

Thermodynamic Evaluation of Primary Tillage: An EROEI Analysis of Manual Broadforking Versus Draft Animal Plowing in Berlin, Germany

1. Introduction and Geo-Climatic Context

The pursuit of absolute nutritional autarky—a state of complete self-sufficiency in food production—demands a rigorous synthesis of agronomic engineering, soil biogeochemistry, and nutritional thermodynamics. Within the broader discourse on sustainable agriculture, the Energy Return on Energy Invested (EROEI) metric serves as the paramount analytical framework for assessing the viability and ecological rationality of agricultural systems¹. EROEI, originally formulated to evaluate fossil fuel extraction, is equally critical in agroecology, where it quantifies the ratio of gross caloric energy yielded by an agricultural system against the sum total of human, biological, and embodied energy invested in its cultivation³. In low-input and subsistence agricultural models, the primary energetic sink is consistently primary tillage: the intense physical manipulation of the soil matrix required to prepare a seedbed, incorporate organic residues, and suppress weed competition⁵.

This report conducts an exhaustive EROEI analysis comparing two distinct, pre-industrial primary tillage paradigms: manual hand-tillage utilizing a broadfork versus mechanization via draft animal power, specifically comparing equines (draft horses) and bovines (oxen) pulling a traditional moldboard plow. The geographical and pedological baseline for this rigorous thermodynamic evaluation is a one-acre (0.4047-hectare) agricultural plot situated in the Berlin-Brandenburg region of Germany.

The Berlin and wider Brandenburg region presents a highly specific and moderately challenging agronomic environment that strictly dictates the parameters of thermodynamic efficiency. Situated geographically within USDA Hardiness Zone 7b, the regional climate is defined by absolute frost dates that compress the operational window for primary biological production. Historical meteorological modeling indicates that the last spring air frost typically occurs around May 8, while the first autumn air frost arrives near September 22, delineating a reliable frost-free window of approximately 137 days¹. By deploying protective horticultural fleece or utilizing heavily cold-adapted cultivars, the operational growing season can be safely extended to up to 163 days¹. The accumulation of thermal energy, quantified as Growing Degree Days

(GDD) utilizing a base temperature threshold of 10°C , is generally sufficient for temperate agriculture, though the region is increasingly subjected to extreme summer heat waves and erratic precipitation patterns resulting from shifting climatic baselines¹.

However, the defining limitation of the Brandenburg agricultural landscape is its unique pedology. The region is overwhelmingly dominated by Pleistocene-derived glacial sands and

sandy loams, formally classified as Arenosols¹. These soils frequently exhibit critically low agricultural yield indices, commonly rated between 25 and 40 *Bodenpunkte* (soil points) on the German agronomic scale, which caps at 100¹. The coarse texture of these glacial deposits ensures excellent aeration and permits the ease of mechanical cultivation under virtually all moisture regimes¹. Simultaneously, this coarse, macroporous structure results in an exceptionally low Available Water Capacity (AWC)¹. Consequently, these soils are highly susceptible to acute drought stress during the summer months and suffer from severe vulnerability to the downward leaching of water-soluble macronutrients—particularly nitrate (NO_3^-) and potassium (K^+)—during winter precipitation events¹.

Compounding these inherent physical limitations is a shifting hydrological baseline across the region. Long-term localized groundwater recharge in Brandenburg has dropped significantly—by up to 40% since 1980—due to shifting precipitation patterns, increased regional evapotranspiration, and the systemic impacts of historical lignite mining¹. The region's mean annual precipitation exhibits a pronounced west-east gradient, generally hovering around a modest 500 to 600 mm, leaving specific subregions with negative seasonal water balances¹. Therefore, any subsistence model or primary tillage regimen engineered for this region must presume a state of persistent water limitation. Relying on intensive, high-volume irrigation is ecologically and hydrologically unsustainable over the long term; thus, the system must achieve absolute resilience through the maximization of Soil Organic Carbon (SOC), strict rotational discipline, and the precise mechanical manipulation of the soil matrix to prevent evaporative losses¹. The thermodynamic efficiency of any tillage methodology in this region must therefore be evaluated not merely on its immediate kinetic or caloric cost, but on its systemic, second-order impacts regarding SOC oxidation kinetics, deep-profile hydrology, and long-term biological resilience¹.

2. Theoretical Frameworks of Agricultural Energetics

Before calculating the specific caloric inputs of human and animal labor, it is imperative to establish the theoretical frameworks that govern agricultural energetics. The transition from human-powered agriculture to draft animal systems represents one of the most profound shifts in the energy profile of human civilization.

Early energy analyses of agriculture revealed that behind the higher labor and land productivity of industrialized and animal-powered farming, there was frequently a marked decrease in the Energy Return on Energy Invested (EROEI) in comparison to traditional organic agricultural systems relying solely on human kinetic energy⁴. Renowned ecological thermodynamicist David Pimentel extensively modeled these transitions. Pimentel demonstrated that early slash-and-burn agriculture, relying entirely on human labor and solar inputs, was highly sustainable and energy-efficient¹³. In these baseline systems, the only fossil or embodied energy input was the production of basic hand tools, such as the ax and hoe, which could theoretically be forged using charcoal, rendering the system totally dependent on contemporary solar energy¹³.

Pimentel's calculations for grain production indicated that approximately 1,144 to 1,200 hours of

human labor were required to cultivate one hectare of maize entirely by hand, representing a massive exertion of human metabolic energy but virtually zero external subsidy¹³. When this human-powered system transitioned to a draft animal agricultural system, replacing a portion of the human labor with approximately 200 hours of ox power per hectare, the direct human labor input dropped precipitously to roughly 380 hours per hectare¹³. This dramatic reduction in human drudgery is the primary socio-economic driver behind the adoption of draft animals. However, this transition introduces a massive biological overhead. The ox in Pimentel's model required immense volumes of feed—concentrates subtracted directly from the crop yield and massive quantities of forage sourced from marginal pastureland—fundamentally altering the spatial footprint and the absolute energetic efficiency of the farm system¹³.

Building upon Pimentel's foundations, modern researchers have expanded energy analysis to include the concept of Emergy (spelled with an 'm'), pioneered by H.T. Odum¹⁵. Emergy analysis, or embodied energy analysis, quantifies the total environmental work—expressed in solar energy equivalents or solar emjoules (sej)—required to generate a product or service, bridging the gap between natural ecosystems and economic systems¹⁵. When evaluating traction systems through an emergy lens, researchers such as Rydberg and Jansén have demonstrated striking divergences between different power sources. In their comparison of horse traction versus modern tractor traction in Sweden, they found that 60% of the inputs supporting the draft horse system were locally generated and renewable, compared with only 9% renewable inputs for the fossil-fueled tractor¹⁶.

However, emergy analysis also exposes the severe spatial inefficiencies of biological traction. While draft animals utilize renewable solar energy in the form of photosynthesis (forage and grain), their conversion of that feed energy into mechanical work is astonishingly poor. Studies indicate that the gross energy efficiency of draft animals—defined as the work energy output expressed as a fraction of the feed energy input—is often equal to or less than 5%³. The vast majority of the caloric energy consumed by a draft animal is dissipated as metabolic heat or excreted in manure³. Consequently, the low energy conversion efficiency of draft animals dictates massive cropland requirements. Feed production alone for draft animals can require up to one-fifth (20%) of the total cultivated arable land they are used on, alongside further non-arable land dedicated to permanent pasture³. In the context of Berlin-Brandenburg, where sandy Arenosols inherently limit baseline yields and water scarcity depresses pasture regeneration, dedicating 20% of the spatial footprint to fuel animal traction introduces a severe agronomic penalty¹.

Recent empirical studies, such as the Long-Term Ecological Assessment of Farming Systems (LEAFS) project, have attempted to directly quantify these disparities in micro-scale horticultural models. The LEAFS project compared human labor, draft animal power, and small-engine machine power for fresh-market vegetable production¹⁷. The researchers found that human and draft animal systems yielded an identical, highly efficient EROEI of 1.21, significantly outperforming the machine-powered system in terms of net energetic returns¹⁷. However, this parity was achieved only through specific boundary delineations. The draft animal system exhibited financial returns to labor (\$31.44 per hour) that were roughly 25% higher than the human-powered system (\$24.78 per hour) due to the sheer mechanical power

output of the animal, which works at a sustained pace of approximately 745 Watts (1 Horsepower), compared to a human operating hand tools at an effective rate of merely 50 Watts¹⁷.

Thus, the core thermodynamic conflict emerges: human labor operates at an extremely low power output but requires minimal spatial footprint and virtually zero "idle" maintenance energy beyond the human's baseline survival needs. Conversely, draft animals deliver massive kinetic power, drastically reducing human labor hours, but require enormous, continuous inputs of biological fuel, demanding a massive spatial allocation that fundamentally reconfigures the agroecosystem.

3. Mechanistic Pedology and ASABE D497 Draft Force Parameters

To accurately model the energy requirements of primary tillage, the precise physical interaction between the soil engaging implement and the sandy Arenosols must be defined. The American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers (ASABE) Standard D497 provides the universally accepted mathematical framework for predicting the draft force and power requirements for agricultural implements operating across various soil textures and conditions⁵.

The ASABE D497 standard dictates that the total draft force (D), measured in Newtons (N), required to pull a tillage implement is a function of the soil texture, the speed of operation, the depth of tillage, and the specific geometry of the machine⁵. The empirical equation is formulated as:

$$D = F_i[A + B(S) + C(S)^2]WT$$

Where:

- D represents the implement draft in Newtons.
- F_i is the dimensionless soil texture adjustment parameter. This is categorized as 1 for fine soils (heavy clays), 2 for medium soils (loams), and 3 for coarse textured soils (sands)⁵.
- A , B , and C are machine-specific geometric parameters empirically derived for specific tools (e.g., moldboard plows, chisel plows, disc harrows)⁵.
- S is the forward field speed of operation in kilometers per hour (km/h)⁵.
- W is the effective machine width in meters (m)⁵.
- T is the primary tillage depth in centimeters (cm)⁵.

For the highly specific pedology of the Berlin-Brandenburg region, the application of this equation yields critical insights. Because the regional Arenosols are overwhelmingly dominated by coarse glacial sands, the soil texture adjustment parameter (F_i) is firmly set to 3¹. Coarse

sandy soils exhibit significantly lower cohesive strength and adhesive friction against steel implements compared to heavy, plastic clay soils.

This reduced physical resistance is further quantified by the Soil Cone Index (CI), a standardized measurement of soil shear strength and penetration resistance acquired using an ASABE-compliant cone penetrometer⁵. The CI values dictate both the draft resistance of the soil and the tractive efficiency of the motive power source. Standard ASABE reference tables indicate that fine, highly compacted soils exhibit a CI of roughly 1,380 kPa, medium soils average 1,140 kPa, while soft, coarse sandy soils—such as the uncompacted Arenosols of Brandenburg—frequently register a CI as low as 450 to 550 kPa²⁰.

The direct consequence of these pedological characteristics is that the absolute draft force required to pull a moldboard plow through a Brandenburg field is drastically lower than the global or European average⁵. From a thermodynamic perspective, this coarse soil texture artificially elevates the operational efficiency of both manual human traction and biological animal traction, as less kinetic energy is wasted overcoming the sheer cohesive bonds of the soil matrix. However, this same lack of structural cohesion makes the soil profoundly vulnerable to compaction and oxidative degradation when subjected to the wrong mechanical methodology²⁶.

4. The Mechanics of Tillage: Inversion Versus Vertical Fracturing

The two primary methodologies under evaluation in this EROEI analysis rely on fundamentally divergent mechanical principles, yielding drastically different second-order ecological impacts. The draft animal system relies on the moldboard plow, while the human-powered system relies on the broadfork.

4.1 The Moldboard Plow (Draft Animal Traction)

The moldboard plow is the iconic implement of European primary tillage. Its mechanical action is designed to execute a complete horizontal inversion of the upper soil profile²⁷. As the draft animal pulls the implement forward, the sharpened plowshare cuts the soil slice horizontally. Simultaneously, the curved moldboard lifts, aggressively fractures, and turns the furrow slice upside down, laterally displacing the soil²⁷. The primary agronomic objective of this inversion is to bury surface weed seed banks, rapidly incorporate crop residues or green manures, and provide a perfectly clean, pulverized seedbed suitable for immediate planting²⁷.

However, in the context of the sandy Arenosols of Brandenburg, moldboard inversion inflicts catastrophic structural damage¹. The German VDLUFA (Association of German Agricultural Analytic and Research Institutes) Humus Balance framework meticulously quantifies the impact of agricultural practices on soil organic carbon¹. Sandy soils naturally experience accelerated rates of organic matter degradation due to elevated oxygen diffusion through their macroporous structure and high microbial oxidation kinetics¹. Intensive plowing exponentially increases the substrate surface area exposed to oxygen and enzymatic hydrolysis. By mechanically shattering the fragile soil aggregates that protect humified carbon, the moldboard plow triggers a massive and immediate burst of microbial respiration¹. Agronomic

studies measuring greenhouse gas fluxes following tillage events confirm that moldboard plowing induces acute, short-term spikes in Carbon Dioxide (CO_2) emissions proportional to the volume of soil inverted³³. Furthermore, by rapidly mineralizing buried nitrogen residues in an oxygen-rich environment, inversion tillage frequently exacerbates the emission of Nitrous Oxide (N_2O)—a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential approximately 296 times greater than CO_2 ³². Under the VDLUFA framework, intensive mechanical cultivation without massive compensatory organic inputs results in severe, negative humus balances, degrading the soil's critical aggregate stability and further diminishing its already poor Available Water Capacity¹.

4.2 The Broadfork (Manual Labor)

The broadfork represents a paradigm shift in primary tillage, aligning with the principles of minimal or "no-till" agriculture. The tool consists of a horizontal steel crossbar equipped with multiple heavy-duty, vertical tines—typically 12 to 14 inches in length—operated via two long, vertical leverage handles³⁸. The operator steps onto the crossbar, utilizing their full body weight to drive the tines deep into the soil matrix, and then pulls backward on the handles to pry the soil upward³⁸.

Crucially, the broadfork does not invert the soil³⁸. Instead, it creates deep vertical fractures and fissures, relieving deep-layer compaction and gently lifting the horizontal strata while leaving them intact³⁸. By avoiding inversion, the broadfork preserves the vertical stratification of the soil microbiome⁴⁰. Aerobic bacteria remain in the highly oxygenated upper layers, while delicate hyphal fungal networks—which are instantly pulverized by the spinning blades of a rototiller or the shearing action of a moldboard plow—are left largely undisturbed⁴⁰.

This precise, non-inversion aeration allows for the deep integration of applied composts and organic fertilizers without exposing the native, humified Soil Organic Carbon to catastrophic oxidative bursts³⁸. For the drought-prone Brandenburg Arenosols, the most critical advantage of the broadfork is hydrological. Because the horizontal soil layers are not broadcast or inverted to the dry atmosphere, capillary action from the subsoil remains intact, and the soil matrix dries out significantly slower than plowed ground, maintaining the vital moisture buffer necessary to survive erratic summer heatwaves¹.

4.3 The Physics of Subsoil Compaction

A frequently cited justification for transitioning away from mechanized fossil-fuel agriculture toward draft animal traction is the mitigation of heavy, tractor-induced soil compaction²⁶. While it is undeniably true that modern, multi-ton agricultural machinery inflicts severe, deep-profile compaction (often penetrating below 20 cm into the subsoil where it cannot be easily remediated), the presumption that draft animals exert benign ground pressure is a dangerous ecological fallacy²⁶.

The severity of soil compaction is dictated by the static and dynamic pressure applied to the soil surface, generally measured in kilopascals (kPa) or pounds per square inch (psi)²⁶. The point-load pressure generated by the hooves of large draft animals is immense²⁶. A standing

sheep exerts a static pressure of approximately 80 kPa, increasing to 200 kPa when in motion⁴¹. A standard, unloaded agricultural tractor typically exerts a pressure of 60 to 80 kPa across its large, wide-footprint pneumatic tires⁴¹.

In stark contrast, large bovine and equine draft animals concentrate massive kinetic force into a highly restricted surface area. A working draft dairy cow or ox exerts a static pressure of 160 to 192 kPa, and this pressure frequently doubles to well over 300 kPa when the animal is actively moving and leaning into the harness to generate draft force against a plow⁴¹. When a team of heavy draft horses or oxen operates a moldboard plow, it is common practice for one animal to walk directly inside the open furrow created during the previous pass⁴⁴. The repetitive striking of hooves exerting 300+ kPa of pressure directly onto the exposed subsoil at the bottom of the furrow generates a highly distinct and virtually impenetrable "plow pan" or "traffic pan"⁴⁴.

This dense layer of compacted soil, typically forming 4 to 12 inches below the surface, physically severs the hydrological connection between the topsoil and the deep groundwater reserves, causing acute drought stress in crops with deep taproots and exacerbating surface waterlogging during heavy precipitation events⁴¹. Eradicating a mature plow pan requires immense thermodynamic expenditure, usually necessitating the deployment of heavy tractor-drawn chisel plows or subsoilers operating at depths that exceed the capabilities of animal traction⁴⁴.

Conversely, the manual operation of a broadfork exerts negligible ground pressure. The human footprint generates vastly lower kPa than a draft animal hoof, and the action of the broadfork itself is explicitly designed to shatter existing hardpans and plow pans without creating a new, horizontal plane of compaction beneath the tines²⁶.

5. Agronomic Output: The Caloric Yield

Thermodynamics of the 1-Acre Model

To establish a mathematically rigorous EROEI ratio, we must precisely quantify the denominator: the total gross energy returned by the agricultural system. An autarkic subsistence model situated on the impoverished Arenosols of Berlin-Brandenburg cannot responsibly rely on monoculture; doing so invites catastrophic failure from soil-borne pathogens and rapid humus depletion¹.

The systemic agronomic design for this region necessitates a strict 5-year crop rotation engineered to suppress devastating regional pathogens—specifically *Plasmodiophora brassicae* (clubroot) in Brassicaceae and *Rhizoctonia solani* (black scurf) in Solanaceae—while actively sequestering atmospheric nitrogen and preserving the VDLUFA humus balance¹.

To model the output of a single one-acre (0.4047-hectare) arable field under optimal autarkic management, the land must be divided into five equal rotational blocks of 0.20 acres (0.0809 hectares) each. The temporal sequence of this rotation, utilizing organic yield baselines adapted specifically for sandy soils without synthetic mineral fertilizers, is established as follows¹:

1. **Year 1: Nitrogen Fixation (Narrow-Leaf Blue Lupin - *Lupinus angustifolius*)**
 - *Agronomic Function*: Biological nitrogen fixation (150–180 kg N/ha), deep subsoil

structural fracturing via taproots, and mobilization of legacy phosphorus reserves¹.

- *Organic Yield (Sandy Soil)*: 2,000 kg/ha¹.
 - *0.2-Acre Block Yield*: 161.9 kg.
 - *Caloric Density (High-Protein Livestock Feed)*: ~3,500 kcal/kg (Estimated gross feed energy)¹.
 - *Gross Block Output*: ~566,650 kcal (2,371 MJ).
- 2. Year 2: First Heavy Feeder (Late Winter Cabbage - *Brassica oleracea*)**
- *Agronomic Function*: Capitalization on the massive nitrogen reserves fixed by the lupin; extreme caloric mass generation¹.
 - *Organic Yield (Sandy Soil)*: 30,000 kg/ha gross (21,000 kg/ha edible after trimming)¹.
 - *0.2-Acre Block Yield*: 1,700 kg edible.
 - *Caloric Density*: 270 kcal/kg¹.
 - *Gross Block Output*: 459,000 kcal (1,920 MJ).
- 3. Year 3: Moderate Feeder (Carrots - *Daucus carota*)**
- *Agronomic Function*: Utilization of moderate residual fertility; avoidance of excessive foliar growth¹.
 - *Organic Yield (Sandy Soil)*: 30,000 kg/ha¹.
 - *0.2-Acre Block Yield*: 2,428 kg.
 - *Caloric Density*: 340 kcal/kg¹.
 - *Gross Block Output*: 825,520 kcal (3,454 MJ).
- 4. Year 4: Second Heavy Feeder (Potatoes - *Solanum tuberosum*)**
- *Agronomic Function*: The primary carbohydrate engine of the subsistence model. Requires massive inputs of compost to counteract the severe humus depletion (~760 Humus-C/ha) caused by tuber harvesting¹.
 - *Organic Yield (Sandy Soil)*: 20,000 kg/ha¹.
 - *0.2-Acre Block Yield*: 1,619 kg.
 - *Caloric Density*: 770 kcal/kg¹.
 - *Gross Block Output*: 1,246,630 kcal (5,216 MJ).
- 5. Year 5: Scavenger and Structural Restorer (Winter Rye - *Secale cereale*)**
- *Agronomic Function*: Ultimate drought tolerance; extensive fibrous root architecture acts to mine deeply leached nitrate and phosphorus, stabilizing the soil matrix against wind erosion¹.
 - *Organic Yield (Sandy Soil)*: 3,000 kg/ha¹.
 - *0.2-Acre Block Yield*: 243 kg.
 - *Caloric Density*: 3,190 kcal/kg¹.
 - *Gross Block Output*: 775,170 kcal (3,243 MJ).

Composite One-Acre Caloric Yield: By summing the gross outputs of the five 0.2-acre rotational blocks, we establish the total annual baseline yield for the entire one-acre field under this strict agronomic regime. The total caloric return is **3,872,970 kcal**.

To conform to standard thermodynamic analysis, these values are converted to Megajoules (MJ) using the standard conversion factor ($1 \text{ kcal} = 0.004184 \text{ MJ}$). The composite

one-acre field yields a gross return of **16,204 MJ** annually⁴⁷. This 16,204 MJ figure represents the universal denominator against which the energy investments of the manual and draft animal tillage systems will be evaluated.

Crop Block	Cultivated Area	Expected Mass Yield	Caloric Density	Gross Energy Return (kcal)	Gross Energy Return (MJ)
Blue Lupin	0.2 Acre	162 kg	~3,500 kcal/kg	566,650	2,371
Cabbage (Edible)	0.2 Acre	1,700 kg	270 kcal/kg	459,000	1,920
Carrots	0.2 Acre	2,428 kg	340 kcal/kg	825,520	3,454
Potatoes	0.2 Acre	1,619 kg	770 kcal/kg	1,246,630	5,216
Winter Rye	0.2 Acre	243 kg	3,190 kcal/kg	775,170	3,243
TOTAL (One Acre)	1.0 Acre	6,152 kg	--	3,872,970 kcal	16,204 MJ

6. The Thermodynamic Investment of Manual Tillage (Broadfork)

Evaluating the energy invested in manual broadforking requires calculating two distinct streams of energy: the direct physiological metabolic exertion of the human operator and the embodied industrial energy of the physical tool itself.

6.1 Human Metabolic Expenditure Kinetics

The physiological cost of human agricultural labor is rigorously quantified using the Metabolic Equivalent of Task (MET) framework. One MET represents the basal, resting metabolic rate of an average adult, defined conventionally as an energy expenditure of 1 kcal per kilogram of

body weight per hour (1 kcal/kg/hr) or an absolute oxygen consumption rate of $3.5 \text{ ml O}_2/\text{kg/min}$ ⁴⁸. All physical activities are rated as multipliers of this resting baseline⁴⁸.

The physical mechanics of operating a heavy-duty broadfork—lifting the steel implement, driving the tines deep into the soil matrix with downward leg thrusts, and utilizing upper body leverage and core strength to fracture the earth backward—represent one of the most metabolically intense activities in agriculture. Ergonomic and physiological sports science studies consistently classify heavy digging, spading, and deep manual cultivation at an intensity range of 6.0 to 7.0 METs⁴⁸.

Assuming a standard, healthy agricultural worker weighing 70 kilograms and operating at a sustained, vigorous output of 7.0 METs, the direct human metabolic expenditure equates to exactly 490 kcal per hour⁴⁷.

The temporal cost of broadforking is immense. Field data derived from intensive organic market gardening operations indicates that carefully and comprehensively broadforking one entire acre of soil to a depth of 10 to 12 inches requires approximately 130 labor hours⁴⁷.

- **Total Human Caloric Investment (per acre):**

$$130 \text{ hours} \times 490 \text{ kcal/hr} = 63,700 \text{ kcal}$$

- **Megajoule Conversion:** $63,700 \text{ kcal} \times 0.004184 = 266.52 \text{ MJ}$ ⁴⁷

6.2 The Embodied Energy of the Tool

In ecological thermodynamics and Life Cycle Assessments (LCA), "embodied energy" (or embodied carbon) refers to the sum total of all energy required to extract raw materials, transport them, and manufacture a finished good, effectively locking that energy consumption into the product's existence⁵⁷.

A professional-grade broadfork must be constructed from high-carbon, forged structural steel to withstand the immense torsional forces involved in subsoiling compacted earth without bending the tines³⁸. According to the globally recognized Inventory of Carbon and Energy (ICE) database developed at the University of Bath by Hammond and Jones, the production of primary forged structural steel carries a massive embodied energy cost ranging from 35 to 50 MJ per kilogram, factoring in mining, smelting, and fabrication⁵⁸.

Assuming a heavy-duty, reinforced broadfork weighs approximately 7.0 kilograms and utilizes the upper-tier embodied energy coefficient (50 MJ/kg) due to specialized welding and heat-treating, the absolute total embodied energy of the tool is roughly 350 MJ⁴⁷.

However, unlike single-use fossil fuels, agricultural tools are durable goods. In LCA methodologies, this embodied energy must be amortized over the tool's functional lifespan. Assuming the broadfork is utilized heavily on a 2-acre market garden annually for a lifespan of 15 years, it will perform 30 total acre-uses before failure. The pro-rated embodied energy cost assigned to a single one-acre tillage event is therefore highly negligible:

- **Tool Embodied Energy (per acre):** $350 \text{ MJ} \div 30 \text{ acre-uses} = 11.67 \text{ MJ}$ ⁴⁷

6.3 Total Broadfork Thermodynamic Investment

The total energy invested to manually broadfork one acre of sandy loam is the sum of the direct human metabolic output and the amortized tool embodied energy.

- **Total Energy Input (per acre):** $266.52 \text{ MJ} + 11.67 \text{ MJ} = 278.19 \text{ MJ}$ (or

66,488 kcal₄₇.

7. The Thermodynamic Investment of Draft Animal Tillage

Evaluating the thermodynamic investment of draft animal traction is orders of magnitude more complex than modeling manual human labor. It necessitates calculating the direct kinetic work output of the animals during the plowing event, the concurrent metabolic exertion of the human handler guiding the plow, the embodied energy of the highly complex mechanical equipment and housing infrastructure, and—most critically—the massive, inescapable biological baseline metabolic overhead required to sustain the massive animals throughout the entire calendar year³.

This analysis models two distinct draft paradigms commonly utilized in historical and modern alternative European agriculture: a pair of draft horses (equines) and a pair of oxen (bovines).

7.1 Direct Work Output and Divergent Digestive Morphologies

The kinetic mechanical work generated by draft animals represents only a tiny fraction of their total gross energy consumption, underscoring the inherent biological inefficiency of utilizing living organisms for traction¹⁷. Thermodynamic analyses consistently demonstrate that the gross energy efficiency of draft animals—defined strictly as the ratio of mechanical work output generated at the drawbar to the total feed energy ingested—is extraordinarily low, generally hovering at a maximum of 5% for horses and ranging between 3% to 10% for cattle³. The stark differences in power output, plowing speed, and feed requirements between horses and oxen are dictated entirely by their evolutionary digestive morphologies.

Draft Horses (Equines): Horses are classifying as hindgut fermenters. They lack a rumen; instead, they digest complex cellulose via microbial fermentation occurring late in the digestive tract, specifically within the massive cecum and large colon⁶⁶. This specialized digestive architecture allows fibrous food material to pass through the gastrointestinal tract relatively rapidly. By absorbing Volatile Fatty Acids (VFAs) produced during this fermentation, the horse can extract readily available energy quickly, enabling it to sustain significantly higher working speeds and generate explosive burst power⁶³. The distinct disadvantage is that horses require higher-quality, more easily digestible forage and heavy grain supplementation to maintain this fast metabolism, and they extract nutrients less efficiently from poor-quality roughage than ruminants⁶⁸.

A pair of heavy draft horses (weighing approximately 650 kg each) can generate immense draft force, typically capable of turning one acre of light, sandy loam with a moldboard plow in approximately 6 hours⁴⁷. The combined active mechanical work output of the team is estimated at 28 MJ per hour, delivering a total of **168.0 MJ** of direct kinetic energy into the one-acre plot⁴⁷.

Oxen (Bovines): Oxen are ruminants, or foregut fermenters. They possess a massive, multi-chambered stomach (the rumen) that utilizes dense microbial populations to ferment high-cellulose, low-quality plant material extensively before it passes into the true stomach and

intestines for absorption⁶⁶. This evolutionary adaptation allows oxen to survive, and even thrive, on highly degraded, lignocellulosic roughage that would rapidly cause fatal colic or severe malnutrition in a horse. The physiological trade-off for this extraordinary feed efficiency is a significantly slower basal metabolic rate and a correspondingly lower, plodding working speed¹⁰.

A pair of mature draft oxen (weighing approximately 550 kg each) typically requires a full 10 hours of sustained effort to plow the same one-acre field⁴⁷. Their combined active work output is estimated at 18 MJ per hour, totaling **180.0 MJ** of direct kinetic energy expended per acre⁴⁷.

7.2 Human Handler Metabolic Expenditure

Biological traction systems are not autonomous; they require constant human intervention. A handler must walk closely behind the plow, manage the complex leather reins, physically stabilize the heavy implement against subterranean obstacles, and guide the animals²⁷. This activity requires constant movement but is significantly less metabolically intense than manually broadforking the soil. Ergonomic data classifies walking behind a plow and managing livestock at an intensity of approximately 4.0 METs (equating to 280 kcal/hr or 1.17 MJ/hr for a 70 kg individual)⁴⁷.

- **Horse Handler (6 hours plowing):** $6 \times 1.17 \text{ MJ} = \mathbf{7.03 \text{ MJ}}$ ⁴⁷.
- **Ox Handler (10 hours plowing):** $10 \times 1.17 \text{ MJ} = \mathbf{11.72 \text{ MJ}}$ ⁴⁷.

7.3 Embodied Energy of Equipment and Infrastructure

Unlike a single, forged steel broadfork, draft animal systems require heavy, specialized, multi-component equipment and dedicated protective infrastructure. Utilizing LCA methodologies and the ICE database, we must account for this embodied energy⁶⁰.

- **The Moldboard Plow:** A modern two-way or walking moldboard plow is a heavy implement containing roughly 45 kg of structural and cast steel. Utilizing the ICE database coefficient of 45-50 MJ/kg, the total embodied energy is approximately 2,025 MJ⁴⁷. Amortized over a robust 25-year lifespan on a standard 15-acre historical farm scale (equating to 375 acre-uses), the cost is highly diluted to **5.4 MJ/acre**⁴⁷.
- **Harnesses and Yokes:** The complex array of leather collars, traces, steel chains, and heavy wooden yokes carries an estimated embodied energy of roughly 600 MJ. Amortized over a shorter 10-year lifespan due to wear and tear (150 acre-uses), this adds **4.0 MJ/acre**⁴⁷.
- **Housing and Shelter:** Draft animals cannot survive Brandenburg winters without heavy timber stables or barns. The embodied energy of constructing this infrastructure, heavily prorated per acre of lifetime work, adds an estimated **25.0 MJ/acre**⁴⁷.
- **Total System Embodied Energy: 34.40 MJ per acre**⁴⁷.

7.4 The Metabolic Overhead: Annual Maintenance Feed

The most critical flaw in poorly constructed thermodynamic models of draft animal agriculture is treating biological organisms strictly like mechanical tractors³. A tractor consumes fossil fuels solely when the ignition is turned on; a biological organism demands a constant, unrelenting

influx of basal metabolic energy—referred to as Maintenance Digestible Energy (DE)—every single day of the year, regardless of whether it is actively pulling a plow or standing idle in a stall during a blizzard¹⁷.

According to veterinary metabolic models and nutritional thermodynamics, a mature, 650 kg draft horse requires approximately 80 MJ of Digestible Energy (DE) daily simply to maintain body weight and basic biological function during light to moderate seasonal work cycles⁴⁷. A 550 kg ox, benefiting from the superior extraction efficiency of foregut rumen fermentation and a slower basal metabolism, requires slightly less, roughly 60 MJ/day⁴⁷.

- **Annual Maintenance Feed for Horse Pair:**

$$80 \text{ MJ/day} \times 2 \text{ animals} \times 365 \text{ days} = 58,400 \text{ MJ/year} \quad 47.$$

- **Annual Maintenance Feed for Ox Pair:**

$$60 \text{ MJ/day} \times 2 \text{ animals} \times 365 \text{ days} = 43,800 \text{ MJ/year} \quad 47.$$

To calculate a mathematically valid EROEI for a single acre of tillage, this massive metabolic overhead must be accounted for. The ultimate thermodynamic validity of the entire agricultural system hinges entirely on how this inescapable feed cost is apportioned across the landscape.

8. Boundary Delineation and EROEI Computation

Energy Return on Energy Invested (EROEI) is formally calculated via the equation:

$$EROEI = \frac{\text{Energy Returned (Gross Crop Caloric Yield)}}{\text{Energy Invested (Labor + Embodied + Fuel)}}$$

In complex agricultural energetics, researchers often inadvertently (or intentionally) manipulate system boundaries to favor specific outcomes³. For instance, if an analyst measures *only* the kinetic energy the horse expends on the exact day it is pulling the plow, biological traction appears vastly superior to human labor. However, if the analyst accounts for the horse consuming vast quantities of oats and hay all winter while generating zero output, the efficiency of the system collapses entirely³.

To provide a highly nuanced and transparent understanding of these dynamics, this analysis computes the EROEI across three distinct, rigorously defined thermodynamic boundary paradigms, measuring the inputs against the 16,204 MJ yield of the composite 1-acre crop rotation.

Boundary I: The Operational Baseline (Direct Task Efficiency)

This boundary represents the absolute narrowest view of the system. It calculates only the energy strictly utilized during the active tillage event: the kinetic physical work output of the human or animal, the concurrent metabolic exertion of the human handler, and the prorated embodied energy of the tools and equipment. It explicitly isolates the tillage event and completely ignores the annual maintenance feed of the animals.

Tillage Modality	Direct Work (MJ)	Handler Energy (MJ)	Tool/Equip Embodied (MJ)	Total Operational Input (MJ)	EROEI (1-Acre Composite)
Broadfork	266.52	N/A	11.67	278.19	58.25
Horse Pair	168.00	7.03	34.40	209.43	77.37
Ox Pair	180.00	11.72	34.40	226.12	71.66

Insight: Under the highly restricted Operational Boundary, draft animals appear thermodynamically superior to manual human labor. The biological machinery and leverage geometry of a 650 kg horse can deliver kinetic energy directly into the plowshare far more efficiently than a human spine and musculature can leverage a broadfork¹⁷. If we ignore the biological reality that animals must eat when they are not working, biological traction is highly efficient at the point of action.

Boundary II: Systemic Pro-Rated EROEI (The Historical Farm Model)

The Operational Boundary is a dangerous ecological fiction. Draft animals must consume calories year-round⁶⁴. In a historical, optimized, and economically functional systemic model, a farmer would never maintain a pair of massive draft animals merely to plow a single, isolated acre. They would be utilized strategically to manage a functional, mixed-commodity agricultural operation typically ranging from 10 to 15 acres in scale⁴⁷.

In this systemic boundary, we amortize the massive annual biological maintenance feed cost (58,400 MJ for horses, 43,800 MJ for oxen) rationally across a functional 15-acre farm.

- **Pro-rated Horse Feed Investment:**

$$58,400 \text{ MJ} \div 15 \text{ acres} = \mathbf{3,893.33 \text{ MJ/acre}} \quad 47$$

- **Pro-rated Ox Feed Investment:**

$$43,800 \text{ MJ} \div 15 \text{ acres} = \mathbf{2,920.00 \text{ MJ/acre}} \quad 47$$

Tillage Modality	Operational Input (MJ)	Pro-Rated Feed (MJ)	Total Systemic Input (MJ)	EROEI (1-Acre Composite)
Broadfork	278.19	0.00	278.19	58.25
Horse Pair	209.43	3,893.33	4,102.76	3.95

Ox Pair	226.12	2,920.00	3,146.12	5.15
----------------	--------	----------	-----------------	-------------

Insight: The moment baseline maintenance biology is factored into the equation, the EROEI of draft animals plummets dramatically, falling far behind the efficiency of human labor¹⁷. The broadfork system carries zero "idle maintenance cost" applied to the *traction system* (the humans must eat to survive, but this caloric demand is the very baseline reason the autarkic farm exists in the first place, not a dedicated energetic penalty for a traction machine)⁷⁶. Consequently, the broadfork emerges as over 14 times more thermodynamically efficient per acre than a team of horses. Oxen systematically outperform horses because their slower, foregut-fermenting metabolism requires significantly less high-density digestible energy to survive the idle winter months⁶⁶.

Boundary III: Absolute Autarkic EROEI (The Diseconomy of Micro-Scale)

This final boundary explores a common fallacy in modern "homesteading" movements: the romanticized desire to maintain a team of draft animals exclusively for a small, one-acre subsistence plot. In this micro-scale scenario, the entire, unmitigated annual feed burden (100%) of the animal team is assigned directly to the single cultivated acre they manage⁴⁷.

Tillage Modality	Operational Input (MJ)	Dedicated Feed (100%) (MJ)	Total Autarkic Input (MJ)	EROEI (1-Acre Composite)
Broadfork	278.19	0.00	278.19	58.25
Horse Pair	209.43	58,400.00	58,609.43	0.28
Ox Pair	226.12	43,800.00	44,026.12	0.37

Insight: An EROEI value below 1.0 indicates an absolute energetic and ecological collapse; the system is hemorrhaging energy, consuming more calories than it is capable of producing². Dedicating a team of draft animals to a single acre requires a biological input of roughly 58,000 MJ of feed, while the absolute maximum caloric yield of that acre (across all five highly productive rotational blocks) is only 16,204 MJ. The animals would literally starve to death within months, or the human population would be forced to forfeit their entire autarkic caloric harvest—and still fall drastically short of feeding the beasts. This boundary mathematically proves that biological traction possesses an absolute minimum acreage threshold to achieve thermodynamic viability.

9. Third-Order Implications and Advanced Systems Analysis

The quantitative data derived from these energetic boundaries reveals profound structural trends that extend far beyond simple caloric accounting, bleeding directly into spatial land-use theory, greenhouse gas atmospheric dynamics, and the socio-agricultural limits of scale.

9.1 The Spatial Tax and the "Energy Trap"

As illuminated by the Emergy analysis frameworks of Odum, Rydberg, and Jansén, draft animals present a fundamental contradiction¹⁵. While their energy source (grass and oats) is deeply reliant on locally renewable solar energy loops, avoiding the massive non-renewable fossil-fuel inputs of diesel tractors, they are catastrophically inefficient regarding spatial land-use¹⁶.

Because draft animals convert feed to mechanical work at a maximum efficiency of roughly 5%³, supporting a team of horses requires dedicating up to 20% of a farm's total arable and pastoral land base strictly to fuel production³. In the specific context of Berlin-Brandenburg—where sandy Arenosols already severely limit gross crop yields and persistent water scarcity depresses the regenerative rates of forage pastures—dedicating 20% of the land base merely to fuel the traction engine introduces a massive, often crippling spatial penalty¹.

The broadfork system bypasses this spatial tax entirely. By relying exclusively on human labor, 100% of the 1-acre plot can be directed toward human nutritional autarky, maximizing spatial caloric density on severely degraded soils¹.

Furthermore, from a biogeochemical perspective, the draft animal system represents what agronomists term an "Energy Trap"⁴. While the animal itself relies on a renewable solar energy loop (grazing), the specific mechanical action it facilitates—moldboard plowing—actively and aggressively degrades the underlying thermodynamic battery of the entire farm: the soil humus¹. By continuously shattering the soil aggregates in sandy Arenosols to achieve a clean seedbed, the plow drives rapid carbon oxidation, forcing the farmer to constantly import massive amounts of compost or manure just to maintain the baseline VDLUFA Humus balance, trapping them in a cycle of perpetual fertility degradation¹.

9.2 The Biological and Physiological Constraints of Hand-Tillage

Despite the overwhelming thermodynamic superiority of the broadfork on a strict per-acre basis (maintaining a massive EROEI of 58.25), the manual methodology eventually collides with an unbreakable biological wall. Hand-tilling an acre requires 130 hours of grueling, bone-crushing, 7-MET labor¹⁷.

For a single farmer, or a small family, attempting to manually manage more than 1.0 to 1.5 acres induces rapid physiological degradation, exhaustion, and systemic musculoskeletal failure, strictly limiting the total absolute scale of production¹. Draft animals effectively bypass this human physiological limit. They absorb the brunt of the kinetic trauma, allowing a single human handler to cultivate 10 to 20 acres, albeit at a drastically reduced systemic EROEI. Therefore, the core paradigm can be summarized thusly: the broadfork system perfectly optimizes *energy*

efficiency and land conservation, whereas the draft animal system optimizes *human time and agricultural scale*.

10. Conclusion

The rigorous Energy Return on Energy Invested (EROEI) analysis conducted for a one-acre, multi-crop rotational plot situated on the sandy Arenosols of Berlin-Brandenburg definitively proves that manual primary tillage via broadforking is thermodynamically superior to mechanized draft animal traction.

With an extraordinary systemic EROEI of 58.25 across the composite crop rotation, the broadfork successfully leverages highly efficient human kinetic geometry with negligible "idle" maintenance costs and extremely low amortized tool embodied energy. Furthermore, its specialized non-inversion mechanics protect the fragile, macroporous sandy soils from devastating hoof compaction and catastrophic carbon oxidation, preserving critical subsoil moisture reserves necessary to survive regional summer droughts.

Conversely, biological traction systems (utilizing either horses or oxen) are plagued by the inescapable biological inefficiencies of maintaining a massive basal metabolic overhead. While these animals are highly kinetically efficient during the exact moment of operation, their systemic EROEI plummets to single digits (3.95 to 5.15) when their immense annual feed requirements are prorated across a functional 15-acre farm. More alarmingly, attempting to utilize draft animals exclusively for a small, one-acre subsistence plot results in a negative EROEI (0.28 to 0.37), leading to certain mathematical and biological starvation.

Ultimately, for micro-scale, high-density agricultural autarky in nutrient-poor environments, draft animals are thermodynamically untenable. They only achieve functional viability when massive spatial expansion (scaling beyond 15 acres) is actively required to overcome the physiological limitations of human labor, trading ecological and energetic efficiency for sheer geographic volume and reduced human drudgery.

Works cited

1. 117 Minimum Acreage For Family Sustenance.pdf
2. (PDF) Development of a Real-Time Tillage Depth Measurement, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339899402_Development_of_a_Real-Time_Tillage_Depth_Measurement_System_for_Agricultural_Tractors_Application_to_the_Effect_Analysis_of_Tillage_Depth_on_Draft_Force_during_Plow_Tillage
3. Energetic Analysis of Draught Animal Hay Harvest - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272201373_Energetic_Analysis_of_Draught_Animal_Hay_Harvest_An_Alternative_Look_at_Cellulosic_Biomass
4. Assessing the energy trap of industrial agriculture in North America, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10632262/>
5. Modelling draft requirement of secondary tillage tools in vertisol, <https://www.gbpuat.res.in/uploads/archive/18.2.15.pdf>
6. Chapter 8 Soil Tillage - ASABE Technical Library, <https://elibrary.asabe.org/azdez.asp?JID=4&AID=41470&CID=epam2006&T=1>
7. Changes in Organic Carbon in Mineral Topsoil of a Formerly ... - MDPI,

- <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/12/4/488>
8. (PDF) Stability of soil organic carbon in agro and forest ecosystems, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259827453_Stability_of_soil_organic_carbon_in_agro_and_forest_ecosystems_on_Arenosol
 9. Chemical properties of Pachiterric Histosol as influenced by different, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279210703_Chemical_properties_of_Pachiterric_Histosol_as_influenced_by_different_land_use
 10. The management and husbandry of male and female draught animals, <https://www.fao.org/4/x5483b/x5483b0z.htm>
 11. Resource requirements for draught animal power - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266882167_Resource_requirements_for_draught_animal_power
 12. Features of Soil Organic Carbon Transformations in the Southern, <https://soilcarbon.bsuedu.ru/files/articles/Features%20of%20Soil%20Organic%20Carbon%20Transformations%20in%20the%20Southern%20Area%20of%20the%20East%20European%20Plain.pdf>
 13. ENERGY USE IN AGRICULTURE: AN OVERVIEW - CIGR Journal, <https://cigrjournal.org/index.php/Ejournal/article/download/1044/1037/1037>
 14. (PDF) Energy Inputs in Food Crop Production in Developing and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26575685_Energy_Inputs_in_Food_Crop_Production_in_Developing_and_Developed_Nations
 15. Emergy evaluation of the performance and sustainability of three, <https://www.emergysociety.com/wp-content/uploads/MartinJF-et-al.2006.Evaluating-comparing-sustainability-of-3-ag.-methods-with-emergy-analysis.pdf>
 16. Comparison of horse and tractor traction using emergy analysis, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222530135_Comparison_of_horse_and_tractor_traction_using_emergy_analysis
 17. Long-Term Ecological Assessment of Farming Systems (LEAFS), [https://bubalis.github.io/pdfs/leafs_asfs\(2014\).pdf](https://bubalis.github.io/pdfs/leafs_asfs(2014).pdf)
 18. Emergy evaluations of Denmark and Danish agriculture, <https://www.emergysociety.com/wp-content/uploads/RydbergT-and-HadenAC.2006.Emergy-of-DenmarkDanish-ag-resource-availability.pdf>
 19. Ansi Asabe D497-4-2003 | PDF | Tractor | Tillage - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/document/345945527/ANSI-ASABE-D497-4-2003>
 20. Spreadsheet for Matching Tractors and Implements, <https://elibrary.asabe.org/azdez.asp?JID=5&AID=20603&CID=por2006&T=1>
 21. Efficient Matching using Matching of Tillage Implements with, https://ijair.org/administrator/components/com_jresearch/files/publications/IJAIR_1974_FINAL.pdf
 22. Spreadsheet for Matching Tractors and Implements, <https://elibrary.asabe.org/azdez.asp?JID=5&AID=20603&CID=por2006&T=2>
 23. S T A N D A R D - ASABE Technical Library, <https://elibrary.asabe.org/azdez.asp?jid=2&aid=36431&cid=s2000&t=2>
 24. Assessing Subsoil Conditions with an ASABE Conform Vertical, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9919435/>

25. (PDF) ANALYSIS OF TELEMATICS SYSTEMS IN AGRICULTURE, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360724605_ANALYSIS_OF_TELEMATICS_SYSTEMS_IN_AGRICULTURE
26. Increasingly Heavy Farm Vehicles Are Crushing Soil Health, <https://modernfarmer.com/2022/05/heavy-farm-machinery-soil-health/>
27. Mouldboard Ploughs: Animal vs. Tractor Analysis | PDF - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/document/971099278/Mould-Board-Plough>
28. The Development of a Draft Force Prediction Model for Agricultural, <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/13/12/2205>
29. Design and Plowing Performance of an In Situ Soil-Turning ... - MDPI, <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0472/16/10/1055>
30. 121. VDLUFA-KONGRESS, <https://www.vdlufa.de/kongress2009/Kurzfassung.pdf>
31. Leitfaden zur Humusversorgung, <https://d-nb.info/1141604558/34>
32. Assessing the greenhouse gas budget of tillage mitigation options, https://teagasc.ie/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/GHG-from-ecotillage_5802.pdf
33. Tillage-induced CO₂ emission from soil - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251335415_Tillage-induced_CO_2_emission_from_soil
34. Intensive tillage as a mechanism for CO₂ emission from soils, <https://www.ars.usda.gov/ARSUserFiles/50600000/Products-Reprints/2002/1018.pdf>
35. Soil N₂O emissions with different reduced tillage methods during the, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6472575/>
36. Impact of reduced tillage on greenhouse gas emissions and soil, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5362153/>
37. Soil Nitrous Oxide Emissions in Corn following Three Decades of, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/51025804_Soil_Nitrous_Oxide_Emissions_in_Corn_following_Three_Decades_of_Tillage_and_Rotation_Treatments
38. Why & How to Use a Broadfork - Homestead Lady, <https://homesteadlady.com/how-i-use-my-broadfork/>
39. No-Till Farming Guide for Small Farms and Homesteads · CuzHens, <https://cuzhens.com/learn/soil-compost/no-till-farming-for-small-acreage-a-beginners-field-guide>
40. If you're going to broadfork every 4"-6" why not just till? - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/OrganicGardening/comments/zk8zda/if_youre_going_to_broadfork_every_46_why_not_just/
41. Soil Structure – protecting your best asset - Daera, <https://www.daera-ni.gov.uk/news/soil-structure-protecting-your-best-asset>
42. A mechanical hoof for simulating animal treading under controlled, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248911023_A_mechanical_hoof_for_simulating_animal_treading_under_controlled_conditions
43. Effects of soil compaction by trampling of animals in soil productivity, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325488103_Effects_of_soil_compaction_by_trampling_of_animals_in_soil_productivity_Remediations
44. Correction and Prevention of Soil Compaction - UKnowledge,

- https://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=pss_notes
45. SAFE BEARING CAPACITY VALUES OF DIFFERENT SOILS,
<https://civilblog.org/2015/09/22/safe-bearing-capacity-values-of-different-soils-rocks/>
 46. Protocol - Total Physical Activity - Comprehensive - Older Adult,
<https://www.phenxtoolkit.org/protocols/view/150703>
 47. [unknown_url](#)
 48. MET Calculator - Energy Expenditure of Activities - Topend Sports,
<https://www.topendsports.com/weight-loss/energy-met.htm>
 49. Physical Activity Questionnaire Comprehension-Lessons ... - PMC,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2694667/>
 50. METs Activity Guide for Cancer Survivors | PDF - Scribd,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/145665031/METs-Table-Exercise>
 51. (PDF) Estimating Energy Requirements - ResearchGate,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/294283835_Estimating_Energy_Requirements
 52. How Many Calories Do You Burn? - Personal Training Leeds,
<https://www.m8north.co.uk/blog/how-many-calories-do-you-burn/>
 53. Physical activity for cardiovascular disease prevention,
<https://ifcardio.org/pdf/italian-heart-journal/2003/11/20030255.pdf>
 54. How much food can realistically be produced from 1000 ... - Reddit,
https://www.reddit.com/r/vegetablegardening/comments/1w4mtdj/how_much_food_can_realistically_be_produced_from/
 55. The No-Till Organic Vegetable Farm: How to Start and Run a,
<https://vabf.org/the-no-till-organic-vegetable-farm-how-to-start-and-run-a-profitable-market-garden-that-builds-health-in-soil-crops-and-communities/>
 56. broadfork – Sustainable Market Farming,
<https://www.sustainablemarketfarming.com/tag/broadfork/>
 57. Embodied energy - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Embodied_energy
 58. Assessing the role of vanadium technologies in decarbonizing hard,
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8564109/>
 59. Improved Embodied Energy and Carbon Accounting - ResearchGate,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281127480_Improved_Embodied_Energy_and_Carbon_Accounting_Recommendations_for_Industry_and_Policy
 60. Punching above its weight: life cycle energy accounting and,
<https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2021/em/d0em00424c>
 61. Punching Above its Weight: Life Cycle Energy Accounting and,
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7d98/33c5645746eb9ebf676e30c671149dec84e8.pdf>
 62. From energy analysis to resource accounting: explorations by,
<https://www.emerald.com/jensu/article/doi/10.1680/jensu.25.00120/1355388/From-energy-analysis-to-resource-accounting>
 63. Improving draft animal management,
<https://www.animaltraction.net/Improving92/Management/ImprovingManagement122RAPearson&AJSmith.pdf>

64. Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino Original,
https://iris.unito.it/bitstream/2318/143059/1/Cerutti_et_al_lca.pdf
65. An Economic Comparison of Traditional and Conventional,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231787176_An_Economic_Comparison_of_Traditional_and_Conventional_Agricultural_Systems_at_a_County_Level
66. Foregut vs. Hindgut Fermentation: Which is More Effective for,
<https://www.letstalkacademy.com/foregut-hindgut-fermentation-cellulose-digestion-comparison/>
67. Fermentation in Horses - Equine Research Database | Mad Barn,
<https://madbarn.com/research-topics/fermentation/>
68. Hindgut Fermentation in Horses: Fiber Digestion, Microbes and,
<https://probiotics.horse/hindgut-fermentation-horses/>
69. (PDF) Training Methods and Horse Welfare - ResearchGate,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226713735_Training_Methods_and_Horse_Welfare
70. Fjordworks: Plowing the Market Garden Part 4,
<https://smallfarmersjournal.com/fjordworks-plowing-the-market-garden-part-4/>
71. Equine production and draft animal power utilization 2020,
<https://eopcw.com/find/downloadLectureNote/1498>
72. Draft Animal Power in Agriculture | PDF | Plough | Horses - Scribd,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/720002452/07>
73. How long would it take a standard yoke of oxen to plow 1 acre,
https://www.reddit.com/r/farming/comments/6wua0o/how_long_would_it_take_a_standard_yoke_of_oxen_to/
74. draught animals | CABI Compendium - CABI Digital Library,
<https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.1079/cabicompendium.85292>
75. Energy analysis methodology for agricultural field crops,
<https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/pdf/10.5555/20133223066>
76. Flex-Fuel Humans | Do the Math,
<https://dothemath.ucsd.edu/2012/04/flex-fuel-humans/>
77. Stocks of organic carbon in German agricultural soils—Key results of,
https://literatur.thuenen.de/digbib_extern/dn062722.pdf
78. Leitfaden zur Humusversorgung - Publikationen - sachsen.de,
<https://publikationen.sachsen.de/bdb/artikel/25484/documents/35267>