Module 2 reflection exercise

Dan Wilton
All Sections

Objective 2.3
To apply the MLP lens to one of the alternatives highlighted in this module.

In module 1 you reflected upon the Puerto Rico case by mapping the landscape, regime, and niche levels of post-disaster recovery. Secondly, you started imagining what different actors and movements might do, and at what levels, to strengthen self-reliance and social/ecological resilience.

For the exercise in Module Two, we are suggesting a parallel approach in two parts. We ask you to do them in sequence.

1. Choose one of the land trust models or specific alternatives like Drawdown or Terre de Liens introduced in this Land module. (You may also want to review the supplementary materials list). Keep your response to one page maximum.
   - List the benefits you see flowing from it.
   - List the challenges you see to advancing it.
   - Note any limitations that you think it may have as a vehicle for systems change.

2. Review what you set out in the first part of this exercise. Pay attention to the politics of the landscape and regime level actors and issues.
   - Does looking at different levels of analysis yield any new insights? Are there some targets and/or strategies relevant to spreading innovations and systems change that emerged for you? Keep your reflection to one page only.

Present your findings below as a graphic (using the Insert Image button), text, file attachment, or a combination.
1. DRAWDOWN

The Drawdown Land Use Model categorizes and allocates land according to agro-ecological zones based on the following factors: thermal climate, moisture regimes, soil quality, slope, cover type, and degradation status. These characteristics influence the suitability of different practices, and solution adoption scenarios are restricted by one or more of these factors.

**Land Use Sector Summary**

SECTOR RESULTS BY 2050

149.6 GIGATONS REDUCED CO2

$131.1 BILLION NET IMPLEMENTATION COST

$1.20 TRILLION NET OPERATIONAL SAVINGS

**BENEFITS FLOWING FROM IT**

Improvements to land use are critical for climate change mitigation. Ecosystem protection solutions prevent loss of carbon currently held in forests and wetlands. Ecosystem restoration solutions and perennial timber and biomass have impressive biosequestration potential. Ecosystem protection and restoration offer essential co-benefits of ecosystem services, while perennial timber and biomass produce important products. Solutions in the Land Use Sector offer biosequestration as well as emissions reduction – and a livable climate cannot be attained without removal of excess atmospheric carbon. Improvements to land use can be seen in micro-scale, in every day lives of the communities and the people, as well as in shorter time periods than in macro-scale (regions, countries, the planet). People having living examples in front of their eyes are persuaded easier than just listening to stories and descriptions.

**CHALLENGES TO ADVANCING IT** There has to be a very strong effort to persuade local communities and individuals to adopt Drawdown improvements to land use, as far as bottom-up procedures are concerned. Awareness creation, persuasion, mobilization, education and training, application are not short term processes. The case in Loess Plateau, China, was a top-down case, the regime started the process. In cases that the process is bottom-up and the regime is not supportive, things are getting much more difficult and the time required for success is much longer. People devoted to the cause, determind, fearless, willing to learn and act for change, have to be involved in very hard struggles against what they have learned till now and then against vested and multinational interests, the state, the police, the court, and even assassins.

**LIMITATIONS** Disturbance rates show the expected loss of protected and replanted forests and other ecosystems due to disturbances like fire. The model is built to include disturbance rates, but sufficient data was unavailble. This may be added to the model in the future as it becomes available. Restoration of peatlands and coastal wetlands was not modeled due to lack of data, though this is clearly desirable alongside protection. Albedo impacts are not modeled but would be useful to include in future upgrades.
Michael Lewis (https://learn.canvas.net/courses/2527/users/263480) Apr 4, 2019

Thanks for this excellent synopsis Lazaros. The challenges you note are important to think through. The challenges to advancing the Drawdown solutions you identify are important. It made me wonder about the value in research the methods, communication strategies, educational resources etc for addressing them. It might be very useful to think through. One could imagine some kind companion set of resources to Drawdown. What do you think? Any ideas?

Edited by Michael Lewis (https://learn.canvas.net/courses/2527/users/263480) on Apr 4 at 9:36am

Lazaros Angelou (https://learn.canvas.net/courses/2527/users/886724) Apr 7, 2019

Dear Michael,

thank you for asking, it stimulates further thinking on ways of action.

A Companion set of resources to Drawdown might be:

1) The "Drawdown" site, as the basic resource on the subject. Everybody should start from there.

Going to the “Summary of Solutions by Overall Rank” you can see the detailed results of the Plausible Scenario, which models the growth solutions on the Drawdown list based on a reasonable, but vigorous rate from 2020-2050. Results depicted represent a comparison to a reference case that assumes 2014 levels of adoption continue in proportion to the growth in global markets.

Using the table you can aggregate by sector and come up with a shorter list consisting of sectors like “Food”, “Electricity Generation”, “Land Use”, “Building & Cities” etc. You can also sort the list in a descending order, realizing that Food is the sector having the greatest impact concerning the total atmospheric CO2-eq. reduction in Gts (321,93), second being Electricity Generation (246,14), third Land Use (149,60), etc., thus providing a list of priority strategies and plans from local to regional and national scale.

2) The second set of resources could be "The Next System Project" site, not restricted to the US, but extended to the globe. There a broad group of researchers, theorists and activists, are using the best research, understanding and strategic thinking, on the one hand, and on-the-ground organizing and development experience, on the other, to promote visions, models and pathways that point to a “next system” radically different in fundamental ways from the failed systems of the past and present and capable of delivering superior social, economic and ecological outcomes.
These two sites provide links that go deeper and deeper in all aspects concerning Climate and Systemic Change, and could be a beacon for people struggling against current regime in global, national, regional and local level.

Lazaros perhaps we can think about creating a space to specifically track what resources from this curriculum could be aligned with the solutions embedded in each of the key Drawdown categories. I am beginning to do this but it would be good to have space online where those explicitly interested in tracking the links and identifying the opportunities for applying specific strategies/models directly to specific solutions at different levels of application.

I think the paper I wrote, an extract of which is in module 1, was commissioned by the Next System project. That is one resource. John Restakis wrote a paper for them as well; it is on the Partner State. And as you said there are many others, some of which will be relevant. Ted Howard and Gar Alperovitz co-founders of the Democracy Collaborative are monitoring this course as is the director of The Next Systems project.

Getting back to the main point I think a modest attempt to put the pieces more explicitly would be very worthwhile. I am quite sure Paul Hawken, who inspired to work that led to Drawdown, and which he edited, would be very interested in such an initiative. If you are interested perhaps we could talk at some point. Perhaps we could get Paul to do an event for the MOOC during the 4-week break or in the three weeks after module 8. Anyways, let us talk about this.

1. Terre de Liens
   - Benefits: Scale-ability, removing small-farm land from the speculative property market, leveraging community investment and sectoral expertise
   - Challenges: Does not leverage spending power of consumers directly, farmers continue to operate according to profit-motive,
   - Limitations for systems change: Not clear how this can be scaled to de-commodify the majority of food producing land, seems tied to the margins from which it emerges. Not in
any obvious way a vehicle for "systems change", but a reaction against the erosion of historical small farms. No clear path forward to buy up and make small the land currently in mega farms.

2. As presented, I don't see this evolving beyond being a niche counter-movement to the dominant regime. The opening in the landscape this capitalizes on is territory which was historically small farms. There is an opening, potentially, in the fact that these farmers do not insist on owning their own land but leasing it from this non-profit. This aspect opens the door to scaleability if a large consumers' co-operative would be willing to invest in land acquisition.

I am curious Tristan to hear more about why you locate as a challenge that farmers are operating in a way where they concern themselves with generating a profit.

On another point, can you elaborate on the idea that scaling this might be served by a large consumers co-operative investing in land acquisition is a path you would recommend exploring?

The profit motive is, from the traditional Co-operative perspective, the pernicious element of capitalism. You can find this view in Owen, in Howarth, in Warbasse, in Kagawa, etc. The basic financial structure of Co-operatives, created in 1844, has as a central goal and tenet, the elimination of profit (because earlier societies were either chronically under capitalized or built up excessive reserves leading to the temptation to carpet bag)

During the period when building towards a Co-operative Commonwealth was a concrete political project (mid 19th century mid 20th century, roughly), 2nd tier wholesaling co-ops, owned by consumer co-ops, were by orders of magnitude the strongest co-op institutions, the only ones capable of appropriating the means of production at a speed that made the takeover of the for profit economy more than a pipe dream. In the UK alone they bought hundreds of square miles of farmland.

There are a lot of reasons why it is more difficult to organize this way today, although significant wholesaling federations still exist in many countries. In Canada we have the Federated Co-operatives LTD (far from perfect, but owned in common by hundreds of consumers' societies). They even own an oil refinery ( (Gross!)
Significantly in Japan, the consumers co-op movement continues to be very strong: https://www.grocer.coop/articles/japan-land-cooperatives

Thanks for the analysis. To add, being critical of a profit orientation doesn’t mean being against surplus, in a coop for distribution or for future investment.

So yes, the most successful eras of coops saw large scale accumulation - as well as distribution - that could then, for example, be put into land, buildings, learning and more. Entities that are non profit and non surplus don’t tend to grow beyond the niche unless they have external impetus to scale up or diffuse the model.

The challenge of cooperative accumulation was one Robin Murray turned to in recent years. I’ll have to look again for what he said!

I agree with your scaleability comment. At this point, with the current numbers and dollars involved it does not seem much more than a niche movement as you say.

If we add up all the capital controlled by organizations that are outside what we might call the mainstream of capitalism, meaning orgs that are legally required to maximize shareholder value, the amount is absolutely massive.

IMO it's not that alternatives don't exist, and it's not that the alternatives are miniscule compared to for-profit capital accumulation, it's that the alternatives are poorly coordinated. And, as I'll keep arguing, this can be at least partly attributed to the absence of a single discourse, or logic, or "politics", that is able to unite them. Not for lack of trying, it seems academics are constantly inventing new frameworks for a post capitalist...
economy. However, there is a strange tendency for these ideas to insist on thinking of themselves as new, and not as an evolution of a tradition.

This is enlightening, and identifying the oversight of a landscape for all the buzzing niches seems crucial : )

You are correct to see and criticize these alternatives as small. When we curated these, we tried to introduce in each alternative different elements of the kind of socialized knowledge that Robin Murray encouraged us to circulate and share across the evolving social and solidarity economy. (See my announcement posted earlier.)

I’m am encouraged by the kinds of knowledge gained in these struggles. Real on the ground instances of organized alternatives. Yes, at one level, they represent a kind of first order learning. We learn how people do things, a kind of technical knowhow.

But at another level, they involve people in second order learning or critical niche learning where collectives of people engage in analysis of the dominant system, and learn to establish alternative values and organizations despite the efforts by powerful incumbent and systemic forces seeking to thwart them.

The goal is not to simply add all these good ideas and practices up. Transition is not additive. Synergy emerges from a confluence or conjuncture of each practice built, each coalition, each mixing and mashing up that we trace across this course.

This week we have focused on land. Each of the six middle Modules explore different problems and alternatives. We loop back to these in Module 8 when discussing the politics of systems change and how to engage the systems within systems we need to alter for ecological and socially just transition.

Taking land out of the market can be a strategic step for transition- for housing, food, and protecting ecosystem services; how surplus is organized and controlled democratically or cooperatively as Ed Mayo mentions morally constrains markets and private capital; how reciprocity and relationality work among small family businesses and cooperatives in the Italian case make social justice and social
equality part of the social accounting in the solidarity economy; how localizing food and democratizing energy play a role in community resilience; how democratic finance and public banks provide another way of funding a hoped for transition.

I am encouraged by our discussions. Maybe we might just be able to forge a new 'first draft' of that mind shift and values shift some of you have been encouraging as a first order step.

Keep at it.

Best regards

Mikeg

---

Anthony Christie

Some of my confusion on these matters is, I think, simply a matter of nomenclature. I wonder if previous generations meant anything terrible different from "transition" and "synergy" when they said "revolution" and "solidarity".

*(This never necessarily implied violence; all sorts of revolutionary reformist/gradualist warps, wefts, threads woven into our grandparents' tapestries of discourse)*

---

Jacqueline Thompson

Here we are in an academic forum discussing global and community change. Frameworks and theories are like chewing straw, unless they are connected to actual living examples of progress. I drifted this week (now I am behind), because I had to focus on getting theory into practice. I love working with practicum students from social justice, health care, law, political science and the like... and watching the Wizard of Oz colour turn on, when they realize all the theories about protecting or changing the landscape systems portend a lot of labour, thinking and time dealing with the regime level. If only our youth could be educated to be the new regime, then again, as Audre Lorde asked, is it possible to "dismantle the master's house, with the master's tools?"
Drawdown

- Benefits
  - The objective of drawdown is to create solutions that are “no regrets”
    - The solutions need to make sense regardless of their climate impact since they have benefits to communities and economies
    - Solutions are meant to create jobs, improve people's lives, aid the environment, enhance security, advance human life

- Challenges
  - The challenges for drawdown is the political interference that may prevent these solutions from happening
  - Drawdown also isn't responsible for implementing these solutions, they are just coming up with them
  - It is very difficult to get buy-in from small communities that potentially could use other economic activity (that may not be climate friendly) which would be much more lucrative. It is difficult for leaders to say no to money when they are responsible for a community that is in great need.

- Limitations
  - As much as this exhaustive list of solutions looks positive, it is unfortunately just that - a list. There is no guarantee that these solutions will be implemented. Furthermore, a community or governing body may decide to take on one of these solutions, but once the key players retire, quit or even die the project may die with them. Or perhaps once a new political party comes into power, they may not be as climate-friendly and put funds into another project
  - The Drawdown projected emission reduction is based the year 2050. That is over 30 years to keep a project alive - this is extremely difficult for any group. It would take a fundamental systems change for a lot of governments to support a number of these solutions.

2.

In order to have the solutions created by Drawdown implemented and actually have systems change, we will need buy-in. We will need buy-in at every level from the individual citizen to upper government. I think the best way to get that is to show how these solutions are effective. People here about these solutions but they want to see the case studies of where they work, and how well they worked. For some, the leap is too large to do blind.
I appreciate your views on this. Probably because they generally match my thinking when I
looked into this. In addition to the lists I find some of the strategies to be in conflict. For example
more trees to sequester carbon and yet more wooden buildings. However if you take more
land to grow trees you have less to grow food.

Food waste was interesting. Fresh fruits and vegetables require temperature controlled
systems to transport. Agree that many CFCs are a problem but refrigeration is a huge energy
consumer even if we use really low GHG producing refrigerants. And for farmers net profit we
are dependent on the margins based on surplus. That is why most large scale farmers grow
crops and animals that have a long "shelf life" to be able to wait for best price. Most large fresh
produce companies control the market and the price. so they throw out food that doesn't sell
and they can't keep to ensure the price is affected negatively.

In terms of "leap" I find as I've gotten older that when someone says "they hae the answer" my
thought is "do they understand the problem?"

Sediment released from the depleted region of the Loess Plateau into surrounding rivers came to
the attention of the Chinese Government. Authorities including investors decided that rather than
focusing on clearing up the knock-on obstructions to waterways, it made more sense to restore the
upper Yellow River valley, an area of 35,000 square km, the size of Belgium, and home to a
significant population of small farmers who made meagre livelihoods there.

With generous government and World Bank funding of $500 million, project leaders had a free
hand in deciding how to rehabilitate the area. Local people were hired to participate and help with
the land restoration.

EEMP John D. Liu's film testifies to these multi-level perspectives addressed, although I detect a
slight tone of condescension towards inhabitants undertaking most of the manual labour? Still the
results are fantastic. Total transformation of the environment for the betterment of everyone
involved and resolution of the problem of leeching soil.

Challenges in emulating this achievement obviously include access to such convenient funding;
negotiating for preferred methods and approaches with very powerful players, and safeguarding
land usage for residents through legal instruments that are respected.
Without the top-down guidance and resourcing, can the fertility and integrity of this agricultural haven be maintained? The enterprise began with an unwanted effect of extensive loose earth migrating and getting in the way elsewhere, so part of the thrust for change came from outside and not necessarily from a sincere desire to support indigenous agriculture in such a committed manner. Unintended consequences may have evolved with engagement but this still leaves much to chance and to the goodwill of those currently in charge.

Instead of inserting a graphic, currently a hurdle, I'm linking to old footage of E. F. Schumacher, who wrote the 1973 book, Small Is Beautiful, subtitled Economics As If People Mattered, which argued for the role of intermediate often ready-to-hand technology in solving food production and similar problems:

```
Small is beautiful impressions of Fritz Schumacher
```

Technological waste is all over the world, along with serious health issues for many of the people exposed to mechanisms to profit a few, yet we still let corporate control blindly lead us with promises of jobs and the ability to consume, to have the newest phone, the smallest car,
the biggest truck. Thank you for sharing this bit of history.

Reply

Thank you for posting this film on Schumacher. What an excellent reminder that all progress must be based in values, hopefully collective values. Simply preserving land, or developing land serves only the exploiter, whether capitalist or state. We must always take the time to listen deeply, to build consensus, and to act for the greater good --- the 7th Generation, not the NOW, not for the immediate gain.

Reply

Loess Plateau- North Central China.

Even though the centre of Chinese civilization this area, roughly the size of Belgium, came to be considered one of the most degraded land areas in the world. Degradation is thought to have started over 1000 years ago. Erosion from the unstable slopes created sedimentation in the Yellow River to the point where the Chinese Government decided it was more economically feasible to rehabilitate the land base than try to continually dredge the sediment. This is truly an “Up-stream” strategy with top-down and bottom up collaborative action. The documentation started in 1995 showing the start of rehabilitation. It ends with the results shown as of 2010.

The benefits flowing from the project as presented. Ideas to consider:

It demonstrated the effectiveness of taking time to enable collaboration to take place involving a wide range of people; from government, researchers, skilled technical staff, including engineers, heavy equipment operators, horticulturalists and soil scientists, and community development specialists A key feature was the strategy to involve the local citizens in all aspects of the project.

The scale of the project is impressive. It demonstrated the basic steps used to transform a biophysical wasteland to a green ecosystem. It also demonstrated steps to take to ensure the local people also were actively involved in both the planning and the action of the change process.

The speed of the transformation was informative. It showed that with a vision that is backed by adequate resources and excellent planning positive change can occur. And in this case it only took 15 years in an area where degradation is estimated to have been an issue 1000 years earlier.

List the challenges you see to advancing it.
Ecological restoration on this scale requires a significant outside support and outside capital investment.

To succeed over time there is a need to have place-based education and training with authentic curriculum that meets the needs of the people in the region. Climate change has made most training curricula obsolete.

If the project is to succeed over time it will need outside capital support for an estimated 25 years. Without a bridging program to build capacity within the local people to be able to govern and to manage the area. Nurturing takes time and outside support that is collaborative.

It often seems that patience and ongoing support is lacking.

**Limitations as a vehicle for systems change.**

I don’t see this as a vehicle for systems change. It appears to be just trying to do better what is already being done by adding resources. That is create more food from the land and don’t create problems for people downstream.

The project is praised for ending hunger and poverty. The person interviewed felt earning up to 6000 Yuan/year was taking her out of poverty. That is the equivalent of about **$2.50 USD/day!!!**

For me it over simplified the complexity of the project and oversold the benefits.
The Saskatchewan pictures are from my neighbor’s farm. The Cambodia and Uganda pictures are what I saw when I was working with farmers in those two countries. Cambodia and Uganda farmers issues are very similar to Saskatchewan.

Cambodia farmers are using 11\textsuperscript{th} century tilling methods. I was invited to plow with the cattle in Cambodia. In Saskatchewan those methods led to land degradation in the Dirty 30’s. The blowing soil created devastation that appears to be close to the scale of the Loess Plateau. However here it took less than 50 years of supply side policy in agriculture to cause a collapse when there was a change in precipitation.

In Saskatchewan the move was to change the agriculture production methods to rely almost totally on ever expanding use of fossil fuel and capital intensive equipment. It is called no-till.

Neither the tilling nor the no-till method of production is sustainable environmentally. However, smaller, less fossil fuel intensive food production methods won’t feed even 5 billion people.

Farmers embrace renewable energy everywhere I have been, just the scale is different. However, all farmers I have met with tell me that solar is useful to augment their farm operation, However, it doesn’t have the capacity to provide the energy required to produce the agricultural surplus they need with the current economic model.

In terms of land tenure all farmers are faced with the challenge of any guarantee of access to adequate land. Power is in financial capital and farmers have very little. The concept of land ownership by farmers is really a myth when it is looked into in every country I have been in including my own land.
A wicked problem is how to contract and share within an economic system that is dependent on creating surplus and based on individual entitlement.

This is my attempt to capture a simplified view of the Drawdown Land Use Sector. Land use solutions mitigate AGG emissions while providing increased ecosystem services, carbon sequestration, and useful materials. Harmful interactions are shown in red; positive ones in green.

Challenges for advancing land use solutions involve expanding practices like afforestation, bamboo production, forest & indigenous people's land protection, and coastal/wetlands/peat lands protection as well as dramatically overturning current disinterest in restoration of temperate and tropical forests.

Due to entrenched economic interests in the status quo, significant challenges exist and impediments to change are already in place. As a vehicle of systems change, the Drawdown analysis is hampered by subsuming local and regional effects within an overarching global model.

As one moves from the view at 10,000 m, down to the political and economic landscape on the ground, the map requires and out-sized effort that must be borne by tropical communities, states, and regions. Tropical forest ecosystem restoration stands out by far as the largest potential contributor yet this is where north-south economic disadvantage and colonial history is most pronounced.
An obvious strategy relevant to spreading innovations and systems change that emerged for me would be engagement with the U.S. political process to remove the current anti-environmental administration and replace it with one favorable to investment in solutions in tropical regions.

Karl this is a very useful summary. Do you see the Green New Deal debate emerging as inclusive of Land Use change as one cluster of solutions? There is a very interesting farmer initiative emerging in the United States that is energetically pursuing the transition to climate and eco-system restoration farming techniques. Are you aware of this?

I'm not on top of the ecosystem-restoration farming literature and how it ties in to the GND. However, I expect this to change shortly as the BioPark where I'm a docent enhances its educational message re: food production and land use.

At our BioPark's Botanic Garden, a large effort is underway (construction to start later this year) that will expand our Heritage Farm (a working demonstration farm based on circa 1925 New Mexico) to emphasize traditional methods that have value in the 21st Century, heirloom crops/heritage farm animals, and sustainability while maintaining productivity. Already the farm's crops are used in the BioPark's food service, donated to local shelters, or fed to zoo animals (chimpanzees love hot chili peppers, who knew?). I look forward to...
seeing what our new farm manager does with management support and a real budget.

https://www.cabq.gov/culturalservices/biopark/garden/exhibits/rio-grande-heritage-farm

Edited by Karl Horak on Apr 7 at 11:15am

Michael Lewis

May 7, 2019

Karl it is great you are going to have the opportunity to do this work. I would encourage you to get the book Drawdown (the web site is a bit limited). My sense is in the land use and food sectors have diverse and several opportunities for very local and regional action that are vital to achieving global impact. One thing Drawdown is not, in my view, is an overarching global model which subsumes local and regional within it. It will be worth digging a little deeper.

Kankshi Waghray

Apr 7, 2019

The Champlain Housing Trust model

1. Benefits
The CHT model provides affordable and secure housing opportunities for low-income community members, allowing for reasonable monthly payments. It is cooperative ownership with no landlords. Barriers such as working in non profits or not having a down-payment or any similar precarious situations don't seem to be a hindrance. In fact, it is more affordable the longer community members stay in the system, and it can reach members lower in income over time. The stewardship protects members during market fluctuations and this model demonstrates CLT homeowners are 30 times less likely to foreclose than the national rate. The CHT model also provides short- and long-term education for homeowners and assists in financial and technical management for the co-op. Strategies are implemented promoting community development for the neighborhood also advocating for forming partnerships with relevant non profits to create community facilities - showing a new perspective of building rights from the ground up. This model is an overall respectful and collaborative approach on a multilevel government scale.

Challenges
Training needs to be provided for lawyers and financial institutions to utilize new tools, with relevant policy changes. Scaling up the CHT model with proper and ample political support could be an obstacle.
### Limitations

Considering multicultural backgrounds of community members, with varying conditions, there is a question of how to create a formula for certainty and successful implementation while simultaneously adapting and applying the CHT model globally.

2. A cooperative and collaborative approach seems to be part of the landscape of this model, whether it is in the neighborhoods or the government level support; extending this approach and continuing to apply the best practices on a global scale along with the necessary knowledge and awareness to educate the relevant participants/institutions would be valuable when considering any systems change. I find it incredibly helpful and maybe even inspirational to see the level of open discussion and exchange of ideas that is taking place, testimonials from community members, international stakeholders and political members; not to mention the equal distribution and balance of interests on the governing board of the CHT further develops an atmosphere of uniformity and inclusion that could be relevant in spreading innovative initiatives or solutions.

---

**Module 2: reflection exercise**

**Task # 1:** The land value tax reforms and Drawdown got me thinking about other areas where similar approaches could be used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Energy Labelling</strong></td>
<td>Proposals have been made to give homes an energy rating as is done with appliances.</td>
<td>Accounts for energy use not just within the home, but construction, transportation costs, and climate-related impact on natural infrastructure</td>
<td>- Political buy-in: City Council is pro-sprawl</td>
<td>- Energy costs would be community-specific, not home-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand to provide a full rating of the energy footprint of a home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Administrative buy-in: City Administration is risk-averse</td>
<td>- Driver buy-in: Affects most people, cash grab, reduces freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport Canada research: Road users pay around 20% of the full cost of roads (includes</td>
<td>Funding for roads, transit, active transportation</td>
<td>- Consumer buy-in: Complicated to assess</td>
<td>- Rebates for low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>counting fuel tax as a user fee).</td>
<td>Funding to reduce negative impacts of roads, e.g., GHGs</td>
<td>- Measurement</td>
<td>- Toll roads &amp; cordon pricing would not be effective in all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding for low-carbon upgrading/ replacement of</td>
<td>- Measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recruiting “champions”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options include: toll roads, cordon-pricing, increased fuel tax, vehicle licences based on fuel efficiency

- Reduces government spending
- Impact on low-income households
- Recruiting “champions”

In Alberta, except for small “water rentals” for hydro, no royalties are charged for water withdrawals.

- Frees funding for environmental restoration of streams
- Discourages hoarding of water
- Encourages water conservation
- Encourages higher-value crops
- Impact on small rural communities
- Recruiting “champions”

Water Use Fees

Most irrigators (and other small users) in southern Alberta have water delivered free of charge through provincially-owned “headworks”

- Encourages water conservation
- Encourages higher-value crops
- Impact on small rural communities
- Recruiting “champions”

Task #2: Could these techniques be applied to the issue of reducing urban sprawl?

Although many factors affect City Council decisions on land use and development, suburban real estate interests have a dominant influence on whether municipal infrastructure is provided to service new subdivisions. This influence comes to a large extent from the campaign contributions provided by the real estate sector (primarily those involved in suburban development): two-thirds of corporate and three-quarters of bundled contributions.

To counter the influence of suburban real estate interests requires an informed, motivated, and sufficiently large group of residents. This has happened on occasion, but has not had enough long-lasting influence to prevent decisions that ignore or circumvent planning policy. More robust measures are needed, as standard operating procedure, to prevent financially, socially, and environmentally unwise subdivision approvals. This means seizing the initiative from the powerful and “guiding” them to actions that serve the public interest, as demonstrated by land trusts, tax-reformers, and activists in Puerto Rico and elsewhere.

How would these options help?

- **Home Energy Labelling** that measures the full footprint of a home would reduce the perceived advantage of sprawl homes and could lead to a tiered property tax system based on energy use.
- **Road User Fees** would free up funding for low carbon initiatives, but – more importantly – be channeled into improving amenities in existing communities to make them more desirable compared to new subdivisions.
- **Water Royalties** could lead the City to recover the additional cost through progressive water/sewage fees based on consumption.
Being a tech-dummy, my post was confusing if not unintelligible.

Attached - hopefully - are the table I included and the diagram that disappeared from the post.

Sprawl Diagram.pdf

Ontario built a toll road so you could avoid driving in 6-8 lanes of congested Toronto traffic. People willingly paid the toll, as it can save hours of idling traffic. But, as often happens, people in power change to maintain the real power brokers. It was privatized.

Later today, we will get a glimpse of what else gets privatized or thrown into crisis with austerity budgeting; big things, like education and health care.

I hear you, Jacqueline. For you non-Ontarians, Ontario's so-called Progressive Conservative government is presenting its first budget.

To part 1:

Drawdown is indeed a very comprehensive mathematical tool to combat climate change, and probably our last chance.

To implement Drawdown in a timely manner requires a worldwide consensus to engineer the
economic, political and social conditions for it.

However, capitalism in its adaptability will always seek ways to profit from any new policies, even our own survival as a species.

To part 2, in regards to looking at 'different levels of analysis,' it indeed 'yields' an insight.

The urgency for a Drawdown has to be understood and consequently, demanded by a critical mass of concerned citizens, in particular in the western world, as the result of a radical mind-shift away from consumerism and an economy based on continuous growth. The drawback with Drawdown is only that there are no profits in indigenous land rights while every teenager nowadays needs a smartphone to survive. Consequently, their loving parents are only too willing to believe any politician promising that CO2 reduction and global warming will soon be possible with the help of some future state-of-the-art innovative job-creating solve-all-problems technology, and thus does not require of anyone really having to make any sacrifices today. If our children want clean air, water, food, and energy, no worries, capitalism will gladly sell it to them, together with a new cool videogame, that's how the whole landscape is set up in order to maintain consumer dependency. The 'regime level actors' are basically all of us voters, who are currently making the most immoral people to their leaders, and despite the best progressive attempts to save what we can while we still can, by the time a mind-shift might finally gain momentum, I'm afraid our nations will have run out of cheap fiat-money to invest in the quick solutions needed.

Community Land Trusts have a great many benefits and challenges which many people in this MOOC have already commented on. I'm not going to add to the list but want to discuss this from the human behavior perspective.

Community Land Trusts operate in a much different way than individual farmers. Trusts such as Terre de Liens, Champlain Housing Trust have a common goal and a vision for all members of the Trust and operate in a co-operative way. Individual farmers on the other hand operate in their own self-interest. For example I was part of an organization trying to organize many new young local farmers to join a "Processing Coop" so they could have a central place to process their unsold product as well as coordinating planting processes so farmers wouldn’t all be growing the same crop and flood the market with the same products all at the same time. In the end self-interest won the day and the coop didn’t materialize.

So the question becomes do we have to change social behavior in order implement a new
economic system? I think this is the biggest challenge to creating a new economy. Once social behavior changes it will be a quick change to a new economy. The world is addicted to continual growth like an alcoholic is addicted to alcohol. The alcoholic can’t change until he or she reaches rock bottom and realizes they need to change their behavior.

First step is to change thinking from operating in our own self-interest to operating in a co-operative manner. After reading Polanyi we see that early traders started with people operating in their own self-interest importing products which helped to make people’s lives easier. Early traders didn’t realize they were upsetting local markets and local people didn’t realize they were disrupting local markets until it was too late. Same as today people started to support the big chains in their own self-interest and didn’t realize they were disrupting local markets. The new economy needs to show people that it is in their best interest to support new emerging economy. We are starting to see that with the growth of local farmer markets, buy local campaigns, join a co-op and growth in the environmental movement. We might still be a long way from reaching the hundredth monkey.

Strategies for implementing system change I believe should include creating and promoting more positive outcomes similar to the Loess Plateau, Champlain Heights, CLT etc. This in turn will show people what communities working together can do. I see lots of actions worldwide such as Drawdown, Green New Deal, Leap Manifesto and New Economy for Social Innovation taking place which show that change is in the air.

I have enjoyed read all the contributions to this module.
Clearly addresses the key environmental causes of climate breakdown
Implementation of these solutions will lead to a sustainable, safer, more just world for all

Challenges are more involved and intertwined with Limitations.

While it may be true that these 80 solutions “exist” and are in process in some form and to varying extents, they all require massive inputs of money and resources and will take years to implement fully. Consider just the first “solution”, Refrigerant Management: a meeting is held in 2016 and the solution to begin this year, 3 years later! Substitutes are “on the market” which is good. But who is buying them? When will these products hit the market, not just for consumers but for very large refrigerant users? This solution will be fully implemented, if their optimistic targets are indeed met, by 2028. Given the environmental crisis we face, and only 12 years in which to deal with it (the IPCC Special Report was completed in Oct. 2018), that cuts the timing for this one solution alarmingly close!

Of the first 5 solutions, 4 of them require significant commitment and coordination between the Regime (national governments) and Landscape (the wealthy and their corporations) actors. Only the call for a “plant-rich diet” reaches the grassroots in a bottom up approach for changing unsustainable farming and food production processes. There are significant logistical challenges to some of these solutions. Ocean-based wind turbines, for example is a good alternative to fossil fuels.

But what will the footprint of those farms be? What impact will the installation of those turbines have on sea life? Studies done in Europe have shown that the noise of installing them affects sea mammals (like all undersea noise generated by human activity), and the constant hum of the whirring blades, amplified underwater affects fish migration patterns.

It is also concerning when large swaths of forest is clearcut to make way for solar farm arrays. However, the major challenge to implementing the Solutions contained in Drawdown is cultural. People must be willing to change, not only their eating habits, but their lifestyle as well.

In the Loess Plateau project, the government took the lead in doing the research and developing solutions. It is noteworthy that rather than just have people to do the work as directed, they took the time to seek villager buy-in by including them in all phases of the process and helping them to understand why change was needed and the benefits they would receive.
Reflections from this week… I couldn’t decide on one topic though.

The Enclosure Movement - The existing paradigm of law and order was of course designed and developed by the already rich and powerful. For England and the Commonwealth the Magna Carta was the King handing over power to an already existent hierarchy of Lords, Knights and Barons. They had the means to further serve themselves and enclose the land served just that.

Learning – don’t worry about lobbying government for ‘better’ laws and taxes, they are populated by believers in big business and neo-liberal doctrine. Far more effective to invent the new system in parallel. Bucky’s favourite view.

Limited Equity Housing Co-ops, a supporting finance mechanism for getting groups started.

Something the Netherlands did really well in the 80’s/90’s to solve their housing affordability issue. In Sweden, where they also adopted the approach, the housing co-ops are the basis of the ‘learning circles’ that are said to be the generator for action on reducing the country’s emissions. A target of being carbon neutral by 2045. Currently they are reportedly 26% down on 1990 levels.

Why – collectivising debt responsibly and managing housing for long term affordability takes some pressure off the need for the economy to ‘grow’. A function of the need to pay the compounding interest of Banks. Housing more than people, housing co-ops are an effective form of grassroots politics.

Community Land Trusts, another way of housing much more than just people. Add mixed use wholistic co-design and there is tremendous potential for the local provision of life essentials – food, energy, craft, plantations, education, healing….

Why – out of all the material for this unit it spoke the most strongly towards stewardship. A mechanism that provides secure tenure, a voice in your ‘hood’.

Participatory Planning – the success of the Loess Plateau seemed to hinge on engaging with the local community to develop the solution, to be put in place on the ground. Attaching responsibilities to the provision of land title was a great twist.

Why – everyone appreciates being asked what they think, add that to the priming from technical experts in various fields and there is great potential for leaps.

Design Thinking – evident in the Drawdown project. What do we want, a safe climate? How to we get it? Sequester the CO2 we put up there via the full suite of solutions available.

If we took a local approach to this thinking, with participatory planning or co-design, with a networked CLT approach (not just one place based project) we could replicate government to the point of either being a powerful lobbying body and/or making it obsolete.

The most powerful thought for me to come out of the material is to Re-Indigenise… to reconnect
with the consciousness of nature, evolution and ultimately ourselves.

Why – proof found in the best eg. of forest management in the Oxfam report.

Module 2: Reflections Exercise Part II

If we are to truly address climate breakdown, there is more to be “drawn down” than just carbon. We must also draw down expectations for GROWTH.

There is no benefit, as I alluded to in Part I to polluting the oceans with windmills, clear cutting the land for solar farms, or establishing free-range factory farms. We must draw down SCALE as well.

In contrast, experiments like the Loess Plateau project, Terre de Liens, and community land trusts are inspiring. They show, on a small scale, what is possible on a larger one.

Landscape actors, with billions of dollars, can erase thousands of acres of forest, blow the tops off many mountains, extract tons of minerals, and destroy the lives of countless people and other creatures in a day.

Their power and influence seem invincible; we can come to believe that indeed, TINA.

Culture and culture change must be directed; that direction can come from the bottom-up through social movements that raise awareness (Poor People’s Campaign) or top-down by government fiat or the imposition of change over which people have no control (i.e. driverless cars). If we are to see rapid implementation of solutions as presented in Drawdown in over-developed countries, it appears that culture change must come from the top-down.

However, I have hope that movements social, political, environmental, and scientific are the means to speed up culture shift. Extinction Rebellion, Sunrise Movement, projects like Cooperation Jackson in Mississippi, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, and yes even The Green New Deal as well as millions of democratically-run cooperatives around the world have power to persuade, inform, teach, and motivate.

The growth of People’s Assemblies throughout Latin America, global movements for Indigenous People’s Rights, Rights of Nature laws, and the recognition of human rights for non-human animals are all beacons of progress and a shift in cultural thinking.
Unlikely as it might seem, I feel science is almost as difficult object to be move as perception since science/technology has been so closely intertwined with “progress’ (i.e. economic growth). There is an arrogance about science that is hard to critique or counter. All a climate denier can do to counter the science is to admit,” I’m not a scientist…”. We have little to no control over the research or application of science in our daily lives.

Wendell Berry had a great deal to say about science and its application in our daily lives. He said, “The standards of our behavior must be derived, not from the capability of technology, but from the nature of places and communities”.

Or as Ghandi phrased it as one of the 7 Deadly sins: **Science without Humanity**

In the above scenario where change is driven from the grassroots, Landscape actors become irrelevant albeit not impotent. There is work to be done to move The Regime; a daunting task, indeed.

---

I am becoming engaged in setting up a land trust for non-profit co-operative housing in my city. The Terre de Liens model provided a compelling example for this work.

**Benefits**

1. The very active role of the trust in development with an integrated strategy. Some land trust models I have seen are very passive as holders of the assets and rely on convincing other partners to lead and manage development on the land. This one is more purposeful and more provide more in depth supporting infrastructure and services for the members as an integral part of the land trust, rather than relying on outside partners.

2. Withdrawable shares - the capacity for allow the inflow and outflow of capital in a matter that still safeguards the sustainability of the trust is very intriguing. My understanding is that most land trusts are evergreen investments where initial investors do not expect to be able to withdraw their
initial principal investment. Tierre de Liens ability to enable investment withdrawals is the first such example I have encountered. This would make it attractive to initial investing partners/individuals who are not sure they would like to make "evergreen investments" with no real hope of withdrawal in the medium term. It would be easier to attract initial capital this way. It can also be used to raise specific capital to support specific projects within the land trust. e.g. the land trust could issue a capital call for withdrawable shares that could support a specific project.

Challenges

1. Land trust and securities regulation would be a significant barrier to implementing this model in Canada. Securities regulations in Canada limit the flow of capital for those entities not issuing prospectus.

2. Enabling more fluidity capital in and out of trust (and investment co-operatives) has the potential of bleeding into investment speculation, which can pervert the main mission of security of tenure and removing assets from the market.

A limitation in general for land trusts is while it addresses the need for long term land tenure, as a structure is can undermine the need for individuals and families to build up assets. By far the most common way of doing this is to purchase a home, farm or land. Mechanisms that enable marginalized communities to build up assets need to be developed in parallel to land trusts to enable upward economic mobility.

I plan on making a much more detailed study of Tierre de Liens as I enter deeper into land trust exploration in my community.

Jacqueline Thompson
https://learn.canvas.net/courses/2527/users/889545
Apr 14, 2019
Years ago (2005-9-ish) I was party to an Ontario Municipal Board hearing (fight) over a big "transition" from farm to sprawl (300+ acres) in the Doon South area of Kitchener. By the time I quit (too depleted, family and work suffering, worried about SLAPP lawsuit, etc.), the head of the City's Planning Dept was the head of the Developer's Planning Dept. "Better" gig, no doubt.

Courage, (even if I lost mine) Jacqueline!
Terre de Liens

a.- Benefits

- No doubt the coming together of community seriously committed to sustainable use of the land plus others interested providing financial resources to keep it that way is a win win situation.

- Land use is a collective effort and this approach facilitates of exchanges of knowledge, expertise and experience.

- It takes an integral approach to territorial development since it brings together different actors and allows for maximainzing the use of instruments to work the land and share the benefits.

b.- Challenges

- Searching for investors makes bring a degree of uncertainty to any plan.

- Get public institutions interested since they would be providing public funds can be risky for the authorities involved.

- Address the issues of climate change, in agricultural production, provide the whole project a degree of risk that it is difficult to calculate, even though is not impossible.

c. Limitations

- Availability of land.

- Hard competition with realtors and increase urbanisation.

- Young farmers staying in the land without clear certainty of long term financial and technical support.

The plus of Terre de Liens is that keep bringing innovation through practice and is interested the wholeness of the approach, is not only increase production and financial success, but that rural development remains in the hands of the community and by creating good livelihood and one way to make the land sustainable.
incorporating all the levels of governance and influence, starting with the Riley Foundation, who seem to have been the initial outside influence on change - having funds to get the project going, and who eventually realized that they needed to allow the citizens to be in the driver's seat; that their job was facilitation. The recognition that the board of directors needed to be chosen from local citizens, including members from each of the ethnic groups who lived there. Then there was the publicity aspect, where one of their community organizers used radio and door to door canvassing to unite the very disparate groups. There was involvement on the city level, who provided equipment for the neighbourhood clean-ups and Stephen Coyle of the Boston Redevelopment Authority came to work closely with the citizens groups. The redevelopment was enhanced by Roy Flynn's using the project in his election campaign, and the state level became involved through people like Gloria Fox at the State level. The result of getting the powers that be engaged and on side was that the city gave the DSNI $134 million to develop their plan, and a plan that the citizens themselves hired a company (David Nesbitt) that listened to the citizens and manifested their plans, not those imposed from above.

In short, the key was having all levels involved from grassroots to the governance and political levels. The plan was very well executed and involved bottom up and top down interests, meeting in the middle. Houses were built, citizens groups did most of the clean up, including instituting and organizing a youth group. Once houses were built, people purchased them. The key was "people investing themselves to make a change," and believing in the possibility.

The classic CLT model includes a multi-stakeholder non-profit organization designed to take land out of the private market and transform its use for community benefit. This model has been copied throughout North America and Europe, in many different forms. Once the land is owned by the community, the trust then has control over who lives there and what is done with the land. The challenge that appears to me is that the energy must be maintained to keep the land in accordance with the original plan, and not allow control to accrue to one or a small number of individuals. The idea of an elected Council comprised of all stakeholders, with regular turnover of council members, is crucial in maintaining the cooperative as originally envisaged, as a true participatory democracy. By 1997 the first homes were built in the DSNI, and the film made in 2015 gave the impression that this CLT continues to be very successful, with many community groups having been formed over the years. As in any cooperative endeavour, it is important that everyone takes part in the maintenance of the cooperative, and that can be challenging in these days of individualism and the nuclear family.
1. Drawdown

Benefits:

- The comprehensive, multi-faceted nature of the solutions
- The efficacy of the solutions have been well evidenced through modelling and research
- The land use solutions proposed will reduce emissions from deforestation and degradation of ecosystems
- What is proposed is extant, the solutions are mostly already feasible. It is the ramping up of each that is the challenge
- Likely to have additional knock on benefits such as enhanced biodiversity

Challenges:

- As noted above though the solutions proposed are extant it is the ramping up to the level required to mitigate emissions that is challenging
- Large scale, top down nature of solutions proposed. The solutions feel institutional and are not community driven or coming from the bottom up
- There is an inevitable tension between the some of the land use solutions proposed such as forest protection and the competing drives of people to exploit available resources and make ends meet
- The solutions require political will to advance given the large investment required
- The vested interest of the status quo
- Great intention with out the movement(s) or the mechanisms necessary to bring them about at the larger scale required and make them effective. Really it is a list of great ideas without the process for making them happen to the level required to reduce emissions

Limitations

- To generalise Drawdown is not a paradigm shift away from the insanity of perpetual economic growth and neoliberalism but Hawken and his team clearly never envisaged it being the case. It is a pragmatic attempt to offer solutions within the boundaries/limitations of the current economic paradigm and for the most part using technologies and ideas already available.
- As noted above Drawdown lacks the social movement(s) & mechanisms required to spread and scale the solutions outlined and achieve the necessary decarbonisation.

2. Review:

Viewing Drawdown with a MLP lens it feels almost like the limits of the kinds of proposals that might be put forward by the guardians of the status quo and the current regime of the market economy. It offers a degree of change but is it the necessary transformational shift in human activity that might allow us to solve climate change and live truly more sustainably on the planet, I don't think so. The actual solutions that we need will involve considerable transformation of our economic system away from neoliberal capitalism and reduction in our compulsion for consumption to a more balanced relationship with the land and planet. Though laudable I'm not seeing enough here to get me excited. As I say though the solutions proposed are clearly preferable to our current path. Contrasting the Drawdown solutions with the niche ideas/movements discerned from our look
at the post-disaster recovery situation in Puerta Rico in module one, one is struck by the absence of a popular movement(s) to advance the amplification required. There is a disconnect between the ideas and the people power needed to accelerate them. As the FAQ section of the Drawdown website states: "Project Drawdown’s role is not to implement these solutions". What is required though and key for amplification is moving beyond the modelling and research to a wide ranging communications strategy that better connects with those people, grassroots movements and communities that could implement them.

Stephen this is a such a thoughtful reflection. I wonder though about your what seems like your conclusion that the Drawdown solutions are not a step away from the neo-liberal paradigm and the growth imperative embedded within it. It is true that among the solutions there will be contributions to ‘growth’. My question to you is any growth that is embedded in any particular solution, and the economic benefits that may flow from it, not so qualitatively different and require such a fundamentally different way of focusing priorities and resources. that it has the potential for shaking the very roots of the current paradigm.

I appreciate your setting out of the challenges related to financing what are clearly economically viable, costs saving investments. Though economic, several will certainly not be profitable in and of themselves, thus the need to think about money and finance from a very different perspective. Not easy.

I further agree on the importance of movements driving the politics necessary to advance such solutions. I could not agree more. We will think about some ways and means of advancing this on the macro-systems level. What is interesting to me is the Green New Deal is entering the scene at so many different levels - from grassroots activists across the globe and a growing raft of seasoned politicians at different levels and even some central bankers. Will be looking forward to carrying on the discussion you have opened up. Hopefully others will weigh in as well.

1. Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative: CLT

Benefits:

- Dudley Neighbors Inc. is a CLT that utilized a land trust model that ensures homes remain affordable and honors development without displacement. The DSNI collaborated with
community partners to implement 3 main features: sustained emphasis on community organizing and empowerment, long-term comprehensive view of planning, and active community governance. Organization came from residents, primary and secondary non-profits, community development corps, small businesses, religious organizations, the youth of the community, university scholars, and elected community residents. The CLT addressed jobs, education, urban agriculture, affordable housing, and community building.

Challenges:

- Some of the challenges that Dudley Street encountered was the question of 'how do you develop confidence in a community and individuals to speak, to stand up for, to strive, to fight, and to have hope for' a better way of life. The challenge in investing in themselves to carry out the initiative. The Dudley Street area was devastated by arson, trash, abandoned cars, the dumping of trash, vacant lots, and boarded up buildings, therefore this was challenging re-purposing priority to strategize change.

Limitations:

- The limitations I noticed that Dudley Street encountered were prior to the advanced community involvement. Encouraging and obtaining multiple perspectives in every culture involved, to implement long-term strategies on all ends of the spectrum to invoke positive change.

2. What emerged to me was that there is proof of the needed change. The insight is moving past the challenges that are holding us back and be bold. Creating a target approach in getting the people of the community to cooperate and collaborate on the key essentials for a sustainable community.

DUDLEY STREET

Benefits

There are many benefits to the formation of Dudley Street's Community Land Trust.

Firstly, it connected a divided community which, over time, had changed demographics from a white mono-culture to one of multiple racial and national differences.

Secondly, the trust created a demographically elected platform in the formation of their elected board which has a fair representation of the community that got local citizens, including the youth, as well as businesses actively involved in their community, becoming a co-partner with the City to determine what happened in their city, where and how resources were deployed.

Most relevantly, the community land trust ensured that land was safeguarded against speculative
development, and through the CLT ensured that locals had access to affordable accommodation and business premises.

CHALLENGERS

The wide demographics of age, race, nationality created language barriers and a divided, isolated community. This community was not used to being politically involved and active and making a stand for themselves. The initiators created a platform to have business and people come together to help take back ownership of their community. Investing in multiple platforms to communicate from radio through to posters etc to discuss the opportunity of the CLT through to the establishment of a representative board enabled a new voice of a connected, resilient community who knew how to take action.

A further challenge was creating platform to work with the political system and to have the City take the CLT seriously. It needed the City to recognize the power of the CLT in the community in order to become a co-partner in the management of the area.

LIMITS TO DESIGN

The success of the project is dependent on the continued and fair participation of the community members. The role of politics can impact the success of the project if there is a poor relationship between the CLT's board and the City as and how the parties of power hold position. The model is only as successful s the participation of the community involved in it.

LANDSCAPE, REGIME

The landscape that characterized Dudley Street was like many geared towards gentrification of the area where poverty, crime, abandoned buildings were the norm. It took a few locals to come together to innovate a different future. The regime created was through the multi-level perspective very effective as the project moved from being an investors development to being a community resource which resulted in the community moving from a disconnected conglomeration of people who all faced eventual eviction and out-pricing of the area into one where multiple races and backgrounds could come together to establish a community land trust thus preserving the resource for future inhabitants of the area and learning to have a political voice thus ensuring that there was fair voice and vote with regards to working with the City.

https://urbanomnibus.net/2018/01/community-land-trusts/
Drawdown

Benefits

- The forests are the lungs of the world, we need to ensure our planet breathes fully and healthily. This is related to the function of being carbon sinks for what is produced.
- Protection and restoration of forests protects and nurtures biodiversity, which is essential to the full health of our planet and ourselves.
- The aspect of Indigenous Land Management is profound; the gratitude and care of nurturing and respecting/protecting the earth as a provider with the impact of all decisions and actions to the 7th generation to ensure sustainability would dramatically alter how we have relationship to the land.
- While a shift in paradigms, beliefs, attitudes, and actions are required to enact this approach, success with this approach would also serve to shift paradigms, beliefs, attitudes, and actions.

Challenges

- Those most directly affected by deforestation, and looking for sustainable solutions, are likely not those in most control of the land.
- Those most in control likely have economic and political imperatives for quick (profit/jobs) results that are not equally met with long-term thinking and solutions.
- Tyranny of the urgent may mean those experiencing subsistence living feel they can’t afford to think long-term when they need to generate cash immediately to provide for their family, and this may not be aligned with the drawdown approach.
- A lack of awareness/knowledge/imagination of the full range of benefits and opportunities in the drawdown model would limit the actors’ ability and desire to believe it is the better option.

Limitations

- It won’t change all the systems itself, but the overall system also won’t sufficiently change without this. It is an extremely significant component of the overall required changes.
- The factors listed above in ‘challenges’ would also present limitations.

Landscape/Regime

- As mentioned above, there are many levels of actors (governments and corporations) that have the most control of the lands, and the least perceived direct incentive/motive to create a long term sustainable plan, while those experiencing subsistence living may not feel the luxury of long-term thinking and planning/actions. Many local residents will know and understand the direct and global benefits both in shorter and long term sustainability models, but they may lack any power/ownership/control to influence actions and outcomes.
- A clear example of the power and impact of land ownership. It isn’t the scientists, Indigenous peoples, the average global and local citizen concerned about climate change, or the children being born 7 generations from now that own the land - who would make very different decisions. And those who do own the land aren’t accountable to those most impacted.
Hey Brendan. Would be interesting to think about drawdown might look like in the Manitoba context when it comes to forests, grasslands, and ecologically sensitive grazing practices. How would one build the awareness and build the coalitions that might have a chance at shifting a significant allocation of resources to the ecological restoration of these sectors? You might want to take a look a module 7 to help you think about the role of the Federal government in creation of non-debt based money as a means of helping provinces and communities undertake this work.

---

Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative

**BENEFITS**

- communal
  - Of the twelve sectors considered basic needs in Raworth's Doughnut Economy, CLTs by their nature focus primarily on housing
  - 300 new homes and 300 housing units rehabbed as affordable housing over long-term
  - Its own governing body with seats designated for ethnic groups and for community organizations increased the social equity, peace and justice and political voice of the community and networks within it by breaking down isolation of tribes, four more of Raworth’s basic needs
  - Urban agriculture also improves health and adds food, yet another basic need
  - Town Common, gardens, parks, playgrounds improve both physical and mental health, another basic need
  - These highly visible successes must also contribute to a sense of achieving more justice, yet another basic need
  - Partnership with Promise Schools (public charter schools) contributes to education--yup, another basic need
  - Youth opportunities & development in the organization is also educational; additionally, it gives group long term sustainability as young people active in the organization stay in the community and continue to invest themselves in its well being
  - Judging by the number of women holding leadership roles, the basic need of gender equality is being modeled.

- societal
  - blighted neighborhood now more productive and pleasant
  - The initiative is a model for low income neighborhood revitalization elsewhere
ecological gardens, urban agriculture, and parks absorb more CO2, generally improve air, soil

CHALLENGES TO ADVANCING

- according to “Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative” at community-wealth.org:
  - lack of access to jobs, high unemployment and poverty
  - lack of public transportation contributes to ongoing unemployment and poverty
  - schools still failing
- Without improving these, the neighborhood, though attractive, will remain vulnerable.

LIMITATIONS AS A VEHICLE FOR SYSTEMS CHANGE

- Initially too dependent on individuals, in this case, Che Madyun and Robert Holmes, Jr., trustee of the Riley Foundation, a small family philanthropy. She asked how many of those coming to help lived in the neighborhood. He managed to overcome his initial reaction that she was an agitator and actually listen. If she hadn’t asked or he hadn’t listened, there would not have been a Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative and the area’s problems would likely have worsened.
- This fortuitous beginning cannot be reliably replicated, meaning most CLT initiatives will not begin in truly poverty stricken neighborhoods but will come from the top down.

Multi-Level Perspective on the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative

LANDSCAPE

- property speculation
- gentrification
- middle and owner class ignorance about lives of working class and people in poverty

REGIME

- city government of Boston
- illegal transfer stations that dumped trash and toxic waste in neighborhood vacant lots
- Riley Foundation, a small family philanthropy; with Robert Holmes, Jr., trustee

NICHE

- Self-governing Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative / CLT

Insights into Strategies Relevant to Spreading Innovations and Systems Change

- A trustee, part of the regime, had to listen to a resident’s challenge to start the DSNT. In Burlington, VT, it took the mayor as a member of the regime, and in the Camden area of London, it took a businessman with a vested interest in the regime to spend months to start CLTs. Who in the lower classes can necessarily count on such regime support?
- So cross-class alliances working together are necessary if the poor are to benefit when system change requires regime approval.
- Yet each class learns different “rules” for what works for their own class and assumes “Everyone knows that!” So I found classmatters.org, “Tips from Working Class Activists,” about how the more privileged can work respectfully with low income classes.
- **Put Relationships First**
  - Start by spending time sharing personal stories to build bonds of trust.
  - Accept that “inefficiently” rambling discussions still lead to plans and strategies.

- **Talk Less, Listen More**
  - Don’t try to dominate the process just because you can talk faster and more articulately.
  - You don’t know the problem solving strengths of other classes.

- **Hang In**
  - If the low-income people you’re trying to work with push you away, keep coming back until you build trust. Good intentions aren’t enough. Prove you’re reliable.
  - Engage even if it’s inconvenient and stressful and doesn’t fit your schedule.

- **Watch Your Language**
  - If you use unfamiliar words, explain them in simple, down to earth terms.
  - Link your information to the reasons it’s important in the community.
  - Even quite literate low-income people get most information in spoken form, so don’t assume they will read printed material. Talk to them.

- **Use Your Privilege**
  - In private, ask low-income leaders about ways your knowledge and ability to talk in the logical and linear style the regime will take more seriously can serve their goals.

- **Recognize Working Class People’s Constraints**
  - If you’re doing the planning, provide childcare.
  - Plan meetings around people’s work hours. In a farming community, meet after dark.
  - Meet with millworkers after their shifts.

---

Sandra this is a very generative reflection. Your naming of basic needs in the Dudley street context to Raworths graphic was striking. Interesting how you identified the challenges in advancing the model, the uniqueness of the circumstances, the importance of building individual relationships across class and then, in the end, digging up a very practical resource to guide people in building relationship across class and racial divides. I think you properly picked up on the limitation of the difficulty of replication, at least as you identified it, the uniqueness of the cross-class relationship. However, I would encourage you to think further about the role of organizing from within the community, the active resistance to city dumping practices, that at the end of the day, helped create the context for what followed.

Nice work Sandra.

---