



Humans: The Bull in Nature's China Shop

Janet Sumner

Welcome to the Clear Cut.

[Music]

Janet Sumner

Hi, I'm Janet Sumner, Executive Director at Wildlands League.

Kaya Adleman

And I'm Kaya Adleman, Carbon Manager at Wildlands League.

Janet Sumner

Wildlands League is a Canadian conservation organization, working on protecting the natural world.

Kaya Adleman

[The Clear Cut](#) is bringing to you the much-needed conversation on Canadian Forest Management, and how we can better protect one of Canada's most important ecosystems as our forests are reaching a tipping point.

Kaya Adleman

Welcome back to The Clear Cut. We're back this week with our third and final part to our conversation with Canadian conservationist Harvey Locke. If you might remember where we left off, Harvey was talking about how we would fit his nature climate nexus idea that is combining nature and climate policies into the same framework. How that would fit within our current economic system.



Janet Sumner

So I'm really excited about this next episode with Harvey, and he's going to take us down a path where we're talking about the corporation, which seems a little bit odd, but it's talking about when was the last time we had to get really creative and think about the economic system and how it could solve a problem. And throughout the two episodes and into the third one, Harvey does a really good job of articulating what our current problem is, which is we've developed an architecture around solving, hopefully, solving the smokestack tailpipe part of the carbon equation. But it's silent for the most part on how do we solve the other aspects of the climate cycle problem. And you can't just like paste it into the existing architecture kids and end up with all kinds of perverted incentives where you have planting trees, offsetting emissions that are actually just growing. So this is a this is a, he's going to lead us down the path now on the corporate side of things and how he had to rethink corporations as entities, for good and for ill. But it is an example of how we can get very creative.

Kaya Adleman

Right. And it's quite interesting. So it's exciting to see all of the ideas that he has with that.

Janet Sumner

And just wait for help kind of brings it all back to Taylor Swift.

Kaya Adleman

Yeah, I try. I try my best.

[Music]

Harvey Locke

And what we know is governments are not prepared to put up the kind of money that's needed to do this. They're all saying, like the global biodiversity framework says, we need the private sector to fund more nature conservation. Okay, well, they're not going to do that for charitable reasons beyond a very small amount. We know that. So, what's the economic reason they would do it? Well, let's development one. And people go well, you know, gosh, that's a pretty fundamental change. I don't know, you know? If it hasn't been done, then what do we you know. Well, we are capable of solving big problems for



government intervention and then getting out of the way of letting the private sector do things, and if I'm not rambling too much, I'll give two clear examples that that are profound, a profound effect on where we are that show that we can do this. And this is truly an all hands-on deck thing. And I think we in the environmental community also need to let go a little bit on this and invite people who understand money into fashioning the solution. So, this is a big tent idea. But I'll give you two examples of when interventions were made by governments that created profound economic opportunity and that are now part of our daily lives. The simple one that we're taking advantage of at the moment is the Internet. That was developed as a means of defense communication and then made available to everyone, and the private sector was allowed to figure out how to optimize and monetize it. Everyone's life has been affected by that. But the governments did that. That didn't come from the private sector. More profound and even more significant is in the 19th century, the Industrial Revolution started. The Industrial Revolution required large amounts of capital. The laws at the time were that you were liable to the extent, full extent of your personal worth for any investment you made, and you were deemed a partner for anybody, you went into business with. Meaning you were personally responsible for all of their conduct too. So that's all partnership law and the old law of unlimited liability if you do something commercially. So, then you have something come along like a railroad. A railroad needs vast amounts of capital and they're very risky. Well, no one would put up the money who had the money because they didn't want to lose all of their like, say, you're an English nobleman, you have vast estates and landholdings, you'd like to invest, but you're not going to put everything you inherited since William the Conqueror at risk to buy railway stocks. So, they invented the corporation. Legislature created this legal fiction an invented person, called the corporation. And they allowed the corporation whole property, buy and sell property, hire and fire people. And they allowed the corporation to insulate its investors to just the amount of money they chose to invest. And they couldn't go past that amount into the people's pockets beyond that. And you weren't deemed a partner of the people who were operating the company. So all of a sudden you could decide to risk \$1,000,000 or \$10 or whatever number in the hope that you would get more back, but you were never responsible beyond that. So your risk is your table stakes. That is the foundation of the modern economy. Government intervention solved the problem by inventing a person, and now in the United States, it has a freedom of speech, this invented person. It's extraordinary. So we created this whole fictional thing to solve an economic problem. Now, surely we have the creativity to figure out how to make it an incentive for that same kind of money to stabilize the planet, which is now degrading hand over fist and putting all of us at risk, including all of the most wealthy people's capital. Your money isn't safe if Europe is overwhelmed with the refugee crisis or the climate shifts so much that there's no water coming to your house anymore. No one is safe from sea level rise except for maybe a few islands that you could build a 20-foot wall around. No one is safe from the loss of freshwater. And this is our moment. So surely if we can have this conversation with enough people and say, bring your creativity to bear, this is a problem like the thing that led to the invention of the corporation. And now people can't even, people don't even know that there's an origin story to the corporation. It's just such a fact of life that it's always been there, and it is a thing. Well, no, it hasn't always been there. It's about 170 years old. And it's the foundation of the market economy we have now, and all the prosperity and investment cycles, everything. And that's the kind of thinking we need



now on an urgent basis. And we need governments to play their role in creating the field, and then we need the private sector money to be available to help solve this problem or else everyone's money is at risk. And if your money's at risk, that's only because it's a surrogate for going back to your societies at risk, which is really what matters. Human society is right now at risk. And it's at risk because we're degrading the environment on which we wholly depend. And that goes back to the simple conceptual framework of the nested hierarchy. Nature is the context for everything, including all human affairs. Human society is a rich place where family exists and recreation exists, economic activity exists, and then a subset of that is the economic activity. And so the economic activity has to serve human society or it's not appropriate. And to say that it gets to destroy not only human society, but the context of all life is a very confused frame of mind.

[Music]

Janet Sumner

So, a couple of things here. One is Harvey references a few times the overwhelming nature of the refugee crisis in Europe. And the reason he's mentioning that is and it's quite common to discuss that in environmental circles, because we've been predicting this for some time, that there's going to be what we call an environmentally caused refugee crisis, where environment start to change so rapidly in places where humanity cannot adapt. And the legal systems, the economic systems, the very systems of life start to collapse. And so whole societies will start to collapse, war will break out, etc. and we'll have, you know, droughts or floods, whatever it is, that starts to drive the system that supports thriving economies and societies and crumbles. And so, when that happens, then we have people escaping war torn areas, and so the route might not be recognized as environmental, but we can see these environmental hotspots around the world and it's driving refugees to seek other regions. And it can be at the core root of challenges, whether it's a lack of fresh water or maybe the harvest has collapsed or maybe there's desertification. And we're seeing this is a contributing factor to how we how we see refugee movement. It's a big deal. How we how we work with nature, how we coexist with nature, and how our economic system is integrated and is foundationally supported by nature, is not something that we can just deal with this climate policy and expect everything about smokestacks and tailpipes. And I, Kaya I want to ask you, I mean, I knew this because I'd seen this movie about it, but were you aware of the invention of the of the corporation or where did you come to that knowledge?

Kaya Adleman

Oh yeah, don't even get me started. Janet. I've written many a term paper on this in university. But my background is America, so this might be a little bit of a US centric mindset, but the invention of the



corporation in the U.S. also came around as a result of the Railroad Citizens United case in the US. That came out 2007 or 2008 I want to say...I'll have to fact check that. But that basically gave corporations in the U.S. and Harvey also references this, the right to free speech, essentially. But not just the right to free speech. It's the idea that money equals free speech. And so corporations can then fund political campaigns just as a very base bare bones description of what that was. So that kind of allowed the lobbying of corporations, of our government officials. There's that. So that's when I first became aware of the corporation. But that's why you see a lot of lobbying in the US on behalf of the fossil fuel industry and other companies that have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo or not wanting to see certain progressive environmental or climate policies or a nature policies being passed. And so, when I started to become interested in environmental issues, the idea that corporations have a huge influence in the policy space. So that's my take on that question.

Janet Sumner

Yeah. So you're speaking on the negative side, so, or outcomes of that. But I mean, what Harvey's referencing there, which is very interesting, is we've been creative before. Let's get creative and find a solution and maybe it's something as audacious and maybe not as damaging, obviously, as creating an invention or a fiction of a personhood for a corporation, because we can argue that all day long on whether or not that's been a good, good idea. But I think what he's pointing out is there's a way to harness it so that you can get investment, you can create, create an idea that will allow you to harness the money to do some of the maybe the nation building things that you want to see. And we can argue whether or not railroads have been nation building or helped or hurt. But great explosions of human invention happened because of, because of this fact that we created - the corporation. And so how do how do we have something maybe not equally as audacious, but we need something to help solve this conundrum, because the policy framework right now is limited.

[Music]

Kaya Adleman

Janet, you were talking about how like we're all, like how, or how it's not feasible to not protect nature because it's a threat to all of our livelihoods, right? But I think what I find is that a lot of, is that there's a huge element to like wealth inequality in this. And that's kind of what draws me, I think, to environmental issues is because they kind of touch like every facet of human society, too. And I think when I speak to people about the threat of climate change, of the biodiversity crises, of not protecting nature to people, it's, I think now with the forest fires over the summer and stuff, it's becoming more pertinent. But I think there's kind of a safety that people like who have a lot of wealth and contribute



the most to climate change and biodiversity loss and natural destruction. There's like a safety that they feel and that they'll always have their wealth and then there's no interest in creating the change because they don't want to, you know, change the way that things are going now for them. I mean, we were talking about Taylor Swift earlier, like she doesn't want to talk about forest carbon accounting because she contributes the most to climate change out of every any celebrity with her private jet flights or, I don't know, like Kim Kardashian hired private firefighters to fight fires in her home in Calabasas. I think I think now, like the urgency is becoming more pertinent, like people are starting to. But I think people in the West and especially wealthy people in the West kind of feel like the sense of safety and maybe don't have this...there's kind of a there is like a block to engaging in that mindset.

Harvey Locke

Sure. So you're talking about, you know, the vision of the world that that interests me is one that's nature positive, carbon neutral and equitable. And those things are bundled together. Right. And inequities lead to distortions. And 'll come back a little bit to some of the specifics you asked about Kaya, but I want to go, when I do that, I want to answer Janet's question at the same time. So, I'm going to read to you from the climate convention. So remember, the goal of the climate convention is to avoid adverse effects of climate change. Okay? That's, that's what it's for. This is the definition of adverse effects of climate change. Means changes in the physical environment or biota resulting from climate change, which have significant deleterious effects on the composition resilience or productivity of natural and managed ecosystems, or on the operation of socio-economic systems or on human health and welfare. That's, you just both asked me about those, right? That's the definition of what we're worried about for the climate. Did you know that? You mean it's not parts per billion? No parts per million is a thing that causes those problems and it matters. But this is what we're trying to do to solve the climate crisis. So, if we go now back to what you're asking me about about disproportionate wealth and and so on. The really interesting thing is that the degradation of the natural world is a great equalizer. I don't care who you were this summer, if you were living in a place where you couldn't go outside to breathe the air, it comes and gets everyone. And if you're living in Pakistan when the Indus River, through the horrible mismanagement of the riparian system, the hydrology of the Indus River has been horribly mismanaged. Those giant floods occurred. Exacerbating the problem didn't matter if you were the richest person on the Indus River or the poorest person and the Indus River, you got wiped out your factory, your house or your bank even would be underwater. So this idea that you can hire private firefighters, private firefighters and be safe is an illusion. No one is safe. This is all of our problems. And, you know, there's this, this theory. Well, you know, I think it was a Margaret Atwood novel that talked about people moving to Hudson Bay and having their fortresses there, too, to stay safe with climate change. Well, I'll make a little confession here. I live in Banff, so Banff's a pretty good place in a climate change world. It's high, it's got lots of vertical relief, it's protected. You'd think you know, maybe it's a pretty safe place. Well, I'll tell you, when that heat dome hit, I was driving past the glaciers at Lake Louise and my car thermometer said 39 degrees Celsius. There is nobody who can run and there's nobody can hide.

THE CLEAR CUT

This affects everyone, everywhere and it's getting worse and worse and worse. And we need people who, you know, I'm a bit odd, but I think that one of the issues with development and equity, you know, fairness is we've kind of failed in our understanding that the well-being of our society is my well-being. The well-being of my planet is my wellbeing. And I think we just have to start having more of these basic conversations. The reason that I, as a supporter of universal health care, for example, is because I don't want to step over someone who can't get access to the health care system when I can afford it. I don't like that. I don't want to live like that. I don't want to be that person. That's a narrative that's in my brain. I'm running software that says we're all in this together. Well the environment is the ultimate example of that. We literally are all in this together, regardless of whether you care about stepping over people who have health care issues or the environment, we're all in it together and we are completely subordinate to the healthy environment. The entire COVID pandemic is, you know, the mechanisms that create pandemics, zoonotic diseases that get into our systems like COVID and Ebola and everything else. Those are relating to abusing the natural world. And last, two weeks ago, all the major medical journals in the world did a joint editorial saying nature and the climate have the same problem their immediate emergency for human health. You can find that. The Lancet did it, other journals did it. You could put that as a link here. This is coming from the medical health community doing research, saying human health, just like that passage I read from the climate convention, Human health is directly related to the state of the natural world. And so, I don't subscribe to the view that if we fix inequity, somehow the environment will look after itself. I don't agree with that, but I agree that fixing inequities is essential to having the kind of world we want to live in. And I think it contributes to people thinking more carefully about how we live together in some safe, just space. There are some people that I disagree with that say, no, this is just about what humans want, what humans need, and if humans are happy, then everything's fine. Sorry, that's not true. We that's just not true. Humans live in the earth. We are not above the earth. And if you took the earth away, there's actually a great example of this. In the nineties there was a big popular experiment in Arizona. They called it Biosphere, the Biosphere Project, and they were going to build a biosphere where people could live on the moon and they built one in the Arizona desert to see, see, we can do this. Well it didn't work. It failed. It failed because we don't even understand how it works. With a vast amount of money and all those controls, we couldn't make it work. And it's because the system is infinitely complex. And I read a great quote by a grizzly bear biologist Bruce McLellan, in a new book that's just come out about the Flathead Valley in B.C. And he said, you know, ecology is not rocket science. It's much more complex than that. And I thought, what a great line that is. And we, so we have this idea that we're managing these systems. Are you kidding me? You really think we manage how rainfall works on planet Earth or? It's just so extraordinary. So, the metaphor I like to use is we're behaving more like a bull in China shop than like a creative manager. And by that, I mean a bull in a China shop has enormous power. It can go into a China shop, it can rampage around and break every dish in the place. But a bull does not know how to make China dishes. That's our behavior right now. We're not realizing that there's a place for bulls, sure. But, inside the China shop and pretending that the bull knows how to manage it, is a conceptual failure. And the more you learn about ecology, and weirdly, my life has evolved so that I publish in Scientific journals and I have an honorary doctorate from the Academy of Sciences and Graduate Studies at the University of Calgary, it was very



nice. The more you learn about the science, the more you get humble. You're just like, wow, is this complicated and wow is this challenging! And we look at the variables and when we take into account these variables and there's other variables and there's things we never thought of, and you know, there's just this feeling that we're in charge of this system, is just nuts. What we need to be as good citizens of the system. People enabling the natural processes that, that make the world safe for us to continue to happen. That we need to restore the places we've gone too far and as best we can. And by the way, nobody knows how to restore intact nature. Nobody. We can make it better. We know how to make it better. We know how to set it in the right direction, but we don't know how to make the original conditions. So, no matter how much restoration you do in southern Ontario, you won't have what you had in 1750, because we don't know how. But we can make it better. And that's why the first priority of every policy and everything right now should be protect intact nature. The second priority is restore that where we've gone too far as best we can. But protecting the intact nature has to be the number one priority for the climate, for biodiversity, for the services, people sometimes call them ecosystems services or nature's benefits to people. That system is the engine and we've got to keep the engine running if we want humans to thrive. So, at the end of the day, this is a conversation about you, me, our kids and our grandkids. It's a very human centric conversation we're having. It's just the humans happened to be inside a system. So, the system is the proper thing to be thinking about.

[Music]

Janet Sumner

So, he mentions that one line that I really like, which is nobody can restore intact nature. And if we go back to the theme of this podcast, which is conversations on forests and forestry, we are living in a myth right now that we do reforestation. That we plant trees and forest comes back. The reality is an intact forest ecosystem does not come back. Trees might come back, elements of that forest might come back, but we don't reestablish that intact forest. And so I think that is at the heart of the question that I have, which is, well, if that's true, then how can we keep expanding the forestry footprint into new intact areas? It means, especially in the face of climate change and in the face of massive biodiversity loss and changes of ecosystems, that we're continuing to expand our footprint out, all the while living inside this mess that these ecosystems come back and that we can restore them.

[Music]

Janet Sumner



If you like the podcast, The Clear Cut, you can subscribe, you can tell us that you like it, you can go on to the episode description where you'll find a link on how to subscribe and how to support the podcast for as little as \$3 a month and help us create more content for the podcasts. Tell us about questions that you might have, guests that you might want to hear from. We'd love to hear from you and what your takeaways are from the podcast.

Kaya Adleman

The Auditor General's report that came out in April of this past year said that we weren't restoring our forests very well. Like because it's there's, it's, it's much more complicated than just replanting trees, right? You actually have to go back in there and make sure that the trees are growing back, what trees are you growing, etc., etc...It's a lot more complicated, which is like what Harvey was saying, like systems are so complex and there's just a lot of hubris behind the idea that we can, we can replicate them.

Janet Sumner

Yeah. And you can see some evidence of a report that we did called Logging Scars, which actually demonstrates that 30 years on from logging, you still have 14% of the forest that remains barren, because we've changed it. And then I referenced earlier in this podcast, this idea that we've seen a conversion of the Southern boreal where it used to be conifer dominant. Now it's mixed hardwoods or in some cases has become more grasslands. So even though we have requirements around regeneration, even though we require companies to replant, we're not regenerating the ecosystems that we took down.

Kaya Adleman

It's crazy to think that we're able to do that and to also envision a world where we can do so equitably and justly and fairly, and to recognize that we are part of a system and that the system is not a part of us. I like that sentiment and what Harvey was saying as well.

Janet Sumner

Yeah. Anyway, it's food for thought in terms of how we manage our forests and how we think about them at that nexus with the climate and what we do, what do we do next.



[Music]

Janet Sumner

I was wrong to say that you have the solution. I think that you have framed the problem, and I think that's where we need as many creative minds on this as possible. And I'm happy to be part of finding the solution, promoting the problem and talking about it, because I think right now we've seen pieces of it and we've got almost a system that doesn't really rationalize because we keep talking about the additionality and the leakage and all the rest of it. But really we have to be talking about the whole carbon system and, and trees are a big part of that, and Canada's trees are a very big part of that. So thank you so much to Dr. Locke for his careful framing of the of the problem and the challenges before us. Kaya, do you want to add anything on that?

Kaya Adleman

Yeah, no, thank you. I really like, I just really like this idea of...someone said it on our podcast earlier, so I don't want to steal the line, but there's like a bit of hubris behind the idea that we can manage our natural systems. And I think, yeah, I really like how our conversation kind of related to that. And yeah, I also, this is just an aside, we don't have to include this in the podcast, but I read your policy options op ed from 2014 about green postmodernism and it was really interesting and I liked the quote that you pulled from like, I think it was an American architect's publication about how like abandoned marginal lands are chockablock with exotic species and that they're really, truly in some areas the only unmanaged landscapes left. And I think that kind of speaks to that idea that humans like thinking that we know how we can manage something and we really don't know anything about it, anything. Like we think we can create a biosphere in Arizona. Turns out that we have no idea about anything. And it's like, why are we doing it if we think if we think we can? It's kind of, there is like that level of hubris that I think we need to try to move on from and think about things in the in the whole system.

Harvey Locke

Well you know there's a funny line that Winston Churchill had about the United States, and he said, you can always count on the United States to do the right thing after they've tried everything else. And I think that that applies to our relationship, to the environment. We've tried everything else, and people have even, that quote that you're referring to as people suggesting, well, these new ecosystems that we've created are somehow more wild than true wild nature, which is just like bonkers. No, they're not. They're an artifact of degradation, they're not they're not as good as the real thing. Sorry. But, you know, that's our challenge is we're now at a moment where we've tried everything except the right



thing. So, let's try the right thing while we still have a chance. And it's still going to be a bumpy ride.

Kaya Adleman

Yeah

Harvey Locke

And the other thing that maybe I can end on is a note of optimism, which is it's very difficult to be scientifically literate right now and not be terrified. It's very difficult to be a person your age Kaya, and not be really angry about the future that my generation and others have left you.

Kaya Adleman

It's very optimistic.

It's well documented, right. And I think you're right to have that sense of, you know, this isn't good enough. And so what we can do is get our ideas right and do our best as fast as we can. Whether that's enough or whether it's perfect isn't the question. And the question is that's the right thing to do. And that has to be enough because none of us truly knows the future. But if we get our ideas right and we start working in the right direction, it might just work out. And that's enough for me. And I think it's, it's something we need to be really mindful of, is that younger people are in despair right now at a profound level, and they're in despair because they can't see a way out of this mess. But I think if we get our ideas right and we pull in the direction of correct thought, that we will actually turn this around, or at least and perhaps enough around that it's livable and acceptable, not just catastrophically horrible, which is the current trajectory. We're you know, we're on a luge course right now going fast into a really bad place and we need to fix it. And I would just add, we need to fix it with a smile. You know, the anger doesn't, the anger needs to be a motivator

Kaya Adleman

Yeah

Harvey Locke



...Not a characteristic, because anger turns people off. But, you know, common dreams, great hopes, we can do this together. That's how humans work best together. And, you know, that's part of why I like this idea of an equitable, carbon neutral nature, positive future, where we just say we're going there, all of us, everywhere together. What does that look like? And let's get at it, now.

Janet Sumner

Thanks, Harvey. And it is the reason that we have Kaya and I on this podcast, because we do want to include the next generation and, and provide hope, and also be very truthful about the real state of things and not sugarcoat it.

Harvey Locke

Super. And thank you both it was talking to both of you and appreciate the chance chat.

Kaya Adleman

Yeah, likewise.

Janet Sumner

I look forward to packaging this up. It's going to be awesome.

[Music]

Janet Sumner

If you like listening to The Clear Cut and want to keep the content coming, support the show. It would mean a lot to Kaya and I. The link to do so will be in the episode description below.

Kaya Adleman



You can also become a supporter by going to our website at www.wildlandsleague.org/theclearcut. And also make sure to leave us a review on your favorite podcast streaming platform. It would really help the podcast.

Janet Sumner

So I think it's important to understand that what we're doing in this episode is Harvey was laying out the challenge that we have before us, which is we have a climate policy system that's based on smokestacks and tailpipes and reducing emissions. We absolutely need to have that happen. The other side of the equation is that we need to make sure that we are addressing the emissions that come from nature and not just whether or not they're counted because they're in the managed area or they are an emission that we can see. Or maybe we've got for some funny math like the flawed carbon accounting that we have on forestry. But we actually need to get very real about the carbon emissions coming from nature and not just, and deforestation - we have to start thinking about if you cut a tree down today and it's not regrown to its full capacity of carbon by 2050, that that's a carbon loss. It has to, it absolutely has to be reported and counted. So we have to get very real about the system and start building the system that allows us to put the right policy frameworks or the right economic drivers in place that will allow us to make the choices like we could do with the Montreal Protocol on ozone depleting gases, etc., that we need the right mechanisms in place and we don't know what those are. We haven't yet got that solution set, and Harvey's presenting this as a problem and saying, this is the challenge that we have before us, and I agree with that. I think it absolutely is a challenge. There's all kinds of ways we need to start recognizing the emissions that come from the natural world, but also recognizing the carbon capture capacity of those ecosystems that are really important. And then the third is that the fact that they actually store enormous amounts of carbon. When you look at a boreal ecosystem, a lot of people are talking about the Amazon and how we need to protect the Amazon, and yes, get out there and do that, it shouldn't be a trade off. We do need to do that. But did you know that 70% of the carbon in the Amazon is in the is in the aboveground vegetation, whereas 70% of the carbon in a boreal forest system is in the below ground carbon. And so, we need to start thinking about that. Yes, we can go in and harvest trees, but does that start to change the soil system? Those are the kinds of things and questions that I still have, and I think that we need to design a system that will allow us to truly track and think about all of these questions so that when we make choices, they influence the carbon equation for the whole carbon cycle, not just for the smokestack and the tailpipe, because that will not lead to the change we need.

Kaya Adleman

Right.



Janet Sumner

It won't secure a safe planet.

Kaya Adleman

I guess just going back on to, we've, I think we reiterated several times throughout this episode that we shouldn't be prioritizing one thing over the other. And I think that really goes back to what Harvey was saying in our first episode of our conversation with him, where he talks about, kind of the three types of conservation that you should be aiming for and how one is not more important than the other. There's the protecting, not touching intact ecosystems. There's kind of the second tier focusing on areas where there is a lot of intact left, but there's regions that are intertwined with industrial activity, mining and so forth, and how can we increase the connection of those intact ecosystems and then kind of restoration that we're doing in already developed areas like cities and suburbs and towns where people where many people live. So, I think that kind of just all ties back in that we, one thing is not of greater priority than the other, but it doesn't mean that we should deprioritize some of these important things that we're talking about, like protecting the boreal or just reorganizing our approach just in general to incorporate nature and the natural world in our climate solutions.

Janet Sumner

Yeah. And I think you know that your, your climate policies or your environmental policies are not doing the job adequately when you can look at what the result is. So, when planting 2 billion trees is more important than protecting the large carbon reserves in the boreal or protecting the peatlands of the Hudson Bay lowlands, then you know that you haven't got your policy framework right. As you're saying, one is not more important than the other. All of that needs to happen. At the same time. All of it needs to be incentivized. We need to create an economy around that that actually drives those actions. And it can drive jobs, too. I mean, restoration in the South can drive enormous number of jobs. We could be looking at climate resilience, which is another thing we haven't talked about and how forests or regrown forests and plantations could be helping with a climate resiliency factor. I know here, I live not far from Rouge National Urban Park, and the trees here are native species and they're more resilient to the floods and the droughts, etc.. And when we had the big ice storm here, those are the trees that did the best in Toronto. So, trying to find ways that trees and forests in the southern context can be seen as a refuge for species, but also as a place for climate resilience, for homeowners and for cities, etc...So I think forests and how we, whether it's protecting some of the large intact areas or looking at forests as a restoration opportunity, both of those things need to happen all at the same time. And we need the climate policies to support that work because they are part of the climate system



And I think in adopting such a framework, I think there's a lot that we can learn from, like Harvey was mentioning before, Indigenous folks who have already this frame of mind and are thinking, you know, in 360, 720 and you can just, if you want more reference to that, please check out our three-part series with Indigenous forester David Flood. Really, really interesting concepts that we talk about in that episode are super applicable to what we're talking about today. And I also think that there's something that we can learn from Taylor Swift in this and in her song Mirrorball, The natural world is showing us every version of itself, and as such we should, we should be taking that into account and looking at all of the versions of the environment and the natural world and how we can address that.

Janet Sumner

How full circle of you, Kaya. You start out with Taylor and we end on Taylor.

Kaya Adleman

Yes.

Janet Sumner

That's fantastic. I didn't I didn't know how we were going to get back there, but I'm really glad that you're able to take us back, I appreciate it.

Kaya Adleman

I'm glad I was able to find a way through. I was like thinking, like song lyrics. And I say, I'm not a Swiftie.

Janet Sumner

Yeah, well, unfortunately, we won't be able to play any of her music. But yeah, appreciate the, the full nature of the conversation. Yeah. Yeah. And I want to give a big shout out to Harvey. I know he's in the United Arab Emirates right now, bringing the climate nature nexus to, to that audience and holding space for that conversation that we desperately need to have, which is how do we actually treat these as the same system and have a policy framework that helps us address that? So, thanks so much, Harvey, for being on the leading edge of this conversation.



[Music]

Janet Sumner

If you like listening to The Clear Cut and want to keep the content coming, support the show. It would mean a lot to Kaya and I. The link to do so will be in the episode description below.

Kaya Adleman

You can also become a supporter by going to our website at www.wildlandsleague.org/theclearcut. And also make sure to leave us a review on your favorite podcast streaming platform. It would really help the podcast. And stay tuned for new episodes by following us on social media.

Janet Sumner

That's @wildlandsleague on Instagram, Twitter and Facebook or LinkedIn, of course.

Kaya Adleman

See you next time.