

## *Veni, Vidi, Vermi...*

### **II. EARTHWORMS IN ORGANIC FIELDS RESTORE SOM & H<sub>2</sub>O AND FIX CO<sub>2</sub>**

Robert J. Blakemore

VermEcology, 101 Suidomichi, Nogyama, Yokohama.

Email: rob.blakemore@gmail.com

#### **Abstract**

Earthworm proliferations of +57–122% under adjacent (i.e., same soil/climate) organic vs. conventional fields related to improved soil quality and higher yields of +12–80% in winter wheat, tropical paddy rice and sugarcane. A 1,000 yr-old pasture had highest earthworms (424 m<sup>-2</sup>), stored 222 t ha<sup>-1</sup> carbon in its soil organic matter (SOM), plus moisture capacity was 90.1% above an adjacent arable field. Megadrile worms correlated ( $r > 0.85$ ) with both soil water and C storage hence atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> reduction via photosynthesis.

Relating to global climate change, extrapolation to areas given over to each of the three crops if all organically converted gives CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents (CO<sub>2</sub>e) of 49.2, 2.8 and 1.1 Gt (total 53.1 Gt) C storage for wheat, rice and sugarcane, respectively. Wheat alone, albeit projected, exceeds global emission (~40 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>); rice matches Eurozone's (2.5 Gt); and cane either Japan (1.2 Gt) or UK & Australia combined (0.5 + 0.4 Gt). Extra carbon sequestered (53.1 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e) would equal ~7.3 ppm atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> reduction. Pasture management offers yet greater potential remedy, here calculated as optimal 222 t ha<sup>-1</sup> x 3.6 Gha total grass = 800 Gt C (x 3.667 conversion factor = 2,934 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e) about equal to present atmospheric values of 3,000 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> and 400 ppm.

Keywords: broadacre crops, carbon, glomalin, climate, food security, soil health, humus, water.

#### **Introduction**

Global species extinctions causing biodiversity loss plus extreme nitrogen-cycle imbalance have both been recognized as much greater critical and imminent threats than risks of climate change (Rockström *et al.*, 2009). A possible solution to all three inter-related issues is broad-scale adoption of agro-ecology: which in essence is organic husbandry and/or permaculture (see Blakemore, 2016). Organic farming yields can equal or exceed 'conventional' farm yields but with less environmental costs: for example, consuming less energy and using no biocides whilst also improving C & N cycles and biodiversity (Drinkwater *et al.*, 1998; Hole *et al.*, 2004; Randerson, 2004; Pimental *et al.*, 2005; Halweil, 2006). A summary of such organic issues was presented by IFOAM (2006) where it was pointed out that whilst limited information is obtainable

from temperate regions, data from tropical climates is even more sparse. The present work helps redress this by researching organic farms in tropical Philippines and comparing these data to the classical long-term model farm at Haughley in temperate UK. Crop yield, soil health and earthworm abundance are criteria of sustainability that relate to issues of global climate change, carbon/nitrogen cycles and soil moisture, all of which contribute to reducing the threat of local species extinctions.

Earthworms are fundamental to organic farming and they also provide essential terrestrial services being the basis of food-chains as well as the ultimate detritivores. They function as '*Nature's plough*' greatly modifying soil and producing humus (= SOM or soil organic matter composed mostly of carbon and nitrogen in ratio ~10:1) upon which Nature and Civilization depend (Darwin, 1881). Earthworms stimulate microbially active humus formation by processing dead roots, leaf-litter fall and manure to provide healthy soils with four key characteristics of: (1) good structural tilth at depth for plants, (2) improved water storage and purification, (3) improved atmospheric gas exchange and, (4) ample habitats for other soil organisms. They thereby contribute to nutrient recycling, above and below-ground plant yield and maintenance of biodiversity (Lee, 1985). Such effects are easier to demonstrate in controlled glasshouse pot experiments but actual field measurements under the complex interactions prevailing in organic field soils are crucial (Blakemore, 1994).

Earthworms in the pioneering long-term, farm-scale Haughley Experiment of organic agriculture in the UK that started in 1939 (Balfour, 1997) were studied by Blakemore (1981; 1996; 2000). Similar study reviews were by Condrón *et al.* (2000), Mäder *et al.* (2002) and Pfiffner & Balmer (2011), sometimes reporting mainly on organic tillage effects and reflecting the great number of studies conducted under conventional no-till systems yet based on herbicides that therefore pose environmental risks. Relations between agronomic practice and earthworms in Norway (Pommeresche & Løes, 2009) also considered a plot fertilization experiment at Møystad, Denmark started in 1922. Other long-term field trials are at Rodale Institute in US from 1947 (Rodale, 2015) and FiBL's DOK trial in Switzerland from 1978 (Pfiffner & Mäder, 1998). In Asia long-term trials tend to focus on crop yields rather than SOM or earthworms, and those considering organic farming methods are rare despite initial work by advocates such as Sir Albert Howard in India (Howard, 1943). Howard criticized small experimental plots (often just 4 m x 5 m) typical for research stations which ignore worm migrations and other important soil biological factors.

Pfiffner & Balmer (2011: fig. 1) charted a total of 14 studies that looked at the impact of organic

farming on earthworm biodiversity compared to non-organic farms; these included Mäder *et al.* (2002) and a meta analysis (Bengtsson *et al.*, 2005) that listed just eight earthworm studies (but overlooked several papers such as Blakemore, 2000) while noting that higher amounts of SOM correlated with increased earthworm abundance in several studies. A limited meta-analysis (Tuck *et al.*, 2014) deliberately excluded earthworms “...*due to small sample sizes (n<5)*” unreasonably ignoring the greater sampling effort required for soil macrofauna that have concomitantly greater contribution to soil processes than do either meso- or microfauna. Note that an FAO/UNESCO soil bioassessment manual (Swift & Bignal, 2015: 9) suggest eight replicated macrofauna samples but says five will suffice as a minimum per site, whereas the current report used at least ten and as many as 33 earthworm samples from crop soil sites.

Few reports consider the relationship of earthworms with carbon sequestration, and fewer still from the tropics. A European report, Don *et al.* (2008) only summarize some processes by a single lumbricid in a temperate soil. Surprisingly, there is little information on earthworms in rice paddy (e.g. Xiang *et al.*, 2006; Blakemore, 2012; Krupakdee *et al.*, 2013), but reports of vermicast fertilizer on rice were summarized by Blakemore (2008). Some conclusions (e.g. by Owa *et al.*, 2003; Choosai *et al.*, 2010) are that earthworms increase rice productivity but species involved were unidentified or misidentified. Almost no research concerns earthworms under sugarcane nor whether factors other than heavy chemical use explain their frequent absence from canefields (e.g. Blakemore, 1994; Zou & Bashkin, 1998; Dlamini *et al.*, 2001). Routine field data for earthworm occurrence under other crops are also relatively sparse for the Philippine Islands (PI) – as newly investigated in the current study – as for elsewhere in the tropics.

In the current study the earthworm activity under organic husbandry is investigated on the simple premise that such management may encourage soil faunal biodiversity and improve soil quality, in particular soil carbon and water relationships that are key factors mitigating climate change effects. An earlier study of organic wheat/pasture at Haughley in the UK (Blakemore, 1981; 2000) is re-evaluated, re-interpreted, and compared to results from two small studies on major Filipino broadacre crops of rice and sugarcane to determine whether similar soil processes occur across a climatic spectrum. Greenhouse gas (GHG) fluxes—which by definition change constantly—are largely irrelevant overall, thus only net soil carbon sequestration is considered along with crop yields and earthworm populations. It is accepted that plants and earthworms are natural monitors of soil quality and health. Controls in each case are represented by adjacent non-organically managed or typically ‘conventional’ fields that may reasonably be expected to have the same soil origin and same climate, i.e., the experimental variable is just the soil management practice.

## Materials and methods


### Study sites

A. New Bells Farm, Haughley, Suffolk, UK (N: 52.236378, E: 0.978406)

This was the first ever ecologically designed agricultural research project on a full farm scale where, since 1939, three side-by-side management regimes had been maintained under the pioneering ‘Haughley Experiment’ (Balfour, 1975). This 100 ha site originally had nearly uniform alkaline clay-loam soils overlying glacial clay with flints and sand pockets on chalk beds; a site description is provided in Blakemore (2000). Figure 1 shows the sections surveyed in winter 1980/81, ~40 years after establishment, viz.:

- O – an Organic ley-arable rotation (organic closed-system established with no external imports)
- M – a conventional Mixed ley-arable with additional agrichemicals (non-organic) with its own herd
- S – a Stockless intensive arable systems with limited rotation using agrichemicals (non-organic).

The organic section operated as an almost closed recycling system with natural inputs (sun, air, rain) and only cattle and other livestock products sold off-site. Fields and pastures were mulched with between 7-30 t ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> of roughly composted farmyard manure (FYM) and crop residues. The Stockless section followed prevailing regional arable practices while the Mixed section was a compromise of both organic and agrichemical. Soil analyses were mostly courtesy of J.A. Pye Research Lab. (managers of the farm in 1980s), other data were determined by the author. Results from Blakemore (1981; 2000) are here revisited to calculate actual mass of SOC to allow comparison with subsequent studies. Included is a 1,000 yr-old “Saxon” permanent organic pasture that may be taken as an ‘upper’ control for the cropped fields.



**Figure 1. Haughley farm layout with study field locations (Blakemore, 2000).**

B. Kahariam Farms, Bgy Adya near Lipa, Batangas, Luzon, Philippines (N: 13.870302, E: 121.142788)

An integrated 23 hectare farm certified organic since 2009 by OCCP (Organic Certification Center of the Philippines, <http://www.occp.phils.org/>) and producing the first wholly organic rice seed in Southeast Asia. It is also an on-the-job training, demonstration and research facility for national Universities and Department of Agriculture (DA). Apart from recycling farm residues from vegetables and chickens, extraneous input is from local racehorse stables that sometimes import alfalfa (= lucerne *Medicago sativa* L.) fodder from Australia. In addition to resolving the horse manure disposal problem, rapid processing through worms allows production of ca. 3 tonnes of vermicompost per day while supporting a resident *Eudrilus eugeniae* (Kinberg, 1867) population of >20 million and ca. 20 t biomass contained in an hectare of worm beds (Kahariam, 2015). Fresh vermicompost not used on the farm is sold commercially off-site.

Batangas district has Type III Climate Type (Corona Classification) with periodic typhoons but no pronounced maximum rain period. Sampling was between the hot, dry season either during the period from December to February or from March to May; annual rainfall and temperature means are 2,828.8 mm and 26 °C (max of 28 °C; min of 24 °C). Local soils are inceptisols classed as Ibaan Clay Loam.

Rice production methods on the organic farm are summarized by (BPI 2014). Farms immediately adjacent to Kahariam did not grow rice; however, rainfed paddy in adjacent San Guillermo village was taken as representative of local conventional (agrichemical) farming for comparative sampling on the next day as they routinely used synthetic N-P-K fertilizers and pesticides (amounts unspecified varying field to field and season to season – as per FAO and local DA and Philrice advice; with organic matter incidentally added from stubble, rice husks and occasional caribou grazing). Rice was at the same stage of tillering growth but initial irrigation of the organic rice possibly affected or negated soil moisture comparisons with the upland rice. Rice yields were based on farm records and local averages. Soil microbial plate counts were by BIOTECH, Los Baños. Chemical analyses courtesy South Tagalog Integrated Agricultural Research (STIARC) Lipa City (May, 2013).

C. Peñalosa Farms' Hacienda Remedios in Manapla, Negros Occidental, PI (N: 10.934479, E: 123.113078)

This farm was NICERT (Negros Island Certification Services, <http://nicert.org/>) and OCCP certified

organic for about 10 years and is a research site for Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences (JIRCAS). Vermicompost from pig, fowl and farm residues was used plus bagasse and rice hull charcoal with occasional direct field application of mill ash and sugar pressmud on ratooned sugarcane monoculture, paddy rice and vegetable beds. Mineral supplements (e.g. rock phosphate, dolomitic limestone) and microbial concoctions (e.g. N-fixing bacteria, fungi, and endophytic mycorrhizae) were also added to the compost ad hoc (R. Peñalosa pers. comm.; Penalosafarms, 2015). Weeds and pests are managed by combinations of organic/IPM control methods.

Climate is classified as Type 1 characterized by two pronounced seasons: dry from November to April and wet during the rest of the year. Soils are Silay fine sandy loams of volcanic origin classified as Aquic Hapludalfs. Ironically, the farm suffered peripheral damage from 2013 Typhoon Haiyan (known as Super Typhoon “Yolanda” in the Philippines) that had record gusting winds of 380 km h<sup>-1</sup> and was partly attributed to effects of Global Warming that this earthworm project sought to redress.

Immediately adjacent to the farm were non-organic farms routinely using urea and chemical pesticides on similarly ratooned fields with average N-P-K fertilization rates in Negros sugarcane in 2008 of 165-85-105 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> (from Bombio & Tahum, 2008 in Sugar Regulatory Administration website – <http://www.sra.gov.ph/>). Canefields were rainfed not irrigated. Several fields at similar growth/harvest stages were sampled in exactly the same way over two days for comparison as noted in the Results section below. Cane yields were based on farm records and local averages. Chemical analyses from Agro-Based Lab. and Sugar Regulatory Administration (SRA), Bacolod, Negros. Note that rice yield is often given in cavans (one cavan is 48 kg) and sugar yield is usually measured in 50 kg bags (Lkg).

### ***Sampling of soils and earthworms***

Compost and soil were bulked sub-samples at depths stated in Results, prepared as per standard routines for submission to chemical laboratories (e.g. Swift & Bignal, 2015). Earthworm estimates were from stratified random samples with provisos excluding 1 m from bunds or field boundaries (to reduce possible edge-effects) and avoidance of anomalies such as ant-nests or puddles. Conventionally, ten earthworm samples per field from 31.5 cm quadrats (i.e., 0.1 m<sup>2</sup> each) were collected to the depth of worm activity, effectively 0-30 cm in most cases. Numbers of worms based on ‘head’ counts (plus cocoons if found) and total wet-weights, both data expressed as means m<sup>-2</sup> soil (that give even numbers for ten sample means). For Haughley, after three pilot

samples for evaluation of coefficients of variation, ten samples of 25 cm side to 20 cm depth (corresponding to the depth of mouldboard plough) were taken at monthly intervals for three months from each of the three sections (i.e., ~33 sample units per treatment). However, as Blakemore (2000) noted: “a sampling error of less than 10% of the mean cannot generally be obtained without excessive cost in sampling effort”. N-P-K data in (Blakemore, 2000) are not repeated here since they are less relevant with compost fertilizers where microbial activity governs mineralization in synchrony with plant demand (Balfour, 1977). No information was found on Balfour’s (1975) planned earthworm studies at Haughley, thus the only data is from Blakemore (1981; 2000). Earthworm extraction was by hand-sorting in all cases (Figure 2). Soil analyses used standard Walkley-Black method for total C, and/or loss-on-ignition for soil organic matter (SOM). Note that Walkley-Black often underestimates total C with a correction factor of ca. x 1.3 required.



**Figure 2. Handsorting earthworms in rice paddy at Kahariam (from Sterin *et al.*, 2014).**

### ***Conventions***

Soil organic carbon was calculated from the formula  $\text{SOC (t ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \text{soil carbon (\%)} \times \text{bulk density (g cm}^{-3}\text{ or Mg m}^{-3}\text{)} \times \text{sampling depth (cm)}$ . Where soil bulk density (BD) was not taken directly, it is estimated by the Alexander-B method, this being the most reliable and conservative of those listed by Valzano *et al.* (2005: tab. 6, fig. 2) as  $\text{BD (in Mg/m}^3\text{ or g/cm}^3\text{)} = [1.72 - (0.294 \times \sqrt{\text{SOC}})]$  using SOC% calculated directly or from mean SOM% x 0.58 vanBemmelen conversion factor. (Cf. Gattinger *et al.* 2010 use of equivalent BD estimations based on Post & Kwon’s method).

Average SOM in 0-10 cm is reported (Valzano *et al.*, 2005: 9) similar to that in 10-30 cm portion (differing by  $\pm 3\%$ ) thus validating comparisons of equivalent soil samples taken from these different depths.  $\text{SOC} \times 3.667 = \text{CO}_2\text{e t ha}^{-1}$  (atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  equivalent). Standard SI units are “Mg” (= 1,000,000 g), here as “t” = one tonne (British and SI = “metric ton” in USA) used for simple ease of comparison with other reports; thus “Mt” or “Gt” = megatonne or gigatonne, respectively; also yr = year. ANOVA and other statistics (e.g. Wessa 2015) are as noted in Results.

## Results

A. Haughley wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) and permanent pasture data from Blakemore (1981; 2000) are reinterpreted in Tables 1 and 2. Winter soil temperatures although measured in adjacent fields on the same day and at the same time (~5 minutes walk between fields) showed remarkable differences: perhaps recording for the first time thermal insulation effects of organic soils. There were corresponding and inter-related variations in moisture and SOM too (Table 1).

**Table 1. Haughley field soil data with % relative differences; means  $\pm$  se and ANOVA superscript results (n>3; p<0.01 from <http://statpages.org/anova1sm.html>).**

	“Saxon” pasture	“Stables” wheat	“Stackyard” wheat	“Peartree” wheat
System type	Organic	Organic	Mixed	Stockless
Nov. Temp., 10 cm depth	N/A	10.0 °C	10.0 °C	10.0 °C
<b>Jan. Temp., 10 cm depth</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>2.5 °C</b>	<b>1.5 °C</b>	<b>0.5 °C</b>
Colour (Munsell)	Black 10YR 2/1	Dark 10YR 2/2	Brown 10YR 5/3, mottled	Brown 10YR 4/2
Bulk density, air-dry (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	0.91	0.84	0.81	1.05
<b>%moisture (% difference)</b>	<b>42 (+90.9%)</b>	<b>31 (+40.9%)</b>	<b>24 (+9.9%)</b>	<b>22</b>
%SOM by ignition (% difference)	21 (+133%)	11 (+22%)	9 (0%)	9
pH (in water)	7.5	7.2	7.6	7.5
CEC (me 100g <sup>-1</sup> )	N/A	17.9 ( $\pm 0.05$ )	15.7 ( $\pm 0.01$ )	13.5 ( $\pm 0.4$ )
<b>Organic C (Walkely-Black %)</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>4.00<sup>a</sup> (<math>\pm 0.03</math>)</b>	<b>2.34<sup>b</sup> (<math>\pm 0.03</math>)</b>	<b>1.75<sup>c</sup> (<math>\pm 0.01</math>)</b>
Relative difference organic C		+128.6%	+33.7%	-

N/A –not available.

**Table 2. Haughley monthly earthworm survey results and statistics.**

	“Saxon” Organic permanent pasture	“Stables” Organic wheat	“Stackyard” Mixed (non-organic) wheat	“Peartree” Non-organic wheat



Number of observations (n)	7	32	32	33
Mean number of worms (m <sup>-2</sup> )	424.0 <sup>a</sup>	178.6 <sup>b</sup>	97.5 <sup>c</sup>	100.0 <sup>c</sup>
Mean weight of worms (g m <sup>-2</sup> )	117.6 <sup>d</sup>	66.2 <sup>e</sup>	35.4 <sup>f</sup>	34.7 <sup>f</sup>
Relative difference counts	+324%	+78.6%	-2.5%	-
Relative difference mass	+70%	+47.6%	+2.0%	-

Earthworms values in Table 2 also differed correspondingly with ANOVA row superscripts after transformation [ $\log(x+1)$ ] at  $p < 0.01$  (except <sup>d</sup> & <sup>e</sup> at  $p < 0.05$ ); biomass of *Lumbricus terrestris* Linnaeus, 1758 matures were deliberately excluded as these would have positively skewed the results more in favour of the organic fields. Population of seven species in the pasture equated to 4.2 million earthworms ha<sup>-1</sup> and biomass (including *L. terrestris* matures) totalling 1.2 t ha<sup>-1</sup> which is higher than average above-ground cattle stocking rates.

Pearson's coefficient (Wessa, 2015) for earthworms m<sup>-2</sup> vs. SOC% in Tables 1–2, albeit for only a few values, give  $r = 0.99$  ( $n = 4$ ;  $p < 0.003$ ), i.e., an highly significant correlation. Transformation to normalize the data [ $\log(x+1)$ ] as per Swift & Bignal (2001) gives  $r = 0.97$ ,  $p = 0.03$  which is a slightly lesser but still strong correlation.

Soil in the organic wheat field under 40 yr organic management had total organic C ( $4\% \times 0.84 \text{ g cm}^{-3} \times 20 \text{ cm}$ ) = 67.2 g cm<sup>-3</sup> or t ha<sup>-1</sup> while nearby conventional wheat soil had total SOC ( $1.75 \times 1.05 \times 20$ ) = 36.75 C g cm<sup>-3</sup> or t ha<sup>-1</sup> in 0-20 cm topsoil. Difference in carbon for organic vs. conventional (67.2 vs. 36.8) = 82.9%, i.e., 30.45 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra SOC or ( $\times 3.667$ ) 111.7 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra CO<sub>2</sub>e storage in the organic wheat field soil.

Permanent pasture total SOC (estimated from SOM%  $\times$  0.58 vanBemmelen) at ( $12.2\% \times 0.91 \text{ g cm}^{-3} \times 20 \text{ cm}$ ) = 222.0 g cm<sup>-3</sup> or t ha<sup>-1</sup>, substantially more carbon than either the organic wheat field (67.2) or the conventional wheat field (36.8); conversely, these amounts may be progressively depleted due to cultivation of pasture for cropland then further depleted under intensive agrichemical use. Total carbon storage estimate in the permanent pasture is equivalent to ( $222.0 \times 3.667$ ) 814 t ha<sup>-1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub>e.

In the Haughley study (Blakemore, 2000), winter wheat shoots were significantly higher by 16.2% with 12.1% longer roots. Moreover, Balfour (1977) found crop yields in terms of both plant growth and nutrient status from the Organic section remained consistently as high and, despite the chemically grown fodder having higher water content, the organic dairy herd produced around 15%

more milk than the mixed dairy herd over a 20-yr period.

From monthly chemical analyses Balfour (1977) newly reported that the levels of available minerals in the soil fluctuate according to the season, maximum levels coinciding with the time of maximum plant demand; and that these fluctuations were far more marked in the Organic Section. A remarkable personal observation at Haughley was the completely different nature of soils in almost adjacent fields that presumably started from a near uniform condition prior to cultivation: whereas the pasture and organic soils were spongy, dry and friable, the intensive arable soil was compacted, cloddy and most difficult to both walk on and to handle.

Microbial counts were not available for Haughley soils at the time of the study.

B. Results for Kahariam rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) are summarized in Tables 3–5 (maize, *Zea mays* L. is included for comparison).

Organic vs conventional paddy rice (Table 3) had ~25% less SOM but ~9% more SOC; ANOVA result (from <http://statistica.mooco.com>, df = 3,4; F= 66.8) give  $p < 0.01$ , i.e., significant overall but not between treatments (A vs. B  $p = 0.08$ ; C vs. D  $p = 0.89$ ). Total SOC t ha<sup>-1</sup> was +23.6% ( $t = 0.56$ ,  $p = 0.62$ ) but also not significant.

**Table 3. Soil characteristics in Kahariam organic vs. San Guillermo conventional soils 15-16 May 2013.**

Field	pH	Organic matter (%)	Organic carbon (%)	Moisture content (%)	*BD g cm <sup>-3</sup>	*SOC t ha <sup>-1</sup>
Organic maize	5.59	3.17	0.441	14.29		
Organic rice-1	6.17	2.65	0.541	12.36	1.50	12.17
Organic rice-2	6.10	2.10	0.406	15.61		
Conventional-1	6.60	3.00	0.429	13.97	1.53	9.85
Conventional-2	6.69	3.37	0.441	18.06		
Mean org. rice		2.375	0.4735	13.985		
Mean con. rice		3.185	0.435	16.015		
% Difference		-25.4	+8.9	-12.7	-1.9	+23.6

\*BD and SOC are estimated from SOC % only for the two paddy fields sampled for earthworms.

Differences in microbial plate counts in Table 4 were also non significant in the rice paddies (from

<http://vassarstats.net/anova2u.htm> df=2,1, row p = 0.13 NS). Mycorrhizae, although requested since they are important for rice, were not measured; however, mean bacterial and fungal counts of +44.4% and +54.6% were effectively higher in the organic paddies.

**Table 4. Kahariam organic vs. San Guillermo conventional microbes 15-16 May 2013.**

Field	Bacteria (CFU/g)	Fungi (CFU/g)
Organic maize	10.4 x10 <sup>6</sup>	4.45 x10 <sup>4</sup>
Organic rice-1	8.15 x10 <sup>6</sup>	3.95 x10 <sup>4</sup>
Organic rice-2	4.8 x10 <sup>6</sup>	2.75 x10 <sup>4</sup>
Conventional-1	4.05 x10 <sup>6</sup>	0.49 x10 <sup>4</sup>
Conventional-2	4.95 x10 <sup>6</sup>	3.95 x10 <sup>4</sup>
Mean org. rice	6.5 (±1.68)	3.4 (±0.60)
Mean con. rice	4.5 (±0.45)	2.2 (±1.73)
Difference %	44.4%	54.6%

Results in Table 5 show worm counts on 15<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> May 2013 were 56.5 % higher for organic paddy at Kahariam vs. conventional paddy at San Guillermo and ANOVA gave p<0.01 overall which is highly significant [df = 3, F = 6.82; t-tests <http://studentsttest.com> n = 10, <sup>a</sup>p = 0.26 (NS) for numbers and <sup>bc</sup>p = 0.0003 for biomass since conventional paddy worms were all quite small]. Earthworm species were mainly *Drawida impertusa* Stephenson, 1920 vs. *Ramiella bishambari* (Stephenson, 1914), respectively (see Blakemore *et al.*, 2014 and data in Appendix).

Organic matter and moisture levels differences were insignificant, and although carbon was 26% higher in the organic field corresponding with its 56.5% greater earthworm abundance these were only marginally significant statistically (ANOVA, p<0.05). Pearson's correlation for SOC vs. worm biometry showed no correlation either although the data were rather limited and heteroscedastic.

**Table 5. Kahariam organic vs. San Guillermo conventional soil data and mean worm counts.**

Field	pH	Soil organic matter (%)	Soil organic carbon (%)	Moisture content (%)	Worms (m <sup>-2</sup> )	Worms (g m <sup>-2</sup> )
Organic maize	5.59	3.17	0.441	14.29	183	23.9
Organic rice-1	6.17	2.65	0.541	12.36	36 <sup>a</sup>	13.8 <sup>b*</sup>
Conventional-1	6.6	3.0	0.429	13.97	23 <sup>a</sup>	0.4 <sup>c*</sup>
Rice % difference	-6.5	-11.7	+26.1	-11.5	+56.5	+3,350

\*ANOVA superscripts differ by p <0.01.

In Philippines, rice yields are measured in cavans (1 cavan is 48 kg). Five years after becoming organic, Kahariam grows 90-120 cavans ha<sup>-1</sup> rice (D. Rubio pers. comm.); since rice production locally ranges 20-90 cavans ha<sup>-1</sup>, their yield increase is up to +33%. From FAO (2015a), Philippine-wide rice yield was 3.89 t ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2013 putting Kahariam's range (= 4.32-5.76 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 11-48% higher than the national average.

C. Results for Peñalosas' Hacienda Remedios, sugar cane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.) are in Table 6; paddy rice is included for comparison.

Soil characters (Table 6) differ significantly by one-way ANOVA between organic and conventional for topsoil moisture, pH and SOM. [ANOVA results from <http://statistica.moood.com> for topsoil moisture n = 3,2; F = 20.9; p = 0.02 i.e., significant difference; for subsoil moisture n = 6,4; F = 0.70; p = 0.4 (NS); pH (n = 6,4; F = 63.8; p<0.001; i.e., highly significant difference) and for SOM n = 6,4; F = 3.9; p = 0.08 (i.e., significance p<0.1>0.05)]. ANOVA for mean worm counts [n = 3,2; F = 0.56; p = 0.55] detected no significant difference. However, original worm count totals (n = 30,20; df = 1; F = 5.5; p = 0.023) gave significant difference at p<0.05 for organic vs. conventional.

2-way ANOVA (<http://statistica.moood.com>) of Water vs. Worms (F = 3.34; p = 0.10 i.e. marginally significant); pH vs. Worms (F = 3.07, p = 0.11 i.e. not significant); OM vs. Worms (F = 3.71, p = 0.09) i.e., also marginally significant p<0.1.

Pearson-r correlation analysis gave closest indication for SOM vs. earthworms [[http://www.wessa.net/rwasp\\_correlation.wasp#output](http://www.wessa.net/rwasp_correlation.wasp#output)] Water vs. Worms df = 3, n =5, r = 0.40, p = 0.50 (NS); pH vs. Worms r = 0.40 (NS); topsoil SOM vs. Worms r = 0.75; p = 0.14 (i.e., NS)]. However, including the subsoil with topsoil data, gave more confident correlation for SOM vs. earthworm counts: df = 8, n = 10, r = 0.72, p = 0.017, i.e., significance at p<0.05. These results slightly skewed due to a high count outlier of 99 worm m<sup>-2</sup> in a canefield adjacent to a woodland that possibly acted as an earthworm refuge; but normalizing the data by transformation of the counts to [log (x+1)] as per Swift & Bignal (2015) gave r = 0.72, p = 0.018 for worms m<sup>-2</sup> vs. SOC%. Moreover, converting SOM% to SOC% with vanBremelen factor (x 0.58) also gave the same outcome. Table 6 data thus show correlation (strictly at p<0.05) for Peñalosa and the neighbouring farm's cane worm counts with their total SOM%, and SOC% were also effectively increased just as with the earlier Haughley results for pasture and wheat fields.

**Table 6. Peñalosa's Hacienda Remedios canefields soil and worm data, 29-30<sup>th</sup> January 2014.**

*Code/Lot	%Moisture	pH	SOM (%)	Worms m <sup>-2</sup>	Code/Lot	%Moisture	pH	SOM (%)
<b>NPCH</b> Top	4.88	6.8	3.92	99	<b>NPCH</b> Sub	4.72	6.7	3.26
<b>NPCM</b> Top	4.91	6.8	3.53	17	<b>NPCM</b> Sub	5.23	7.2	2.63
<b>NPCR</b> Top	4.85	6.3	2.74	17	<b>NPCR</b> Sub	4.86	6.4	2.35
NNCRTop	4.52	4.6	2.73	29	NNCRSub	4.29	4.4	2.47
NNCMTop	4.23	5.2	2.34	11	NNCMSub	5.66	5.2	2.24
<b>NP</b> (Organic) mean	4.88	6.63	3.40	44.33		4.94	6.8	2.75
NN (Non-org) mean	4.38	4.90	2.54	20.00		4.98	4.8	2.36
Difference of means	11.5%	35.4%	34.0%	121.7%		-0.8%	41.0%	16.6%

\* NPC - Negros Peñalosa cane (organic fields are **bolded**), NNC - Negros non-organic cane, R - replant, M - mature, H – harvested; Top - top soil 0-10 cm, Sub - soil @ 15 cm depth.

Table 6 shows organic topsoil had +34% more SOM and 11.5% greater soil moisture than its conventional neighbour's non-organic fields; it was more alkaline by 1.7 pH points favouring microbial activity and natural mineralization, all these characters associated with its attaining a mean earthworm population of +120%.

For sugarcane fields organic for 10 yrs, SOC is estimated (by mean 3.40 SOM% x 0.58 =) 1.97%; its conventional neighbour has SOC = 1.47% (from 2.54 SOM% x 0.58) with difference = 40.0%. Bulk densities of Organic vs. Conventional cane are estimated at 1.31 vs. 1.36 g cm<sup>-3</sup>, respectively, to give total SOC% (1.97 x 1.31 x 10 =) 25.8 vs. (1.47 x 1.36 x 10 =) 20.0 t ha<sup>-1</sup>; differing by 129.1% or 5.8 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra C x 3.667 = 21.3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>e in top 10 cm of the organic soil.

The organic sugarcane yield averages 90 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (R. Peñalosa, pers. comm.) against a usual yield in northern Negros area of 50 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, i.e. +80%. Mean Filipino cane yield in 2013 was 73.2 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (FAO, 2015b) putting Peñalosa farm's organic yield at +23% above the national average.

Paddy rice fields at Hacienda Remedios sampled for comparison had mean SOM 2.28% and 24.0 earthworms m<sup>-2</sup> (see Appendix). Various other earthworms populations were recorded under vegetable beds, banana plantations and coconut groves, but insufficient time was available for further survey nor for comparison with conventional fields in the neighbourhood. Fieldwork was also hampered by severe typhoon flooding of the home farm soon after initial sampling.

Analyses of vermicompost data is summarized in Table 7. Total N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O data were also obtained but, as with organic soils, it is generally irrelevant for microbially active composts and is deliberately omitted.

**Table 7. Summary of vermicompost characteristics (from Kahariam farm).**

	Organic matter (OM %)	C:N ratio <sup>1</sup>	Total C (%)	H <sub>2</sub> O (%)	pH	Bacteria CFU/g	Fungi CFU/g
Kahariam	36	15:1	ca. 21	30	6.8	1.23x10 <sup>7</sup>	1.5x10 <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Total C for from OM% x 0.58 conversion factor.

The fresh Kahariam sample was as applied to fields and sold commercially. Peñalosa's field applications have organic matter ranging up to 65% with average about 40% (i.e., ca. 23% C) in combined composts/vermicomposts that were applied at 10-20 t ha<sup>-1</sup> per yr for cane and 1.5-3.0 t ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> for rice (R. Peñalosa pers. comm.).

Cursory biodiversity survey over a few days on both farms in the Philippines had lower abundance than at Haughley but greater diversity with at least a 20 species identified (including several new native species and new exotic records) from Kahariam organic farm, and about a dozen from Peñalosa's farms, in addition to *Eudrilus eugeniae* that was dominant in wormbeds at both sites (see Blakemore, 2015 and Appendix).


Table 8 gives worm and related soil results from all three organic farms and their non-organic neighbours.

**Table 8. Summary results of worm counts vs. means of SOM and soil moisture at all sites**

Farm	Crop	Worms m <sup>-2</sup>	SOM %	Moisture %
A. Haughley, UK	Organic pasture	424	21	42
	Organic wheat	178.6	11	31
	Non-organic wheat-1	97.5	9	24
	Non-organic wheat-2	100	9	22
B. Kahariam, PI	Organic maize	183	3.2	14.3
	Organic rice-1	36	2.7	12.4
San Guillermo	Non-organic rice-1	23	3	14

C. Penalosa's Hacienda	Organic rice	24	2.3	4.3
Remedios PI				
	Organic sugar-1	99	3.6	4.8
	Organic sugar-2	17	3.1	5.1
	Organic sugar-3	17	2.6	4.9
Remedios' Neighbour in PI	Non-organic sugar-1	29	2.6	4.4
	Non-organic sugar-2	11	2.3	5

Pearson-r correlation (<http://www.wessa.net>) and Linear Regression (<http://www.alcula.com/calculators/statistics/linear-regression/>) analyses in Figure 3 show strong positive relationship between worm abundance and both SOM and H<sub>2</sub>O from Fig. 8. Similar result for the SOM vs. soil moisture demonstrate the intimately linked, mutual inter-relationships between all three factors (Fig. 3).



**Figure 3. Linear regression of scatter plots and Pearson's Correlation for data from Table 8.**

## Discussion

The current study supports a viable and natural option for both mitigation and adaptation for both biodiversity loss and for global climate change. It considers the status of resident earthworm populations and crop yields as evidence of healthy soils and sustainability of organic farming methods in both temperate and tropical soils. Shortcomings in the current study, e.g. brevity of survey, lack of glomalin data, and failure to weigh all Filipino samples nor yet completely identify them (Appendix), were entirely due to lack of basic support in the field; nevertheless statistically significant results were achieved quickly and relatively economically. Biological variation is invariably present in Nature, giving marginal significance of some results at  $p < 0.1$  level for the

smaller data sets, but this is also why conventional agronomic trials use sterilized mesocosm/pot soils: to avoid the “complication” of excessive yield when an earthworm is present. Analyses of the main study crops (viz. wheat, rice, sugarcane) and of a few incidental plots (e.g. maize, bananas, vegetables) show definite trends indicative of research meriting further investigation, should funding be suitably prioritized. However, as International Foundation for Organic Agriculture (IFOAM) President Andre Leu (quoted from Lappé, 2014) points out: “Fifty-two billion dollars is spent annually on agriculture research worldwide, but less than 0.4 percent [i.e., ca. \$200 million] is spent on organic farming systems”. Following the Paris COP21 meeting in December, 2015 this situation may soon change and the role of organic farming in carbon sequestration, food security and biodiversity be widely recognized and more broadly supported (via <http://4p1000.org> that is committed to ensuring at least 50% adoption of agroecology approach by 2020).

Although the comparisons of organic and conventional farming for temperate wheat and tropical sugarcane were found statistically valid and meaningful, data for the Filipino rice paddy are perhaps less certain being based on fewer samples, also the absolute SOC values were much lower than the other two crops. This may be accounted for its relatively recent conversion to organic (since 2009), the lower compost applications (initially 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, then reduced to 1.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> without apparent loss of yield) and, perhaps most significantly, the difficulties in comparison between paddy that are periodically inundated, drained or in a fallow phase. Particular management differences were that the conventional rice was rainfed (upland) while the organic had supplementary river ram-pump and windpump irrigation options. Conventional yields may have also been depleted by an obvious problem in their rice paddies of Golden Apple Snail (*Pomacea spp.*) that were not found on the organic fields which were also mostly unaffected by Filipino’s common Black Bug [*Scotinophara coarctata* (Fabricius, 1798)] infestations. Whether this resistance was due in part to more resilient plants with synergistic trophobiosis (e.g. Paull, 2007) is unknown. Suppression of insect pests such as aphids and psyllids in response to vermicompost applications are noted in a comprehensive review (Magdoff & Weil, 2004). In Europe, Zaller *et al.* (2013) found that presence of earthworms in mesocosms also reduced mollusc herbivory by 60% compared to worm-free controls. Such factors may be important additional benefits for vermicomposting/organic farming in themselves meriting further research funding.

Surprisingly, only a few other other rice studies have considered earthworms: one (Sahrawat, 1983) gave organic C (%) variations in Filipino rice paddy soils from 0.63-5.46% (mean 2.0%) – all higher than the Kahariam findings (of 0.54%). While not considering organics per se, long-term fertilizer treatments for 16 yrs on paddy in China, had seven species of earthworms that were



depleted under a wholly chemical treatment (*Xiang et al.*, 2006) but that positively correlated to SOC and total N of plots and also with rice paddy yield. Their SOC values (1.65-1.78%) were also higher than Kahariam's (0.54%) but approached the Peñalosa rice SOC value (2.28%). From their data it is calculated that Chinese paddy plots fertilized with manure had total SOC 2.06 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra compared to unfertilized plots. This is equivalent to 7.56 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra CO<sub>2</sub>e for the Chinese organic fertilizer rice paddy.

Soil bulk densities for Kahariam organic vs. conventional paddy (Table 2) are estimated at 1.50 vs. 1.53 g cm<sup>-3</sup>, to give total SOC (0.541 x 1.50 x 15=) 12.17 vs. (0.429 x 1.53 x 15=) 9.85 t ha<sup>-1</sup>; which differ +23.6% or by 2.33 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra C or 8.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra CO<sub>2</sub>e which is similar to the Chinese figure of 7.56 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra. Given that 165 million ha are planted to paddy rice, it may be speculated that if all converted to organic with similar results then 165 x 8.5 = 1.40 billion tonnes extra CO<sub>2</sub>e sequestered. Moreover, these values are for 0-15 cm topsoil and may reasonably be doubled for 0-30 cm (as per Valzano *et al.* 2005: 9, 67) to give total of ca. +2.8 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e above conventional paddy storage levels, equal to annual emissions of either the EU 'Eurozone' or India (2.0-2.5 Gt in 2010 as reported by [www.wikipedia.com](http://www.wikipedia.com) on data from EDGAR (database created by EU Commission and Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency in 2013 [http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/news\\_docs/pbl-2013-trends-in-global-co2-emissions-2013-report-1148.pdf](http://edgar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/news_docs/pbl-2013-trends-in-global-co2-emissions-2013-report-1148.pdf)).

Regarding the sugarcane data, given that 26.5 million ha are planted to sugarcane globally in 2013 (FAO 2015b) with most production in Brazil, India, China and Thailand, if trash burning ceased and all fields converted to organic with somewhat similar results to those presented herein, then 26.5 ha x 21.3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub>e = 564.5 million t extra CO<sub>2</sub>e. Furthermore, these values are for 0-10 cm topsoil and may be reasonably doubled for 0-30 cm depth (the actual value Peñalosa farm's SOC at 15 cm = ~62.6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) to give total of ca. 1.1 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e above conventional canefield levels, which is approximately the same as Japan's annual fossil fuel carbon emissions of ca. 1.17 Gt. This raises possibilities of carbon credit schemes to offset emissions from developed countries in exchange for tropical organic growers conversion to organic production (such exchanges between countries were recently ratified at COP21 in Paris in 2015).

Reinterpretation of the Haughley data (Blakemore, 1981; 2000) confirmed its significance, with 111.7 t ha<sup>-1</sup> extra CO<sub>2</sub>e storage in the organic wheat field soil; and it becomes even more meaningful as the need to remedy atmospheric carbon and concomitant climate change becomes more imminently critical (see <http://4p1000.org/>). This is especially pertinent since 220 million ha

globally were planted to wheat in 2013 (FAOSTAT 2013). If all were to be converted to organic with similar results then  $220 \times 111.7 = 24,574$  million tonnes or 24.6 Gt extra CO<sub>2</sub>e would be sequestered in topsoil – almost exactly double the OECD members' emission rate (of 12.6 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>). These ca. 0-20 cm topsoil values may reasonably be at least doubled for >20 cm layer (e.g. Valzano *et al.*, 2005) to total ca. 49.2 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>e above comparable arable wheat C stock, which is much greater than entire global CO<sub>2</sub> emission of ca. 40.0 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> projected for 2014 (CDIAC, 2015).

In comparison to Haughley, a long-term agronomic plot trial established in Pendleton, Oregon in 1931 of winter wheat-summer tilled fallow with organic or synthetic fertilizers found after 70 yrs that the major soil carbon pool – including glomalin – was dependent on arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (Wuest *et al.*, 2005). These authors (on page 164) also found statistically significant correlation (here recalculated as  $r = 0.89$ ,  $n = 9$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) between glomalin and earthworm counts that were maxima of 2.59 mg g<sup>-1</sup> and 144 worms m<sup>-2</sup> in organic fertilized plots (cf. 178.6 worms m<sup>-2</sup> at Haughley). These authors failed also to weight their worms.

Reinterpretation of this Pendleton data (Wuest *et al.*, 2005) shows a correlation between earthworms and total soil organic C ( $r = 0.70$ ,  $n = 9$ ,  $p < 0.03$ ) with recalculation of total topsoil C (including glomalin) in the plot fertilized with manure ( $22.4 \text{ t ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1} = 111 \text{ kg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  N equivalent) of 15.9 g kg<sup>-1</sup> total carbon. This would translate as approximately 32 t ha<sup>-1</sup> SOC (from 1.59 C%  $\times$  1.35 estimated BD g cm<sup>-3</sup>  $\times$  15 cm sample depth) which is comparable to the Haughley winter wheat organic field value of 67.2 t ha<sup>-1</sup> to 20 cm depth SOC. Incidentally, Pendleton's 70 year organic fertilizer treatments sustained higher grain yields (by +5-53%) and a greatly increased water infiltration rate (of 2.34 mm min<sup>-1</sup>) compared to any other of their plot treatments; also similar to the case at Haughley.

In a long-term study commencing in 1892 at the Magruder experimental plots in Oklahoma, an untreated plot without any fertilizer continues to produce winter wheat grain yields  $>1 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$  although its SOM has declined from 4 to 1% (Girma *et al.*, 2007). This exemplifies the scale of loss of SOM under cultivation that may be redressed by crop rotation and adding FYM, organic composts and mulches as at Haughley.

Yet another long-term trial at Järna, Sweden that lasted 32 years was reported (Granstedt & Kjellenberg, 1997) as having higher soil fertility and higher yields of wheat and potatoes in organic (biodynamic) treatments than in conventional inorganic NPK fertilizer treatments. Humus,

organic C and earthworm activity were also improved as was also the case in the current studies.

Also supporting the findings presented herein, a meta-study by Rodale Institute concluded that if all cropland were converted similar to their regenerative model it would sequester 40% of annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; adding pastures to that model would add another 71%, effectively overcompensating for the world's yearly carbon dioxide emissions (Rodale, 2015). Moreover, their side-by-side trial after 30+ years, slightly less than the Haughley trial that was 42 years when reported (Blakemore, 1981), showed organic : conventional yields to be equivalent over a range of crops with organics higher in drought years; the energy input lower (by “1,300 MJ/acre/yr”); greenhouse gases lower by (“500 lbs CO<sub>2</sub>/acre/yr”); and profits higher (by “US\$368/acre/yr”). Earlier results from Rodale were reviewed after 20 years (Pimental *et al.*, 2005). Such findings refute a recent report (Seufert *et al.*, 2012) that, while proclaiming all organic yields lower than conventional chemical yields, considered neither earthworms ecology, economics nor carbon per se.

According to FAO, permanent pastures occupied an estimated 3.6 billion ha (36,000,000 sq km) in 2000, representing 26% of the world land area and 70% of the world's agricultural area. If all pasture managed similar levels of carbon to the findings from the Haughley study its total SOC ( $222 \text{ t ha}^{-1} \times 3.6 \text{ Gha} =$ ) ca. 800 Gt C or 3,000 Gt CO<sub>2e</sub> matches almost exactly the current atmospheric concentration of 3,000 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>.

Darwin (1881) conservatively estimated 17-40 t ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> of earthworm casts for the whole of the UK; if average wormcast SOM is ca. 12% then  $\times 0.58$  conversion factor = 1.2-2.8 t ha<sup>-1</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> C that for 3.6 Gha pasture globally would be  $\approx 10 \text{ Gt C yr}^{-1}$  or ca. 100 Gt yr<sup>-1</sup> every 10 yrs for organically converted pastures. It seems the great evolutionary scientist and first soil ecologist had already unintentionally provided a direction to help fix our unanticipated contemporary CO<sub>2</sub> problems too.

However Darwin's figures, as with those calculated herein are likely massive underestimations of the potential of earthworms to influence the storage of soil carbon at depth. There seems some major discrepancy in the calculations of total global carbon in soils which is given by COP21's International “4 per 1000 (2016)” Initiative as just 1,500 Gt whereas NASA (2011) has 2,300 Gt carbon. The NASA figure is taken from the US Department of Energy and their original source for the soil carbon budget is “Houghton (2007)”. Accessing Houghton (2007: 316), he states:

*“The amount of carbon contained in terrestrial vegetation (550±100 Pg) is on the order of the amount in the atmosphere (800 Pg). The organic matter in soils is two to three times this amount [1500–2000 PgC in the top meter and as much as 2300 Pg in the top 3 m (Jobágyi & Jackson*

2000)J”

Then, from Jobágyy & Jackson (2000), I found they based their analysis on >2700 soil profiles in three global databases to give 2,344 Pg C, or 56% more than the 1,502 Pg estimated for the first meter. This likely accounts for the 4p1000 vs. NASA discrepancy, i.e., 1 m vs. 3 m soil depths.

Nevertheless, it does not account for the actual soil surface area miscalculations which Jobágyy & Jackson (2000: tab. 3) give at  $121 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^2$  from “land area values based on Whittaker (1975) and Jackson *et al.* (1997)”. These calculations by Jobágyy & Jackson (2000: tabs. 3-4) take mean soil carbon figures for biomes (including tundra and deserts but naturally excluding icefields such as Antarctica and Greenland) and multiply by a **flat earth** area which is often erroneously given as  $148,300,000 \text{ km}^2$  ( $= 14,830,000,000 \text{ ha} = 148 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^2$ ) or supposedly about 30% of total global surface area. This is a mistake when it is realized that the land terrain is not flat but undulating and especially the soil micro-relief surface area even down to the size of worm casts is many times greater and, moreover, Blakemore (2016b) suggests soil carbon may actually have much higher total figures when calculations are standardized with glomalin and taken to depths >3 m.

## Conclusions

The current study reports potential for organically managed pasture and broad-acre crops of wheat, rice and sugarcane to increase yield whilst maintaining carbon/water storage and biodiversity in soils. Earthworms are seen as both monitors and mediators of these processes in the field (as often demonstrated from pot experiments), whilst the contributions from vermicomposting species are important for processing and recycling all biodegradable “wastes” into a valuable organic fertilizer resource called vermicompost that far surpasses charcoal additives heavily promoted as “biochar”.

Highlighted is a need for standard methods of earthworm and soil sampling to allow ease of comparison of biodiversity, soil moisture and carbon budgets (including glomalin) – issues addressed in an accompanying and complementary paper (Blakemore, 2016b). Actual true global soil terrain surface area is also required as noted in the latter paper.

Taking recent  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration as 400 ppm and total atmospheric carbon as ~800 Gt ( $= 3,000 \text{ Gt CO}_2$  from NASA 2011), an estimate is that  $1\text{Gt C} = 0.5 \text{ ppm CO}_2$ . Thus the potential extra C sequestered in land under the three crops tested here, should they all be converted to organic, would be in the order of (wheat 49.2 + rice 2.8 + sugar 1.1  $\Rightarrow$ ) 53.1 Gt  $\text{CO}_2\text{e}$  ( $\times 0.273$  conversion factor) = 14.5 Gt C which equates to ca. 7.25 ppm reduction or roughly 7 points off Mauna Loa’s current value of atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  of 400 ppm.

As shown for all three crops in the current study, organic farming can provide substantially higher yields with advantages of lower input costs (in terms of agrichemicals, spray safety equipment, irrigation, etc.; plus manures, sugar-mill and vegetable wastes are freely available), whilst also supporting more abundant soil biodiversity **and** sequestering carbon (cf. Seufert *et al.*, 2012). Organic farming is often more labour intensive which, nevertheless, helps resolve dual problems of rapid urbanization with high rural unemployment. Since organic produce has longer shelf-life (e.g. Granstedt & Kjellenberg, 1997: fig. 3), food spoilage and hunger are also reduced. Moreover, when all organic wastes are entirely recycled then environmental pollution and contamination are removed as downstream externalities. Other social, economic and ecological impacts are less harm to farmworkers and their families (who in the Philippines as in other developing countries often live in or near sprayed fields), to consumers and to the environment from poisonous biocides plus fewer problems with runoff pollutants or eutrophication of waterways and coastal coral reefs that are considered important in places like Queensland and PI. Darwin's humble earthworm may be thus seen as key to providing all these naturally beneficial services with the challenge now to confirm these organic yields, soil carbon data and earthworm abundances on a broader scale and in greater depth.

Indeed, as Lady Eve Balfour –originator of the Haughley Experiment and co-founder and first president of the Soil Association – said in her Introduction to *Harnessing the Earthworm* by Barrett (1947): ‘*When the question is asked, “Can I build top-soil?” the answer is “Yes”, and when the first question is followed by a second question, “How?” the answer is “Feed earthworms”*’.

### **Acknowledgments**

The original Haughley work was supported by a modest grant from Suffolk County Council with accommodation by my grandmother in nearby Eye; Dr Steph Greshon assisted cold winter field work. Thanks are warmly extend to owner Manuel “Nonong” Bagatsing, farm manager Danny Rubio and other friendly Kahariam staff. Generosity of Ramon “Mon” Peñalosa and family is appreciated. Help in PI was by Rowena Ocenar and Ag. students Cherry Ann Madrazo of VSU, Maria Valenzuela, Mark Retrita & Jaypee Oblina of CBSUA plus Meldrick of UPV. APN Kobe made minor contribution to my PI project for just one of the proposed two years and I personally conducted, supervised or verified all data collection in this report.

### **References**

4 per 1000 Initiative (2016). Website <http://4p1000.org/understand>. (Accessed April, 2016).

- Balfour, E.B. (with Milton, R.F.) (1975). *The Living Soil and the Haughley Experiment*. 2nd revised edn. Faber & Faber; London. ([organiccollege.com/dl/file.php/1/the-living-soil.pdf](http://organiccollege.com/dl/file.php/1/the-living-soil.pdf)).
- Balfour, E.B. (1977). *Towards a Sustainable Agriculture – The Living Soil*. Address to an International Federation of Organic Agricultural Movements (IFOAM) conference in Switzerland. (Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> September, 2015); <http://www.soilandhealth.org/01aglibrary/010116Balfourspeech.html>.
- Bengtsson, J. Ahnstrom J. & Weibull A-C. (2005). The effects of organic agriculture on biodiversity and abundance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 42(2): 261-269.
- Blakemore, R.J. (1981). Ecology of earthworms under different fertilizer regimes in agriculture. BSc. Honours thesis. Westminster University. 801/1/22. Pp 93.
- Blakemore, R.J. (1994). Earthworms of south-east Queensland and their agronomic potential in brigalow soils. PhD. Thesis, University of Queensland. Pp 605. Online: <http://www.annelida.net/earthworm/PhD%20Thesis/PhDThesis.DOC>.
- Blakemore, R.J. (1996). The ecology of earthworms in agricultural fields under different fertilizer regimes. In: Curry, J.P., Bolger, T., Kaye, B. & Purvis, G. (eds.). XII International Colloquium on Soil Zoology, UC, Dublin. Abstracts. Pp. 190.
- Blakemore, R.J. (2000). Ecology of earthworms under the 'Haughley experiment' of organic and conventional management regimes. *Biological Agriculture and Horticulture*, 18: 141—159. DOI: 10.1080/01448765.2000.9754876. (Available online: [www.annelida.net/earthworm/Haughley/Haughley.doc](http://www.annelida.net/earthworm/Haughley/Haughley.doc)).
- Blakemore, R.J. (2008). Rice and soybean with vermicast. Online report:; [www.annelida.net/earthworm/RICE%20and%20SOYBEAN%20with%20Vermicasts.doc](http://www.annelida.net/earthworm/RICE%20and%20SOYBEAN%20with%20Vermicasts.doc).
- Blakemore, R.J. (2012). *Cosmopolitan Earthworms – an Eco-Taxonomic Guide to the Peregrine Species of the World*. V<sup>th</sup> Edition. VermEcology, Yokohama. Pp. 900.
- Blakemore, R.J. (2015). Eco-taxonomy of iconic vermicomposter - the 'African Nightcrawler' earthworm, *Eudrilus eugeniae* (Kinberg, 1867). *African Invertebrates*, 56(3): 527-548. <http://africaninvertebrates.org/ojs/index.php/AI/article/view/395>.
- Blakemore, R.J. (2016a). Darwin's earthworms (Annelida, Oligochaeta, Megadrilacea) with review of cosmopolitan *Metaphire peguana*–species group from Philippines. *Opuscula Zoologica*, 47: 9-30. Online: [http://opuscula.elte.hu/PDF/Tomus47\\_1/Op\\_Blakemore\\_Darwins\\_%20Earthworms.pdf](http://opuscula.elte.hu/PDF/Tomus47_1/Op_Blakemore_Darwins_%20Earthworms.pdf).
- Blakemore, R.J. (2016b). *Veni, Vidi, Vermi...* On the contribution of Darwin's 'humble earthworm' to soil health, pollution-free primary production, organic 'waste' management & atmospheric carbon capture for a safe global climate fix. VermEcology Occasional Papers (Current).
- Blakemore, R.J. Lee, S. & Seo. H-Y. (2014). Reports of *Drawida* (Oligochaeta: Moniligastridae) from far East Asia. *Journal of Species Research*, 3(2): 127-166. [[http://www.nibr.go.kr/download?attach\\_path=journal&attach=2014vol3no2\\_3.pdf](http://www.nibr.go.kr/download?attach_path=journal&attach=2014vol3no2_3.pdf)].
- BPI (2014). Bureau of Plant Industry, Manila, Philippines. Kahariam Organic Inbred Rice Seed Production Booklet. (Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); <http://bpi.da.gov.ph/attachments/article/377/Kahariam.pdf>.
- CDIAC. (2015) Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis for US Department of Energy website. (Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); <http://cdiac.ornl.gov/GCP/carbonbudget/2014/>.
- Choosai, C. Jouquet, P. Hanboonsong, Y. & Hartmann, C. (2010). Effects of earthworms on soil properties and rice production in the rainfed paddy fields of Northeast Thailand. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 45: 298-303.
- Condron, L.M. Cameron, K.C. Di, H.J. Clough, T.J. Forbes, E.A. McLaren, R.G. & Silva R.G. (2000). A comparison of soil and environmental quality under organic and conventional farming systems in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research*, 43(4): 443-466, DOI: 10.1080/00288233.2000.9513442. (Online <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00288233.2000.9513442>).
- Darwin, C.R. (1881). *The formation of vegetable mould, through the action of worms, with observations on their habits*. John Murray, London. Online:

[http://darwin-online.org.uk/EditorialIntroductions/Freeman\\_VegetableMouldandWorms.html](http://darwin-online.org.uk/EditorialIntroductions/Freeman_VegetableMouldandWorms.html).

- Dlamini, T.C. Haynes, R.J. & van Antwerpen, R. (2001). Exotic earthworm species dominant in soils on sugarcane estates in the Eshowe area of the north coast of Kwazulu-Natal. *Proceedings of Annual Congress of South African Sugar Technologists Association*, 75: 217–221.
- Don, A. Steinberg, B. Schoning, I. Pritsch, K. Joschko, M. Gleixner, G. & Schulze, E-D. (2008). Organic carbon sequestration in earthworm burrows. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 40: 1803-1812.
- Drinkwater, L.E. Wagoner, P. & Sarrantonio, M. (1998). Legume-based cropping systems have reduced carbon and nitrogen losses. *Nature*, 396, 262-265. Online: <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v396/n6708/abs/396262a0.html>.
- FAO. (2015a). Food and Agriculture Organization. (Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); Online report of PI rice yields: <http://faostat.fao.org/site/567/default.aspx#ancor>.
- FAO. (2015b). Food and Agriculture Organization. (Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); Online report of cane yields: <http://faostat.fao.org>.
- FAOSTAT. (2013). Online report, 2013. <http://faostat.fao.org/site/368/default.aspx#ancor>.
- Gattinger A., Mulli A., Hani M., Oehen B., Stolze M., Niggli U. (2012). Soil carbon sequestration of organic crop and livestock systems and potential for accreditation by carbon markets. (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Natural Resources Management and Environment Department, 2011). Online: <http://orgprints.org/21773/>; <http://saveoursoils.com/userfiles/downloads/1351591967-OrganicFarmingEnhancesCarbonStocks-FAOrapport.pdf>.
- Girma, K. Holtz, S.L. Arnall, D.B. Tubana, B.S. & Raun, W.R. (2007). The Magruder Plots: Untangling the Puzzle. *Agronomy Journal*, 99: 1191-1198.
- Granstedt, A. & Kjellenberg, L. (1997). Long-term field experiment in Sweden: Effects of organic and inorganic fertilizers on soil fertility and crop quality. *Proceedings of an International Conference in Boston, Tufts University, Agricultural Production and Nutrition, Massachusetts; March 19-21, 1997.* (Online: <http://www.jdb.se/sbfi/publ/boston/boston7.html>).
- Halweil, B. (2006). Can organic farming feed us all? *World Watch Magazine*, 19(3). Online: <http://www.worldwatch.org/node/4060> (accessed April, 2016).
- Hole, D.G. Perkins, A.J. Wilson, J.D. Alexander, I.H. Grice, P.V. & Evans, A.D. (2005). Does organic farming benefit biodiversity? *Biological Conservation*, 122:113-120.
- Houghton, R.A. (2007). Balancing the Global carbon budget. *Annual Review of Earth Planetary Science*, 35: 313-347.
- Howard, A. (1943). *An Agricultural Testament*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. (Accessed 15<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); Online: <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks02/0200301.txt>.
- IFOAM. (2006). *Dossier Organic Agriculture & Food Security*. IFOAM (by Rungren, G.). [www.ifoam.bio/sites/default/files/organic\\_agriculture\\_and\\_food\\_security\\_printcopy.pdf](http://www.ifoam.bio/sites/default/files/organic_agriculture_and_food_security_printcopy.pdf).
- Jobbágy, E.G. & Jackson, R.B. (2000). The vertical distribution of soil organic carbon and its relation to climate and vegetation. *Ecological Applications*, 10(2): 423–436.
- Kahariam. (2015); Kahariam Farms Website. <http://www.kahariamfarms.com/>.
- Krupukdee, A. Iwai, C.B. & Ta-oun, M. (2013). The influence of earthworm and rice stubble on soil aggregate, carbon sequestration and soil fertility in sandy loam paddy soil in northeast Thailand. *International Journal of Environmental and Rural Development*. 4-1. (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); Online: <http://iserd.net/ijerd41/41001.pdf>.
- Lappé, A. (2014). 5 Questions for an International Organics Expert: IFOAM's Andre Leu. (Accessed on 12 September, 2015); Online article by Anna Lappé at: Civil Eats . <http://civileats.com/2014/11/13/5-questions-for-an-international-organics-expert-ifoams-andre-leu/#sthash.ui76b7O2.dpuf>.
- Lee, K.E. (1985). *Earthworms, their ecology and relationships with soils and land use*. Academic Press. New York, NY.
- Mäder, P. Fließbach, A. Dubois, D. Gunst, L. Fried, P. & Niggli, U. (2002). Soil fertility and



- biodiversity in organic farming. *Science*, 296: 1694-1697.  
<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/296/5573/1694.full>).
- Magdoff, F. Weil, R.R. (2004). *Soil Organic Matter in Sustainable Agriculture*. CRC Press. Pp. 412.
- NASA. (2011). National Aeronautics and Space Administration Earth Observatory; 2011. (Accessed on 12 September, 2015); <http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/CarbonCycle/> with data taken from “U.S. DOE, *Biological and Environmental Research Information System*” - <http://genomicscience.energy.gov/carboncycle/index.shtml>. (Accessed April, 2016).
- Owa, S.O. Oyenusi, A.A. Joda, A.O. Morafa, S.O.A. & Yeye, J.A. (2003). Effect of earth-worm casting on growth parameters of rice. *African Zoology*, 38: 229–233.
- Paull, J. (2007). Trophobiosis theory: A pest starves on a healthy plant. *ELEMENTALS ~ Journal of Bio-Dynamics Tasmania*, 88: 24-28. (Archived at: <http://orgprints.org/12894/1/12894.pdf>).
- Penalosa Farms. (2015); Penalosa Farms’ website. <http://penalosa farms.com/>.
- Pfiffner, L. & Balmer, O. (2011). *Organic agriculture and biodiversity*. FIBL, Frankfurt. (Online: <https://shop.fibl.org/fileadmin/documents/shop/1548-biodiversity.pdf>).
- Pfiffner, L. & Mäder, P. (1998). Effects of biodynamic, organic and conventional production systems on earthworm populations. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 104: 207-214.
- Pimentel, D. Hepperly, P. Hanson, J. Seidel, R. & Douds, D. (2005). Organic and conventional farming systems: Environmental and economic Issues. *Bioscience*, 55(7): 573-582. Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015.  
[http://dspace.library.cornell.edu/bitstream/1813/2101/1/pimentel\\_report\\_05-1.pdf](http://dspace.library.cornell.edu/bitstream/1813/2101/1/pimentel_report_05-1.pdf).
- Pommeresche, R. & Løes, A.K. (2009). Relations between agronomic practice and earth-worms in Norwegian arable soils. *Dynamic Soil, Dynamic Plant, Special issue 2*: 129–142.  
[www.globalsciencebooks.info/JournalsSup/images/0906/DSDP\\_3\(SI\)129-142o.pdf](http://www.globalsciencebooks.info/JournalsSup/images/0906/DSDP_3(SI)129-142o.pdf).
- Randerson, J. (2004). Organic farming increases biodiversity, *New Scientist*, Oct 2004.  
<https://www.newscientist.com/article/dn6496-organic-farming-boosts-biodiversity/>.
- Rockström J. Steffen W. Noone K. Persson Å. Chapin III F.S. Lambin E.F. Lenton T.M. Scheffer M. Folke C. Schellnhuber H.J. Nykvist B. de Wit C.A. Hughes T. van der Leeuw S. Rodhe H. Sörlin S. Snyder P.K. Costanza R. Svedin U. Falkenmark M. Karlberg L. Corell R.W. Fabry V.J. Hansen J. Walker B. Liverman D. Richardson K. Crutzen P. & Foley J.A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, 461: 472–475. (doi:10.1038/461472a ; [http://steadystate.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/Rockstrom\\_Nature\\_Boundaries.pdf](http://steadystate.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/Rockstrom_Nature_Boundaries.pdf)).
- Rodale Institute. (2015). *The Farming Systems Trial: Celebrating 40 years*”. (Accessed on 12 September, 2015); Brochure available online: <http://rodaleinstitute.org/assets/FSTbooklet.pdf> ; <http://66.147.244.123/~rodalein/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/FSTbookletFINAL.pdf> .
- Sahrawat, K.L. (1983). Mineralization of soil organic nitrogen under waterlogged conditions in relation to other soil properties of tropical soils. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*, 21: 133–138.
- Seufert, V. Ramankutty, N. & Foley A. (2012). Comparing the yields of organic and conventional agriculture. *Nature*, 485: 229-232.
- Sterin, A. Stevenson, L. & Tupas, L. (2014). *APN Science Bulletin (4)*. Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research.
- Swift, M. & Bignal, D. (2015). Standard methods for assessment of soil biodiversity and land use practice. *International Centre for Research in Agroforestry Southeast Asian Regional Research Programme. ASBL Lecture Note 6B*. pp. 34. (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> September, 2015); [www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/images/resources/pdf\\_documents/manual-soil\\_20bioassessment.pdf](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/nr/images/resources/pdf_documents/manual-soil_20bioassessment.pdf).
- Tuck, S.L. Winqvist, C. Mota, F. Ahnström, J. Turnbull, L.A. & Bengtsson, J. (2014). Land-use intensity and the effects of organic farming on biodiversity: a hierarchical meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51: 746-755.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2664.12219/abstract>).
- Valzano, F. Murphy, B. & Koen, T. (2005). The impact of tillage on changes in carbon density with



- special emphasis on Australian conditions. Technical Report No. 43. Dept Environment and Heritage. Pp. 164. (Online: <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/23322/20050818-0000/www.greenhouse.gov.au/ncas/reports/pubs/tr43final.pdf>).
- Wessa, P. (2015). Free Statistics Software, Office for Research Development and Education, version 1.1.23-r7. (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2015); URL <http://www.wessa.net/>.
- Wuest, S.B. Caesar-TonThat, T.C. Wright, S.F. & Williams, J.D. (2005). Organic matter addition, N, and residue burning effects on infiltration, biological, and physical properties of an intensively tilled silt-loam soil. *Soil & Tillage Research*, 84(2):154-167. (Online <http://naldc.nal.usda.gov/download/7701/PDF>).
- Xiang, C.G. Zhang, P.J, Pan, G.X. Qiu, D.S. & Chu, Q.H. (2006). Changes in diversity, protein content and amino acids composition of earthworms from a paddy soil under different long-term fertilizations in the Tai lake region, China. *Acta Ecologica Sinica*, 26(6): 1667-1674. (<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1872203206600309> ; [www.ecologica.cn/stxben/ch/reader/create\\_pdf.aspx?file\\_no=stxben20060605&year\\_id=2006&quarter\\_id=6&falg=1](http://www.ecologica.cn/stxben/ch/reader/create_pdf.aspx?file_no=stxben20060605&year_id=2006&quarter_id=6&falg=1)).
- Zaller, J.G. Parth, M. Szunyogh, I. Semmelrock, I. Sochurek, S. Pinheiro, M. Frank, T. & Drapela, T. (2013). Herbivory of an invasive slug is affected by earthworms and the composition of plant communities. *BMC Ecology*, 13: 20. doi: 10.1186/1472-6785-13-20.
- Zou, X. & Bashkin, M. (1998). Soil carbon accretion and earthworm recovery following revegetation in abandoned sugarcane fields. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 30: 825–830.

## Appendix

Earthworms collected in 2013-2014, using Blakemore (2000, 2012, 2016a) for Families and species IDs wherein proper taxonomic authority/synonymies may be found plus several mtDNA barcodes.

No.	Code	Earthworm FAMILY/Spp.	Kahariam organic farm	Peñalosa Negros organic farms
I	E	EUDRILIDAE		
1	E	<i>Eudrilus eugeniae</i>	x	x
II	N/E	MEGASCOLECIDAE		
2	N?	<i>Amyntas spp.</i> (unidentified)	x	x
3	E	<i>Perionyx excavatus</i>	x	
4	N	<i>Pheretima cf. decipiens</i>	x?	x?
5	N	<i>Pleionogaster adya*</i>	x	
6	N	<i>Pleionogaster sp. nov.2*</i>	x	
7	E	<i>Metaphire bahli</i>	x	x
8	E?	<i>Metaphire cf. tschiliensis*</i>	x	
9	E	<i>Metaphire houlleti</i>		x
10	E	<i>Pheretima philippina lipa*</i>	x	
11	E	<i>P. philippina victorias*</i>		x
12	E	<i>Polypheretima elongata</i>	x	x?
13	E	<i>Polypheretima cf. stellari</i>		x?
III	E	OCTOCHAETIDAE/BENHAMIINAE		
14	E	<i>Dichogaster modigliani</i>	x	
15	E	<i>Dichogaster saliens*</i>	x	
16	E	<i>Dichogaster annae</i>	x	
IV	E	OCNERODRILIDAE		
17	E	<i>Eukerria sp.</i> (unidentified)	x	
18	E	<i>Ocnerodrilus sp?</i> (unidentified)*	x	
19	E	<i>Ramiella cf. bishambari</i>	x (+ in Conv. rice)	x (in Org. rice and canefields)
V	E	GLOSSOSCOLECIDAE		
20	E	<i>Pontoscolex corethrurus**</i>	x	x
VI	E/N?	MONILIGASTRIDAE		
21	E	<i>Drawida barwelli</i>	x	
22	E	<i>Drawida impertusa</i>	x	x
23	E?	<i>Drawida sp.</i> (unidentified)*	x	
VII	E/N?	ENCHYTRAEIDAE		
24	E?	<i>Enchytraeus spp.</i>	x	x
Total spp			21	12

Codes: N–native; E–exotic; \*native spp new to science or new exotic records for Philippines, e.g. *Dichogaster saliens* (Beddard 1893) is a new Filipino record; \*\*South American *Pontoscolex corethrurus* present but not dominant as it often is in soils of declining quality.