, they are simply an obvious choice.

## Land Requirement and Locations

The most important thing that needs to be understood 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 problems; to alter it in such a way so that those in charge will want to deal with them (because they will make more money and have more power by dealing with

them). It is doubly important to apprehend this with regard to the Africa references in this section.

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.

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 for many reasons, some of which are obvious. The requirement will be obtained from within the band that stretches from Mauritania to Somalia and includes Sudan (yes Somalia and yes Sudan).

The third requirement that should be somewhere in the Americas could be in North or South America, or it could be an Americas corporation establishing an operation somewhere in Asia. It could even be China.

## 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.

There are more efficient methods of delivering water than by standard irrigation canals and on the scale being suggested, desalination can (will) be used to source water.

Tree types are certainly an issue but not as much of an issue as one would initially think. There are some 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 in a forest environment and what are the different types of wood required; this is what is meant by category.

Soils are generally very poor in arid regions and there are many ways to enrich soil, but a limited number of really clever options when doing it on such a scale.

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.

And what about the idea that the Darling River will once again flow strongly throughout the year, or the overflowing of Lake Chad courtesy of a major change in the regional climate dynamics.

With the establishment of over thirty-five million hectares of trees in outback Australia and thousands of gigalitres pumped into the region, is there anybody out there prepared to say that such a thing is not possible for the Darling. And what of a change that would allow us to take back the southern boundaries of the Sahara or the overflowing of Lake Chad; one hundred and fifty million hectares is no thicket.

One needs to remember that we're talking about something on an unprecedented scale, even larger than the Russian agricultural developments in the fifties. We will go close to doubling the dense forest cover in Africa and perhaps even more than double it in Australia.

There will be an impact on the regional climate dynamics in both regions. 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; the topography surrounding these regions is not necessarily going to be a constant; and the word "surrounding" has a slightly broader context than most would imagine.

## Soil Enrichment

The original soil enrichment strategies for this operation were formulated in about 2001 and there has been a great deal of research on the subject since then.

The finer details of the 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 the sewerage produced in at least two of our capital cities and transportation to site by rail. The treated sewerage 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 this from all the towns inside a one thousand kilometre radius of Oasis operations and delivery may be easier.
2. Mixed in with the sewerage during treatment will be a mixture 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 enhance the zoological cycle in the region to enhance deposition of the various nutrients and organic matter required; this will probably happen without us, although there are a few necessary adds that could not happen on their own.
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 sewerage. 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 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 sewerage) 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?

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 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 (I refrain from using the word limit or restraint for something on this magnitude) of an operation like this, and in fact would be cheaper than desalination and may even provide more water than desalination. Is it something to be considered? It is mentioned because it has been floated in the past and some people seem to think it is a good idea. It will not be considered inside Oasis operations, and after H3 begins I will fight any attempt to pipe water out of northern Queensland for any purpose.

We build the infrastructure in stages and an important question is at what point are the regional climate dynamics affected? What volume of water could we expect after it has been substantially affected?

At the moment desalination is not cheap, and although we will need to resort to the existing technologies for the first stage, we will use new and better technology for the subsequent stages.

Knowing what I know and my experiences of the last ten years, leaves me with no doubt that we will be able to find technology that will cost 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 more importantly, what to look for and to know what we're looking at when we're looking at it.

The overall water requirement will ultimately be measured in tens of gigalitres per day across Oasis operations; we **will** find a way to drop the cost through the floor.

If better desalination technology does not surface elsewhere then I will simply create it. I have already done some work on this and will simply do more if what I've done so far, and a search, does not produce results. We will have an extraordinarily low cost option by the time we get to stage two of the Australian implementation; not maybe.

When calculating the requirement it is important to realize that we will not simply use standard irrigation ditches. Here's an important point of discussion: When doing something on this scale, what is the best delivery method? I would like this discussion but I doubt that I will have the time to get involved in it; obviously I've already done "some" work on it.

Man made lakes will pepper Oasis regions. How many and how deep is the most efficient configuration?

## Electricity

Oasis operations require a significant amount of electricity, this is obvious.

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 can only be used part of the time.

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, which then means that we also require more than two times the capacity in power plants as well; a double double. So in addition to the power plants costing considerably more than fossil fuel power plants, we will need twice as many. If this is to be done then none of the existing technologies are acceptable options to produce electricity. So what do we do?

Boy did this last part of Electricity change in the last few years: It was originally waffling around saying things like the Solar Tower for the first stage and then VAST, because I hadn't revealed any of the more advanced energy technologies, and I was cautious about others views on how such a thing, just can't be possible (in practice this is the view EVERYBODY has had for about a decade). I'm not going to mess around with this issue any longer:

It has been made abundantly clear that I have developed a suite of new energy generation technologies all of which will beat coal in the marketplace, and most of them will beat it easily. The sacrificial lamb that was thrown out into the open in 2009 called Water Tower, clearly shows that we do not need fossil fuels for base load generation. Water Tower Technology will beat coal in the marketplace, and it is openly displayed for discussion. The Water Tower is the baby brother in the advanced energy suite from H3, and although we may use a Water Tower in the energy mix, as a novelty, the others are cheaper and have far superior scalability:

**WE WILL NOT NEED TO USE FOSSIL FUELS TO GENERATE THIS ELECTRICITY  
ABSOLUTELY WILL NOT**

## 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 the man made lakes will be situated around 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 design of the towns will not be that different, with all the facilities being roughly the same; after all part of Oasis is part of a larger plan to bring them up with the rest of us. 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.

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, to everyone's benefit, whether they live in New York or Nouakchott.

## Cost of the Reform

There is a cost of implementation but it will be borne entirely by commercial enterprises.

The Oasis Forestry Reform is a commercial enterprise that will produce annual revenues of over \$200 billion from forest products, with higher margins than the industry is used to, and over \$50 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 around \$1 trillion and total asset creation of around \$2 trillion. What we will get is a massive going concern that will be a major plank in the solution for climate change.

It is no doubt something that will be present in many people's minds, so it will be mentioned here: It is the intention of H3 to own less than 40% of Oasis Australia and less than 10% of Oasis Africa.

This is also an appropriate place to spell out the nature of H3. It has been created by me and initially will be owned in its entirety by me. Most of the commercial enterprises inside H3 (currently numbering between thirteen and fifteen depending on a number of factors) will be public, and from ten to sixty percent of each enterprise will be given away for a variety of reasons. The interpretation of the term "given away" should be taken literally more than half of the time, and the rest of the time refers to outrageously discounted share offers, sometimes public and sometimes restricted to a limited number of very large corporations. H3 will not be in this to squeeze every last drop out of the public; we will have different goals in mind. And as far as management of such a large operation is concerned, we will bring on the best people in the world and trust them to do their jobs; it is an obvious assumption that this operation will attract the absolute best people in its fields of operation. The central H3 operation will control more than thirty large global organizations in this way; very little micro-managing (only when absolutely necessary), and no major decisions will be made outside a formal/informal Action and Policy Board structure.

Over 99% of all the money that is made inside H3 will be focused on achieving H3's agenda of reforms, altruistic endeavours, and its positive social, political and economic goals. We're going to make the world a better place with actions that those in power will actually want to do, and not because it will give them the warm and fuzzies, but because it will give them more money and more power; solutions for the real world.

The cost of this reform is that we add a couple of trillion dollars to the global economy and you get me and all of what that entails (refer to the section entitled The Proposer). Oasis was the first major global reform developed inside H3 and it has and will set off an avalanche of reforms, some designed by H3 and some designed by others, and they will more than double the size of the global economy. But even more importantly is that the nature of the reforms, directly linking improving environmental and social conditions with the making of money on a trillion dollar global scale, will have an effect on the human psyche that is priceless. One of the main principles inside H3 is called The Generational Effect, and this will be one of the main effects to spring out of connecting these two previously opposing parts of society. The Generational Effect is not something I created, but I consider it to be my greatest revelation because of what it means for the world, for the future. I haven't thought about the Generational Effect for a month or two and it just watered my eyes a little; it has had that effect on me a hundred times, and will no doubt do so a hundred more.

The cost of this reform is incalculable but it is all upside; in the making of money and in the improvement of the human condition towards what we would like it to be.

## 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 sewerage 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 there are obvious jokes there so have at it). It is possible that the towns around Oasis operations and inside Oasis operations will be enough, and if they are then would it be cheaper to do it that way? Such a thing is by no means certain (that they would produce enough).

Some other requirements are the provision of interstate rail infrastructure, upgrading of port facilities at Darwin and in two or three cities in Africa, 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 will co-operate only 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 we can do it.

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 because this part of it is more akin to the complexity of the more advanced reforms in the H3 suite, and because the two different implementations of Oasis deal with the issue 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 and the sweeteners for each participating country make it a *fait accompli*. Yes the second is part of the recently created version and it is a more advanced version, but it will not be unveiled until people understand who I am, and are able to assimilate what my motives are; that there is somebody out there who is driven to make trillions of dollars, but has absolutely no interest in personal material possessions, and that over 99% of the money made will be directed to an agenda that is designed to make the world a better place. This will be a very hard thing for people to believe as being possible, but the weight of what will emerge in the first year alone will be hard to deny; after the second year, impossible to deny.

## Environmental Impacts

The environmental impacts of Oasis have been very well considered, and if it 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. Its environmental benefits will be wide-ranging, long-lasting and unprecedented.

### Positive Environmental Impacts:

1. Discontinuation of Native Forest Logging in Australia within five years.
2. Discontinuation of Native Forest Logging worldwide within ten years.
3. Electricity and Desalination will be delivered with zero emission technology, and so thirty-five million hectares of plantation forestry (and eventually around two hundred million hectares worldwide) speaks for itself in the issue of CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration. It will have a very noticeable impact on Climate Change.
4. 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 thirty-five million hectares of forest in outback Australia, and pumping 10 gegalitres of water into the region every single day (and ultimately more) is going to have a hard to define but substantial impact on rainfall on the East Coast, and maybe even on the West Coast. So a partial and perhaps even complete solution to Australian drought conditions.
5. And in Africa the daily input of over 100 gegalitres of water into the region from Nouakchott to Berbera 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 reaches of the Sahara.
6. The positioning of the Oasis Project in Australia will allow the release of over 100 megalitres of water per day down the Darling River, and this is going to have an enormous impact on the tens of thousands who depend on the Murray Darling River System.
7. And in Africa Lake Chad will be returned to beyond its historical peak.
8. Discontinuation of Sewerage dumping in the oceans around several of our capital cities is a substantial environmental benefit that will mostly go by unnoticed, because the outfalls have been placed further out to sea over the past decades.
9. Groundwater sources in outback Australia are well on their way to being depleted, and the Oasis Project is very likely to fill them back up over about a decade or two, and in Africa also.
10. Such a project developed under the new balancing reforms ideology will get people thinking about solving other global, regional and local 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, and in reality the

individual animals of the disrupted species will simply “move down the road” in a large number of cases.

2. We are going to interfere with the local climate dynamic, there is no getting away from that fact. But this time rather than taking out we’re adding back in, and 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 a negative, but it is a positive negative (not really a negative), if that makes any sense.
3. Desalination operations of the size incorporated into Oasis projects are going to have a noticeable coastal footprint.
4. Desalination does produce a (natural and absorbable) waste product, and operations of the size incorporated into Oasis projects are going to produce a great deal 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 most of the waste for construction especially in Africa; this is one of the main options.
5. Obviously the impacts from building towns where there were none, but they will be very green towns, and to object to such a thing is to object to civilization in general; go and live with the luddites if you have this objection.

It is a question of greater good and trade-offs. In 500 years things may not work that way, 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. But that is not how this world works. This is a world of commerce and the wheels must turn.

## The Proposer

I wondered over whether this should be included in the discussion paper and it is not my preference to have it in here, but it is a critical component of Oasis as it pertains to its ability to be implemented, and is a necessary addendum to all other reforms that H3 will propose in the future. It is a necessary inclusion here, but it will not need to be included into future discussion papers because of the profile these activities will guarantee.

Yes I have stormed onto the scene with plans and intellectual property (tech and social) of unprecedented magnitude, and have provided enough proof of substance to make even the skeptics wonder if I just might be able to pull off what I’m suggesting, but this is all very new and so there has been insufficient time for the real magnitude of this to sink in properly. Most people would not be able to believe the main element of the more advanced Oasis implementation as being possible right now (meaning that nobody could be trusted to do it); it will not be doubted in about twelve months (that H3 can do it and that we should be trusted to do it) because of how I will be perceived.

How will I be perceived in twelve months:

- ✓ Twelve months will have passed since the release of a book called Add \$50 Trillion and Shake. It is impossible to define the impact of this book without sounding like all the marketing pretenders out there. It is the biggest leap in social theory since John Locke and is intellectually accessible and written to be interesting to the general public.

- ✓ Six months will have passed since the release of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Testament book, which is a non-religious bible for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is impossible to overstate the impact of this book, which may be even greater than Add \$50 Trillion and Shake.
- ✓ It will have been twelve months since the secrets to more than a dozen next generation technologies were revealed with the promise of prototypes to flow thick and fast from around month eighteen. People will be anticipating this flow to start in about six months at this time.
- ✓ The Water Tower technology will have been out in the open for about twelve months, and it will have been dissected in great detail by the time we get here. The Water Tower will continue to bring context to H3's advanced energy suite and it is this more advanced suite that will start coming out in about six months from this time.
- ✓ Around one dozen discussion papers will have been released for evolutionary new directions in many areas of existence, and any one of them will be worthy of a Nobel Prize in their implementation. There is nothing small in the discussion papers, and all will be greatly and truly desired by those who make the decisions over whether a thing is done or not.
- ✓ The international discussions for the FISCIL reform of the global Fishing Industry will be well underway.
- ✓ The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Testament Trust that is established to live the ideals in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Testament will be ramping up.
- ✓ Discussions for the five square kilometre site required for the H3 Headquarters in Newcastle will have just commenced. These discussions will make a little noise.
- ✓ H3 will be in the early stages of establishing its principal operations; a principal operation that requires the equivalent of a 110 storey headquarters by about year four.
- ✓ A book called ttk ohtk tks and mks will also have been available for twelve months and it will make an even bigger noise than the other two books mentioned above. Nobody is prepared for what is inside ttk ohtk tks and mks.
- ✓ There are other factors, the specifics of which will not be public knowledge, and they will further enhance the ability to implement this newly defined Oasis.

How will I be perceived after a year of this? It is impossible for others to imagine until they've read the books and seen just how evolutionary the discussion papers and technologies are.

So who am I specifically:

I will live in the building I work in (on the same floor or the next one down), I will have no weekends, Christmas is just another day, and I have absolutely no interest in personal material possessions. I do not like to be thanked for anything I do no matter how grand, I want no acclaim, insist on no gifts, and I do not like to be complimented. I have a singular focus, I create something new and extraordinary almost everyday, and if you tell me something relevant that I do not already know then I will love you for it.

Dag Hammarskjöld, the second Secretary General of the United Nations, once suggested that when he takes up the position of Secretary General of the United Nations, the private man should disappear and the public servant take his place. This is how I view my position in the world now; I am public property and my decision to develop something of this magnitude and to publicize it incurs with it a public trust to do all that I can to deliver it. There is nothing else

on my dance card from this moment on. There is nothing else I can imagine myself doing. This is who I am.

## Conclusion

In its original form the Oasis Forestry Reform would either live or die with the ability to adequately convey the long term principles in its commercialization to the general public, and especially to those who could participate financially (creation of such an operation now will completely dominate the industry in fifteen years).

Normally when I use the reference long term I am talking about five hundred to one thousand years, but for this purpose I am using it as current society uses it, ten to fifteen years.

As I have been writing this discussion paper and with consideration to the last ten years, the feeling that this (conveying the long term principles) is going to be very difficult has been growing. It may even be insurmountably difficult, or so difficult that the implementation would take over five years, when it should take less than a year given the obvious and overwhelming benefits to all who are involved in the industry; this sort of strategic thinking is very rare today.

Getting towards the end of writing this discussion paper an alternate implementation occurred to me for Oasis and I worked it through and defined it; I have since gone back into the body of this paper and inserted a few references to it.

It is now far more likely (and perhaps even settled) that this new implementation for Oasis will be H3's main forestry approach, but the contents of this discussion paper remain as for the original implementation; much of the details are the same and it remains a commercial operation, but the need to get people to think long term with their money is no longer required in the newer more advanced implementation.

The main reason for staying with the original implementation in this discussion paper, is that the ability of the new implementation to be adopted is going to largely depend on how I will be perceived in about twelve months time. There is more on this point in the section entitled The Proposer.

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 a 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.

Whichever implementation is used governments get arms-length comfort, which means all upside and no downside for them, bureaucracy are happy because additional monitoring staff

is required, big business is 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.

Every other approach to climate change is going to cost a fortune and in reality accomplish next to nothing; let's at least be honest about that. The complete solution to climate change from H3, of which the Oasis Forestry Reform is a big part, will solve it completely and make over \$10 trillion as we're doing it.

Isn't this worth talking about. Clearly, that is not a question.

**PREPARED BY:**

Sean Gallacher

61 7 3277 2975

[h3@h3operations.com](mailto:h3@h3operations.com)

[www.h3operations.com](http://www.h3operations.com)