Field Memo: Extractive behaviour in the Regenerative Movement.
Written in the only voice that matters: ACCOUNTABLE

TLDR;

- Extraction is a structure problem, not a morality play. Good people running on bad defaults still extract…
- If speed dies with scrutiny, so will your project!
- Look for one-way value flows, "impact karaoke", pilot/re-pivot purgatory, governance theatre and provenance fog.
- Metrics without trade-off registers are camouflage.
- Consent must be free, prior, informed, documented, and withdrawable.
- Tokens are not rights. Rights are rights!
- Talk is not governance!

Intention: This article aims to start **brutally honest and constructive** conversations about the degenerative shadows in the regenerative space, helping lead the movement to greater maturity and accountability. The movement requires strong, stern and pragmatic leadership. Many in this movement carry trauma or resistance related to money, bureaucracy, or the systems they left behind in the corporate world. It's easy for contributors to reject structure and for organisers to overcorrect into control, and vice-versa. These are trauma responses. The work we need to do is structure with consent. It's easy for the pendulum to swing too far in response, towards chaos, informality, or blind trust. The challenge is to move beyond old patterns without rejecting structure altogether. We need structures that support clarity and accountability, without repeating the harms we're trying to leave behind.

I am a contracts obsessive lad who audits paper like a forensic accountant on espresso. My hobby is returning vibes to sender and replacing them with consent, signatures, vetoes, and payables.For me, if it is not in writing, it is folklore. I design governance that survives cross-examination and bad weather, then road-test it with communities so the rights bite and the budgets behave. I am a regeneration practitioner by conviction, and I treat greenwash as combustible and trade-offs as exhibits.

This… this here is a field guide to catching intentional and non-intentional extraction early on, before it drains your project's soil, budget, sanity… and perhaps also your own personal time, resources, dedication, and, hopefully, catch it **well before it extinguishes your regenerative flame.** It's also a continuation of this article I wrote earlier this year: **Alignment Is Not Enough: Why Agreement Is the Real Engine of Change,** and offers repair paths, not public shaming.

Extraction is a structure problem, not a villain problem. Good people running on bad defaults still extract… If value, narrative, and control flow up, while risk, operations, maintenance, and cost stay down, you are not collaborating… you are quite frankly either harvesting or being harvested. Detection starts with governance, money, data, and IP, not with branding, and most definitely not with vibes… and this space requires **BRUTAL HONESTY** for regeneration to actually happen at scale.

Remember this meme? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=684NkDeSJis

Watch out for these patterns of extraction

Impact karaoke

When a project sings about outcomes but hides costs, you are not hearing impact, you are hearing marketing. If the metrics cannot display harm, the metric is make-up. Require a public trade-off register, a fixed method agreed in advance, and access to raw data. No register, no method, no data = no trust, no money. Tie payments to the publication of the ugly parts.

A climate project that counts trees but not the survival rate, or a social program that tracks jobs created but not burnout or churn, is running a cover-up, not an evaluation.

If the garden tour skips the weeds and the dead bees, you are buying perfume, not impact. No harms logged, no value exchange.

One-way value flows

When a project receives community time, knowledge, data, or story and does not return cash, rights, or decision power, the arrangement is quite plainly, extractive. Visibility, tokens, or future goodwill are not consideration. If the ledger shows labour in and trinkets out, the deal is defective. Remedy: convert thanks to fees or equity, and record ownership of every asset in writing. Absent written sharing of upside, halt performance.

And super important, **DO NOT!!!!111one** fall into the trap of "ThErE's mOrE tHaN oNe tYpE oF cApItaL, hurr durr". Yes, there are more forms of capital (financial, material, living, intellectual, experiential, social, cultural, spiritual, etc.), and you should have access to ALL of them. No exceptions. And if you are not getting or giving access to one, you should make everybody involved understand why and get or provide consent…

If you pour love, time, and story in but get no cash, rights, or say out, you are compost, not partner.

Pilot - rebrand - repivot purgatory

A pilot must be a bounded experiment, not a neverending story. The founder should specify a fixed end date, automatic sunset, funded handover, and a conversion-or-clean-exit decision on the stop date. The agreement will name decision rights during and after the pilot, set a compensation floor payable regardless of outcome, and publish a trade-off register. Refusal of these terms indicates an attempt to retain control without paying for it and creates foreseeable disputes.

A perpetual pilot defers compensation and rights into a future that does not exist. The contributor will require a hard stop date, automatic sunset, funded handover, a compensation floor, and a written conversion-or-clean-exit on the stop date. Tokens are not rights, visibility is not consideration, and handshakes are not enforceable. If these terms are trimmed or ignored, performance should pause pending renegotiation on paper.

If the journey has no return date, you are the road, not the traveler. Set a stop or step away.

Governance theatre

Advisory votes without power over treasury, IP, or scope are stage props. Minimums: named veto rights by stakeholder class, a recorded ‘balance-of-interests’ test for every material decision, and a communications map that shows who is informed, consulted, and decides. If it fails balance-of-interests on paper, it fails legitimacy. If you cannot veto a spend, hire, or asset transfer, you are not governing, you are lending legitimacy without authority, decline to do so.... put binding authority in bylaws or an executed agreement naming who holds a veto today. If it is not written, it is not real. Decline to legitimise theatre with your presence.

Vibes are not veto. Name the guardians of the purse and the songs in signed covenants, or leave the fire.

Consent laundering

Listening sessions are not authorisation.

Consent that cannot be withdrawn is not consent.

If people cannot read the materials in their language, cannot easily say no later, and you treat attendance lists as approval, you are manufacturing consent.

Demand **FPIC**: free, prior, informed, documented, and withdrawable consent, and show custodianship, not extraction. Document belonging to place, kinship with the more-than-human, and how decision power and benefits are shared with those custodians. A yes without custodianship evidence is still a no. Budget for language access. If withdrawal is punished, walk away…

A yes without an easy no is a spell, not consent. FPIC or pass the talking stick.

Budget alchemy

When locals run operations and maintenance for free while the center invoices for strategy, the budget is doing tricks, not accounting...

For example, unpaid labour must convert to equity/co-ownership, revenue share, or a fee schedule, on paper. Set day-rate floors and late payment penalties. Consider utility gains, commodity, or at least a promise of future value under documented terms and conditions. If the people doing the work are not paid and the people talking about the work are, the arrangement is upside down. Turn it or leave it!

A potential solution could be merit-based compensation with decay. It is a pay system where performance-based increases, such as salary raises or bonuses, are temporary, and decrease over time, even if performance remains consistent. In other words, do great, you get a bump, keep merely steady, the bump shrinks unless you earn it again. This keeps incentives fresh, budgets honest, and management effective without locking yesterday's effort into tomorrow's payroll.

For other spend, treat it the same: require a value-to-mission test, three quotes over a set threshold, potentially even a conflict-of-interest register, and written approvals by tier. Classify OPEX vs CAPEX and use total cost of ownership (TCO), include maintenance, upgrades, and end-of-life. If these terms are hard to understand, I suggest using the AI provided below to simplify your journey. Publish a simple rate card for software, travel, events, ads, and consultants, with caps per month and variance rules. Ban vanity spend and founder perks in kind, no ghost invoices, no "exposure" deals. If a purchase cannot trace to outcomes, risk reduction or return on investment on paper, it does not clear procurement.

Every purchase needs to pass four living-system checks: empowers the people doing the work, is communicated to affected parts before commitment, balances interests across parts and whole, and does not pursue 'efficiency' at the cost of resilience. Fail any one, procurement declines.

Songs at the center do not fill bowls at the edge. Pay the hands that keep the lights on.

Opacity as a business model

"We cannot disclose" translates to "you would not accept this if you read it".

Make document delivery a condition precedent, upstream grants, subcontracts, licences, side letters. Include a clause stating that failure to disclose within 2 weeks is material breach. No documents, no deal, no exceptions…

Secrets are not sacred, they are sales tactics. Unveil the bundle or we do not dance.

Complexity camouflage

If the rights, duties, and money flows cannot fit on two pages, the complexity likely masks mechanistic degeneracy, asymmetries that block collaboration and evolutionary coherence. Two pages or it's fog.. Smokescreens hide asymmetry. Require a plain-English term sheet that maps cash in, cash out, who approves, who owns, and what happens on failure. If the organisers cannot explain it simply, they do not want you to see it clearly. Decline to invest your time and resources in fog…

Sacred is simple. If the keepers cannot explain it plainly, they are guarding smoke, not wisdom.

Emergency forever

Emergency powers are tools for fires, not a governance model. Response-ability is not perpetual emergency!

If temporary controls do not auto-expire, they will persist by habit. Narrow the scope, set a short fuse, and require a supermajority to extend with written reasons. If the project claims it must always move fast to avoid scrutiny, understand this, the plan will also fail fast once scrutiny finally arrives. Pause it, audit harder, fix it or end it.

Keep the fire watch, not a fire cult. Reasons in writing, short fuse, or the circle stands down.

Narrative extraction

If your people become content creators or ideators/builders while the assets remain elsewhere, the story is stealing from the source... For example, media and software asset rights must come with fees, attribution, and takedown rights. No asset creation, no story rights. If they film you, if they use you for promotion, solution or product design, they pay you, or they share equity. Perpetual, royalty-free, universe-wide licences for a sandwich and a photo are not acceptable. Decline to participate until the licence is fair, clear, and all-incapsulating.

If they design with your roots and patent the fruits, the orchard is stolen. Fees, equity, and takedown or no graft.

Provenance fog

I'll write about this pattern at length, given how relevant it is for the regenerative movement.

In fast-moving public collaboration, ownership often disappears into thin air. Ideas flow freely across calls, chats, and shared docs, yet no one records who owns what or agrees on terms. A recording becomes mistaken for a contract, and the person who speaks the loudest gets credit, even if others did the real work. That isn't shared creation, that's extraction hiding behind collaboration.

You see it when media, frameworks or vibecoded tech are built together with shared intent, but no one has written co-authorship or agreed on usage rights. The team might rely on AI transcripts or Zoom recordings to show who contributed, but without a clear ledger of contributions or a record of prior work and licences, those files don't mean much. Launches happen into the public eye while ownership remains murky, and disputes follow. Sometimes everyone trusts each other by handshake, but without documentation, contributors are left exposed.

You can stop this from happening, or fix it right after idea sessions, by making the co-ownership model explicit. Perhaps you agree on joint ownership with equal, undivided shares and rules for decisions. Maybe a steward organisation takes ownership while contributors grant licences and get a revenue share. Or you define a lead author for different modules, with others licencing those parts back in. Whatever you choose, write it down. No formal choice, no build.

Once you have named your co-ownership model, start a contribution register and treat it like a living ledger, not a scrapbook. After each session, record the date, session ID, who attended and in what role, what artifacts were produced, exactly who did what, the prior art everyone declared with source links, the licence rules agreed, the decision method for this artifact, and get signatures. Go further than narrative notes, adopt a simple taxonomy of contribution metrics and version it over time so changes are auditable. At minimum, log columns for: artifact ID and type, contribution type taxonomy tag (eg. creative-origin, editorial-transform, technical-build, stewardship-ops, custodianship-place, data-provision, risk-assumption, decision-influence), effort units (hours), optional weight multiplier by role, source links to prior work, licence-in and licence-out, file hashes for inputs and outputs, provisional revenue or benefit share basis, vetoes invoked, conflicts disclosed, approvals, consent status including any withdrawals, and the verification step (who validated the entry and when). Assign a metric set version, for example Conversation Contribution Metrics (CCM) v1.0, and maintain a change log when you update definitions or weights, never silently rewrite history. Use the recording and transcript to seed the first pass of entries, but require human confirmation within 72 hours or mark the row as contested and pause use of the contested material. The video shows who said what. The register shows what governs, how value was created, and how it will be shared.

Apply licences intentionally. For content and documents, consider using Creative Commons, BY or BY‑SA, or BY‑NC if necessary. For code, allow reuse and remix with permissive licences like MIT or Apache‑2.0, or choose copyleft licences like GPL or AGPL when protection matters. For data sets, go with Open Data licences or CC‑BY‑4.0. Don't rely on a tweet or on AI taken notes to document how you're protecting what you created. Write it on the record. Use tools like https://creativecommons.org. Seek legal advice!

Encourage everyone to declare their prior work before remixing it, linking to original sources and keeping the original licence intact. And don't let recordings stand alone. Pair every Zoom or voice file with a signed session sheet that records what was produced, links the artifacts to contributors, notes the file's hash, and states the agreed terms. The video shows who said what. The sheet shows what matters. An explicit conversation of "this is my stone that I'm putting into the soup" can be helpful for everyone to understand and also can be used later if there's disagreement/confusion around what IP was developed jointly. Use AI (one is provided below to help with this) to draft the first session sheet from the recording and transcript.

Commercial terms belong on the table early on. Clarify who can licence, who can fork your work, who may publish it, and how revenue will be split. Define how disputes get resolved and build in a kill‑switch if things go sideways.

If credit and shares only come up after brainstorming, or if recordings and Google Docs are treated as proof of ownership without a ledger, you're inviting fog. When work launches without clear provenance or licences, or nobody can say in writing who owns or benefits, that's a warning sign. If the people who speak and document rise to the top with benefits, while the real labour and risk stay buried, it isn't collaboration, it's exploitation. Accountability lives in records, not energy or volume.

If you've already brainstormed, and forgotten to document, then send a "Session Record and IP Terms" email with your one-page summary: date, participants, contributions, rights, licences, commercial terms. Ask everyone to "Reply All -> Agreed" within 72 hours. Until someone says otherwise, treat the outputs as drafts. If anyone disagrees, pause public use of those artifacts until you resolve things in writing.

Going forward, always use that one-page sheet at the start or end of sessions. Lay out who did what, what belongs to whom, what licence applies, how revenue or decisions happen, how attribution shows up, and how someone pulls out later. Include a recording link, file hash, storage location, and typed signatures.

If you get stuck, default to joint ownership, Creative Commons BY-SA for docs, MIT for code, CC-BY for data, a 60-day cool-off before external licencing, a revenue split of 60 % to contributors and 40 % to stewarding organisation (or whatever ratio your group finds regenerative), routine decisions by simple majority, and licencing decisions requiring two out of three approvals (or other quorum requirements as applicable to your context).

Record what happens. The words you speak in a video don't count as proof of ownership if someone's prior declaration beats it. Tell the story in writing, so your collaboration remains fair, and regenerative.

Note: If "credit, benefit, and decision power" move up to those documenting, while contributor rights, risk, and ownership stay down, this is not collaboration, it's provenance fog. Print the ledger, or don't proceed.

If the hands that planted the seed are missing from the harvest ledger, the story is stripping the soil. Write their names, share the yield, or do not plant.

Common excuses that mask extraction

Pragmatic note: If any of these 44 ring a bell in your programme, fix the structure, not the story. Each "excuse / translation" pair is a potential red flag. If you feel it, start enquiring…

1. "We cannot disclose the agreement" = opacity as co-opted structure model, there is no agreement you're welcome into.
2. "We need a mindset shift" = individual blame used to avoid changing structures that produce the harm in the first place.

3. “Education and awareness will fix this” = education about sustainability without second-order system change to rules, rights, or incentives.
4. “We ran a systems thinking workshop” = mindset theatre that leaves first-order boundaries intact and the status quo unexamined.
5. “We honor indigenous wisdom” = performative respect while violating Kanyini’s custodianship duties of reciprocity and care.
6. “Central stewardship protects the land” = removal of place-based custodial rights and kinship obligations from those who live there.
7. “Let’s avoid polarisation for harmony” = calls for unity used to mute critique of mechanistic, extractive defaults.
8. “Scale requires standardisation” = single-strategy rollout that erases context and reproduces mechanistic goals over living interdependencies.
9. “Pain stories divide us” = suppression of feedback about harm so the system never learns or repairs.
10. “Competition drives excellence” = zero-sum growth logic that damages interdependencies and blocks evolutionary coherence.
11. “Our programme is holistic already” = umbrella claim that hides a one-track approach and leaves leverage points untouched.
12. “Everyone benefits in the long run” = present costs externalised to the usual people.
13. “Budgets are tight” = labour is the subsidy, locals carry Operations and Maintenance unfunded.
14. “We had to move fast” = we skipped consent and controls on purpose.
15. “It is just a pilot” = indefinite control without transfer of rights or revenue.
16. “Community was consulted” = listening session used as authorisation.
17. “Everyone signed” = consent without language access or withdrawal mechanics.
18. “Data is anonymised” = derivative models privatised, no revenue share.
19. “We follow global best practice” = local law and FPIC conveniently ignored.
20. “Metrics show success” = the metric was picked to hide the trade-offs.
21. “Emergency powers were necessary” = bypassed process that never sunset.
22. “Legal said it is fine” = lawful, not legitimate, and not reciprocal.
23. “Impact is hard to measure” = no preregistered methods, no raw data.
24. “IP protection ensures quality” = enclosure of community knowledge.
25. “We will share benefits later” = no floor, no schedule, no audit.
26. “Locals are not ready” = we are not ready to cede control.
27. “The funder requires it” = we chose money over governance.
28. “This is how DAOs do it” = keys centralised, ops run on one calendar.
29. “Token gives everyone a voice” = advisory votes without treasury rights.
30. “Scope cannot change midstream” = scope creep only travels upward.
31. “Stories are important” = narrative extraction replaces asset creation.
32. “This is complicated” = complexity as camouflage for asymmetric power.
33. “We do not have time for translation” = consent by exclusion.
34. “Volunteers are passionate” = burnout arbitrage instead of payroll.
35. “We brought in experts” = the people most affected were sidelined.
36. “We need a quick win” = shortcuts now, liabilities later.

37. “We will fix governance post-launch” = theatre now, trust never.
38. “Partner is reputable” = diligence by brand, not by documents.
39. “Dashboards are green” = trade-off register missing on purpose.
40. “We will publish a learnings report” = confession without remediation.
41. “Open by default” = trademarked toolkits and non-commercial traps.
42. “The algorithm is fair” = training data taken, royalties zero.
43. “We pay in tokens” = stickers without rights.
44. “Our lawyers will draft something later” = stalling until leverage fades.

If true regeneration works, it survives a line-by-line contract review, if there is one set in the first place... too often this space runs on vibes, not binding agreement.

Here is what shows up repeatedly. No villains. Look for systems at play. If this rings a bell in your programme, fix it. If not, **audit harder.**

Never forget: “Verba volant, scripta manent”

Words fly away. Writing stays. If something matters, put it in writing. If value, narrative, and control flow up the chain while risk, maintenance, and cost stay behind, you are not collaborating, you are extracting or being extracted…

Image created by Alex Lion Yes! with Midjourney.

To close on this, a regenerative project that cannot survive a line-by-line review is not regenerative, it is fragile branding around old habits. Demand simple documents, reversible consent, paid labour, shared upside, and real vetoes. **If the answer to “who benefits, who**

decides, and who owns" is not in writing, the only party protected and benefitting is the one extracting.

Things to do tomorrow

- **If you are an organiser**: Write and publish your current defaults: who can stop spend, who owns IP or other assets, what consent can be withdrawn, and where revenue flows. If you are unsure, that is your first red flag.
- **If you are being organised:** Write and publish your current defaults, too. Your status, scope, pay and cadence, what assets, IP and data you retain or co-own, what consent you can withdraw, what you can veto, and how you exit. If any of this is not in writing, pause performance. If you are unsure, that is your first red flag, equally. Agreement is reached with constant check-ins for checks and balances, communication is key.
- **Audit your current projects:** What are the assets and who owns them? Who actually benefits from the resources, time, labour, and attention you're investing? Write down specific names and specific benefits.
- **Follow the money:** Track where money flows in your regenerative projects. Who is the investor? If it's some large extractor, why? Are the reasons verifiable and agreed by a majority? How much came in? What were the motives for accepting those funds? Who/what gets paid? Who provides paid/unpaid labor? Who owns the assets? Document the actual financial relationships, the assets sheet, and get consent from all involved.
- **Identify decision makers:** List who actually makes binding decisions in your communities and projects. Not who facilitates meetings, but who has veto power and final authority.
- **Exit interview yourself:** If you left your current regenerative project(s) tomorrow, what would you have gained (other than experience) and what would you have lost? What IP or assets do you get to keep, and what remains behind? Be brutally honest about the exchange.
- **Research organiser histories:** Look up the track record of people leading your projects. What happened to their previous communities, businesses, or organisations?
- **Set concrete accountability metrics:** Define specific, measurable outcomes that organisers must deliver. Not visionary goals, but practical benchmarks with deadlines. Go one step further and document a RASCI table (Responsible, Accountable, Supportive, Consulted, Informed).
- **Run a 30-day PAR cadence:** Plan the change, act in a bounded sprint, observe with the community, reflect and publish. Repeat. Also publish a 1-page 'Custodianship Declaration' naming place-belonging, kinship beneficiaries, and who holds shared responsibilities and vetoes.
- **Create resource protection:** Establish systems that prevent any individual from walking away with community resources if the project(s) fail.
- **Document everything:** Start keeping records of promises made, resources contributed, and actual outcomes delivered. Create accountability through documentation.

- **Build support networks:** Connect with others who've left similar projects. Ask them specifically what red flags they missed and what they'd do differently.

Scope, applicability, proportionality, and project types (it depends)

Applicability varies by context. The tests above are principles, not a one-size hammer. Apply them with proportionality and purpose limitation.

- **Commons and mutual-aid projects**: Cash returns may be the wrong instrument. Ownership should be stewardship. Reciprocity can be delivered as access rights, service credits, shared infrastructure, stewardship covenants, or irrevocable community licences. Still mandatory: written provenance, FPIC, a contribution ledger, a trade-off register, and named vetoes anchored.
- **Charities and non-profits**: Mission lock and restricted funds change the money logic, not the duty of care. Pay for actual labor, disclose conflicts, ring-fence programme assets, and keep governance real, not theatrical. Beneficiaries (internal and external) come first on paper, not just in decks.
- **Cooperatives, commons enterprises, and post-capitalist builds**: You may not issue equity. Fine. Use member classes, patronage dividends, redeemable shares, exit-to-community paths, or social licences. Tokens still are not rights. Write the rights.
- **Open source and open data**: Openness is not ownerless. Pick explicit licences, set a contributor licence agreement, protect community marks, and publish a provenance log. Replace NDAs with licence discipline and a release process.
- **Indigenous and place-based knowledge**: FPIC is non-negotiable. Respect cultural IP, sacred knowledge limits, and custodial governance. If uncertainty remains, do not publish. No extraction by translation.
- **Crisis or humanitarian response**: Emergency powers can be proportionate and time-boxed. Include an auto-sunset, retrospective ratification, and a post-crisis audit with remediation.

Method note: Participatory audit. Use a simple Participatory Action Research (PAR) loop (in other words, plan-act-observe-reflect) with those affected/involved, plan the measurement and terms, act on a bounded change, observe together with open logs, reflect into the next plan. This is not a ritual. It is the agreement engine that converts talk into structure.

Minimum Viable Governance

While potentially ideal, especially in the context of start-ups, formalisation may strain very early, especially for underfunded projects where formalisation is resource-prohibitive. Consider suggesting practical **minimum viable governance** steps for start-up teams (such as annotated term sheets, simple consent forms, a memorandum of understanding, phased-in equity agreements, etc.). Use tools like Google Docs/Sheets, Docusign or modern tools like https://hypha.earth for record keeping. Sure look it, even pen and paper still works, just make sure everyone gets a copy.

To clarify, trade-offs are unavoidable in coherence-seeking early-phase movements, and the principle is not to eliminate trade-offs but to expose and register them, actively managing them in participatory ways rather than concealing them.

I encourage start-ups and nascent organisations to treat documentation as an evolving artifact, start with informal but clear records, moving toward formal contracts as project maturity and funding allow, making accountability accessible at all steps of the projects.

The insistence on documentation, transparency, enforceable rights, and registered trade-offs matches standards seen in compliance-heavy fields (Traditional accounting, Legal, Audit, Monitoring & Evaluation) and is particularly relevant for early-stage, nascent movements lacking institutional guardrails or traditional rigour.

If that feels harsh, **good!** Regeneration isn't airy talk. It requires hard structure and integrity. It's easy to cut a tree down for profit, not as easy to plant one and wait till it grows… Build systems where those closest to tech, land, water and forests can veto, fork, or exit. Where metrics show what they can't fix. Where consent stays reversible. When story, money, and authority go up, accountability must too. Without that, you're repeating history, not changing it… If you think otherwise, please, prove it wrong in the comments section.

If this still feels hard, **good!** The point is not to become a full-time notary. The point is to spend a few minutes per meeting turning vibes into paper so nobody steals the forest. If that ruins anyone's magic, then it was not magic, it was misdirection or sleight of hand at best…

Regeneration is not just a story you tell, it is a structure that holds when nobody is watching!

Repeating this, I know. Take a note of this if you need to: if authority, story, and cash go up while accountability goes down, you are not regenerating, you are repeating the same old extractive cycles you want to transform.

If you're doing or generating the capacity for any of the above patterns knowingly… please, in the name of purist regeneration… stop, and regen-calibrate.

For founders and contributors who prefer receipts to rhetoric, this AI drafts what you need tomorrow morning: a minimum viable governance kit, cash map, IP map, veto map, exit, next steps, etc. Use it, or keep trusting vibes. Your call.

http://ief.wiki/RegenAssist

Disclaimer: This article is general information for governance design, meant to strengthen the regenerative movement's momentum and to clear out the bad air in many rooms. It is **not** legal advice.

Change. The. Structure.

VIVA LA REGENAISSANCE!

Special thanks to Andrew Alan Hasse and Alex Lion Yes! for starting the fire in my heart that led to this article, and for their contributions, and to Sharon Gal-Or, Alejandra Verde, Simon Quarmby, Alejandro Adon, Charles Blass, Gustavo Segovia, Bret Warshawsky and Victor Vorsky for their peer review and remarks/commentary provided.

Deep gratitude to Dr. Anneloes Smitsman. Her PhD thesis, Into the Heart of Systems Change, shaped many of the Regenerative and Thrivability ideas in this article. I drew directly from her work, which offers a clear path for rethinking systems both from the inside out and outside in.

Many thanks to the unnamed heroes who keep receipts, ask “who owns this?”, and won’t sign or contribute unless there’s a takedown clause, the legally binding “take my stuff down now” button that makes FPIC real… You know who you are. May your compost be rich, your bylaws binding, and your tokens backed by something more than vibes.