
Subject: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 06:02:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

<http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-lon g-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>

(sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [rick](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 09:36:17 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

now that's funny!

On Tue, 4 Dec 2007 23:02:55 -0700, "DJ" <[animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net](#)> wrote:

> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-lon g-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>

>

>(sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)

>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [Sarah](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 10:17:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm just shocked. Not! The only thing surprising about this is that anyone would be surprised by it. Come on, they didn't just "forget" to have an exit strategy . . . it's always been about getting a foothold over there in Petroleum Heaven, especially with the looming threat of changing the oil standard from the dollar to the euro. That's a whole lot of human sacrifice for the primary benefit of a bunch of greedy liars.

OK, I'm not sayin' anymore about this. Trying to swear off political posts.

S

"DJ" <[animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net](#)> wrote in message
news:47564021@linux...

> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-lon g-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>

>

> (sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 16:20:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote in message news:47567bca\$1@linux...

> I'm just shocked. Not! The only thing surprising about this is that
> anyone would be surprised by it. Come on, they didn't just "forget" to
> have an exit strategy . . . it's always been about getting a foothold over
> there in Petroleum Heaven, especially with the looming threat of changing
> the oil standard from the dollar to the euro. That's a whole lot of human
> sacrifice for the primary benefit of a bunch of greedy liars.
>
> OK, I'm not sayin' anymore about this. Trying to swear off political
> posts.
>
> S
>

I'm not really too concerned about the base there. This piece of paper is only as valid as the administration(s) that signed it. Iraq or the US could unilaterally cancel it at any time. I don't see either party raising holy hell about this so the Democrats are onboard with it as well. After all, cheap oil means that they can claim economic prosperity as well if they are elected.

What concerns me is that we are going for a short term panacea..Maybe 20 years and we're going to be right back in the same situation if we don't develop our resources here and seriously ramp up our technologies to deal with the inevitable "peak oil" situation.....and we won't do that. Once the price of oil stabilizes, we will fall back into the same old habits.....we always do once the pressure is offand when this happens again, it will be exponentially worse.

OK, I'm done.

Deej

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 16:45:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message

news:4756d0de@linux...

> What concerns me is that we are going for a short term panacea..Maybe 20
> years and we're going to be right back in the same situation if we don't
> develop our resources here and seriously ramp up our technologies to deal
> with the inevitable "peak oil" situation.....and we won't do that.

So true. Our greed and complacency hold us hostage, but nothing like what
it will in coming years.

Then there's the suspected coming water war, esp. here in the west.....

Anyone see that Ted Turner has been buying up land in Nebraska, South
Dakota, etc?

2 million acres now - most of it right over the Ogallala Aquifer, the
world's largest underground water system.

I'm sure he just wants to be a rancher and ride fences over his 2 million
acres - should only take a year or so
depending on how fast his horse is. ;-)

Back to music....

Dedric

> Once the price of oil stabilizes, we will fall back into the same old
> habits.....we always do once the pressure is offand when this
> happens again, it will be exponentially worse.

>

> OK, I'm done.

>

> Deej

>

>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 17:03:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:4756d69d\$1@linux...

>

> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message
> news:4756d0de@linux...

>

>> What concerns me is that we are going for a short term panacea..Maybe 20
>> years and we're going to be right back in the same situation if we don't
>> develop our resources here and seriously ramp up our technologies to deal
>> with the inevitable "peak oil" situation.....and we won't do that.

>

> So true. Our greed and complacency hold us hostage, but nothing like what
> it will in coming years.
> Then there's the suspected coming water war, esp. here in the west....
>
> Anyone see that Ted Turner has been buying up land in Nebraska, South
> Dakota, etc?
> 2 million acres now - most of it right over the Ogallala Aquifer, the
> world's largest underground water system.
> I'm sure he just wants to be a rancher and ride fences over his 2 million
> acres - should only take a year or so
> depending on how fast his horse is. ;-)
>
> Back to music....
>
> Dedric

Boone Pickens has been doing this for years. Ted's a humanitarian. He's just buying up all those water rights so the evil Pickens won't be able to get them and he can, in turn, keep the price of water below \$100.00 per barrel for the good of humanity.

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 17:32:21 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So do you think this is a jousting match between Turner and Pickens to see who controls the AL for western and Texas water useage? ...and longterm, a power play for control over water for the west so we serfs can be dehydrated of our bank accounts?

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message news:4756dade\$1@linux...

>
> Boone Pickens has been doing this for years. Ted's a humanitarian. He's
> just buying up all those water rights so the evil Pickens won't be able to
> get them and he can, in turn, keep the price of water below \$100.00 per
> barrel for the good of humanity.
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 17:34:01 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Sorry DJ - AL should have been OA, or rather Ogallala Aquifier, or rather I should just give up on acronyms and stick to more descriptive phrases like "the thing with all the water underground".

Dedric

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 18:17:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:4756e20d@linux...
> Sorry DJ - AL should have been OA, or rather Ogallala Aquifier, or rather
> I should just give
> up on acronyms and stick to more descriptive phrases like "the thing with
> all the water underground".
>
> Dedric

I think Turner saw an opportunity to make money and he is taking advantage of his great wealth to make more money. Plain and simple. I also think that if they start trying to control downstream access to water, their lives will be shortened by a few years. There are a few good ol' boys around here who will pick them off at 2 miles with .50 cal rifles if they can get in range. People kill each other over water rights in Colorado. It's a tradition.

;o)

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 19:07:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Since my family and I are basically transplants and not fully familiar with most Colorado traditions (other than skiing :-)) are the less violent ones we can participate in? ;-))

Dedric

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message news:4756ec3c@linux...
> People kill each other over water rights in Colorado. It's a tradition.
>
> ;o)
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [DJ](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 19:31:27 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote in message news:4756f7f0@linux...

> Since my family and I are basically transplants and not fully familiar

> with most Colorado traditions (other

> than skiing :-)) are the less violent ones we can participate in? ;-))

>

> Dedric

>

> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message

> news:4756ec3c@linux...

>> People kill each other over water rights in Colorado. It's a tradition.

>>

>> ;o)

>>

>

Well.....skiing is good here. Dec 1 was opening day at Silverton Mountain, Purgatory and Telluride. They actually had to close the lifts at silverton because they couldn't dig them out of the snow fast enough. They had to refer everyone down to Telluride or Purgatory. wolf Creek got 28" in 24 hours last weekend. Of course when all that snow starts melting, it turns to water.....and people die.....

;o)

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [TCB](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 20:48:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well, I dunno, Sarah. I don't buy the 'cheap oil' argument all that much. It would have been a hell of a lot cheaper to just drop sanctions on Iran and Iraq and buy oil from them, they were more than willing to sell. Additionally, oil is not cheap, in fact, it's almost as expensive as it's ever been (inflation adjusted oil was north of 100 of today's dollars back in the late 70's). Also, expensive oil doesn't really benefit oil companies all that much. The price of the commodity has skyrocketed while the price of the retail products it is used to create has not gone up at nearly the same rate. What this means, of course, is that we were getting seriously gouged back in the early 90's when oil was \$8/bbl and gas cost \$1.89/gal. The expensive oil really benefits whoever happens to have the stuff in the ground, as the cost of extraction is a (relative) constant. So, in addition to greatly helping 'allies' like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, high oil prices are the lifeblood of all kinds of supposed 'enemies,' Venezuela, Nigeria, Russia, Iran, Libya, etc. In fact, any believing Christian must think it a real godly thigh slapper that he decided to stick so much of the really good natural resources under the pitter

patter feet of so many non-believers of various stripes. From Mohamedans to animists, to the distant descendents of Zoroaster.

Anyway, why invade Iraq? At this point I'm leaning toward what this article rather floridly describes--permanent US bases in the region. The Saudis impolitely asked us to leave some years back and Kuwait and Qatar aren't really enough. Look at the map, I don't suspect Yemen or Iran would be champing at the bit to invite us in. The US has traditionally wanted large military bases near maritime choke points and the strait of Hormuz is right up there with the Strait of Malacca, and the Suez/Panama canals in the choke point department.

Either that or the Iranians pulled off the greatest intelligence coup in the history of mankind. Or I'm missing something really obvious.

TCB

"Sarah" <sarahjane@sarahtonin.com> wrote:

> I'm just shocked. Not! The only thing surprising about this is that

> anyone would be surprised by it. Come on, they didn't just "forget" to have

> an exit strategy . . . it's always been about getting a foothold over there

> in Petroleum Heaven, especially with the looming threat of changing the oil

> standard from the dollar to the euro. That's a whole lot of human sacrifice

> for the primary benefit of a bunch of greedy liars.

>

> OK, I'm not sayin' anymore about this. Trying to swear off political

> posts.

>

> S

>

>

> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote in message

> news:47564021@linux...

>> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-long-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>

>>

>> (sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)

>>

>

>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 21:53:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:
>In fact,
>any believing Christian must think it a real godly thigh slapper that he
>decided to stick so much of the really good natural resources under the
pitter
>patter feet of so many non-believers of various stripes. From Mohamedans
>to animists, to the distant descendents of Zoroaster.

Actually it was a test. A test to see if we were wise enough to understand the dangers involved in becoming symbiotic with the middle east. A test to see if we were smart enough to find our own resources and stay independent and free.

We flunked...

DC

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [LaMontt](#) on Wed, 05 Dec 2007 23:09:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Old, but new news.. This has been the plan al along.. Pitiful.

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-long-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>
>
>(sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)
>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [Kim](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 00:02:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>(sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)

You're right. One offs don't bother me. :o) It's when we start getting 3 new political threads a day for 3 weeks and the politics to music ratio is still on the slide that I start going "OY!". ;o)

I actually think people should talk more about politics in society, but there

comes a point where this is a music forum and posts have to stay mostly in that direction.

Anyhow, as you were. ;o)

Cheers,
Kim.

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [emarenot](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 16:35:56 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yeah DJ, troubled is right. This whole damn thing just rips me up, thinking about it, trying to understand my feelings about the "war." I've got no good answers, but here are some of the questions that vex me:

-Doesn't the world really run on oil? It ain't just our cars, its that trucking industry, the shipping industry, the industry that makes all the parts for all the other industry, its in the damn keyboard I'm typing on now. So, is switching, within our lifetimes, over to an alternative fuel source really possible such that we have no dependence on OPO (other people's oil)?

-In the world of geopolitics, our relationships with Russia and China matter (to them and to us) -but how much, and for how long?

-Is some quantity of oil or economic "stability," or "dominance," worth even one life?

Funny creatures we are.

MR

"DJ" <animix_@animas_.net> wrote:

> [http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-lon g-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/](http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-lon-g-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/)

>

>(sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)

>

>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 19:48:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It made a lot of people a lot of money for 80 years. And don't forget the helpful role played by our US spooks in 'radicalizing' those wacky middle easterners.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>In fact,

>>any believing Christian must think it a real godly thigh slapper that he

>>decided to stick so much of the really good natural resources under the

>pitter

>>patter feet of so many non-believers of various stripes. From Mohamedans

>>to animists, to the distant descendents of Zoroaster.

>

>

>Actually it was a test. A test to see if we were wise enough to

>understand the dangers involved in becoming symbiotic with

>the middle east. A test to see if we were smart enough to

>find our own resources and stay independent and free.

>

>We flunked...

>

>DC

>

>

>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 21:15:04 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>

>It made a lot of people a lot of money for 80 years. And don't forget the

>helpful role played by our US spooks in 'radicalizing' those wacky middle

>easterners.

>

>TCB

Like they need much help...

I think we can all agree that our dependence on that region
for energy sources has given rise to much foolishness and
danger to all of us.

DC

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 21:46:50 GMT

"Plenty of oil" is relative to demand, difficulty of extraction, and ramifications of atmospheric effects.

"Plenty of oil" is also relative to the price we are willing to pay in terms of dollars, armed conflict and political intervention.

All of that taken into account, betting the farm on oil is a short term gamble at best.

For longer term viability we need to invest heavily in developing other sources of energy, using energy more efficiently, and developing strategies for polluting less in the process.

Oil is not sustainable in the long run, nor will it last forever. But we have the opportunity to use it to help transition to a sustainable future now, if we're smart. Or squander it and wonder what happened later, if we're not.

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

DC wrote:

> Good points.

>

> One thing I would add is that there is plenty of oil out there, and

> we need to get that oil so we can move away from OPO ASAP.

>

> Alternatives should be developed as well, but the emphasis

> must be on our own oil supplies in the short term. The issues at

> hand are too large and too important to not act now.

>

> Every SINGLE administration the OPEC oil embargo has utterly

> failed at this vital task and now we are paying for it...

>

> DC

>

> "Mike R" <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

>> Yeah DJ, troubled is right. This whole damn thing just rips me up, thinking

>> about it, trying to understand my feelings about the "war." I've got no

>> good answers, but here are some of the questions that vex me:

>> -Doesn't the world really run on oil? It ain't just our cars, its that

> trucking

>> industry, the shipping industry, the industry that makes all the parts for

>> all the other industry, its in the damn keyboard I'm typing on now. So,

>> is switching, within our lifetimes, over to an alternative fuel source really

>> possible such that we have no dependence on OPO (other people's oil)?
>> -In the world of geopolitics, our relationships with Russia and China matter
>> (to them and to us) -but how much, and for how long?
>> -Is some quantity of oil or economic "stability," or "dominance," worth
> even
>> one life?
>> Funny creatures we are.
>> MR
>>
>>
>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-long-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>
>>>
>>> (sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)
>>>
>>>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 22:08:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good points.

One thing I would add is that there is plenty of oil out there, and we need to get that oil so we can move away from OPO ASAP.

Alternatives should be developed as well, but the emphasis must be on our own oil supplies in the short term. The issues at hand are too large and too important to not act now.

Every SINGLE administration the OPEC oil embargo has utterly failed at this vital task and now we are paying for it...

DC

"Mike R" <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:

>
>Yeah DJ, troubled is right. This whole damn thing just rips me up, thinking
>about it, trying to understand my feelings about the "war." I've got no
>good answers, but here are some of the questions that vex me:
>-Doesn't the world really run on oil? It ain't just our cars, it's that
>trucking
>industry, the shipping industry, the industry that makes all the parts for
>all the other industry, it's in the damn keyboard I'm typing on now. So,
>is switching, within our lifetimes, over to an alternative fuel source really
>possible such that we have no dependence on OPO (other people's oil)?

>-In the world of geopolitics, our relationships with Russia and China matter
>(to them and to us) -but how much, and for how long?
>-Is some quantity of oil or economic "stability," or "dominance," worth
even
>one life?
>Funny creatures we are.
>MR
>
>
>"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-long-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>
>>
>>(sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [DJ](#) on Thu, 06 Dec 2007 23:46:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think methane is the answer. It's always been here and it's always gonna
be here as long as we are all full of shit, and since that will be the case
as long as we eat and breathe, don't you think it's time to get our shit
together?

;o)

"Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47586ebf@linux...
>
> "Plenty of oil" is relative to demand, difficulty of extraction, and
> ramifications of atmospheric effects.
>
> "Plenty of oil" is also relative to the price we are willing to pay in
> terms of dollars, armed conflict and political intervention.
>
> All of that taken into account, betting the farm on oil is a short term
> gamble at best.
>
> For longer term viability we need to invest heavily in developing other
> sources of energy, using energy more efficiently, and developing
> strategies for polluting less in the process.
>
> Oil is not sustainable in the long run, nor will it last forever. But we
> have the opportunity to use it to help transition to a sustainable future
> now, if we're smart. Or squander it and wonder what happened later, if

> we're not.
>
> Cheers,
> -Jamie
> www.JamieKrutz.com
>
>
> DC wrote:
>> Good points. One thing I would add is that there is plenty of oil out
>> there, and
>> we need to get that oil so we can move away from OPO ASAP.
>>
>> Alternatives should be developed as well, but the emphasis
>> must be on our own oil supplies in the short term. The issues at
>> hand are too large and too important to not act now.
>>
>> Every SINGLE administration the OPEC oil embargo has utterly
>> failed at this vital task and now we are paying for it...
>>
>> DC
>>
>> "Mike R" <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>> Yeah DJ, troubled is right. This whole damn thing just rips me up,
>>> thinking
>>> about it, trying to understand my feelings about the "war." I've got no
>>> good answers, but here are some of the questions that vex me:
>>> -Doesn't the world really run on oil? It ain't just our cars, its that
>> trucking
>>> industry, the shipping industry, the industry that makes all the parts
>>> for
>>> all the other industry, its in the damn keyboard I'm typing on now. So,
>>> is switching, within our lifetimes, over to an alternative fuel source
>>> really
>>> possible such that we have no dependence on OPO (other people's
>>> oil)? -In the world of geopolitics, our relationships with Russia and
>>> China matter
>>> (to them and to us) -but how much, and for how long? -Is some quantity
>>> of oil or economic "stability," or "dominance," worth
>> even
>>> one life? Funny creatures we are.
>>> MR
>>>
>>>
>>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-long-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>
>>>>
>>>> (sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)
>>>>

>>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:32:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The Barnett shale formation is being explored in a very serious way in Texas. there are huge deposits of shale in western Colorado. they will be developed, but not before the price of developing it gets so ridiculous due to bureaucratic red tape that only the majors will have the money to play the game and then the prices will be fixed by them. No way around it. the environmental lobby in western Colorado is going to add 20% to the production costs of recovery and that will be passed along. Good or bad??? Doesn't matter. It will happen. there are 128,000 gas wells projected to be drilled along the western slope of the rocky mountains in the next 10 years. I'm so busy here I can hardly find time to get in the studio these days. 16 hour days are getting old.....16 hour per day billing averaging 6.5 days a week is not. My studio could never bring in that kind of revenue. There aren't that many people these days that know how to do what I do. The young people who were getting into this field in the late 70's bailed out when it went belly up in '82 and then everyone went into the computer field. I'm among the last of a dying breed.

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47588f84\$1@linux...

>

> Hey Deej,

>

> My wife and I have this discussion regularly. You should know the

> answer to this, but it seems to me that between the new

> discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico and the oil shale, and other

> opportunities, we should be able to put enough pressure on

> the oil producers to remove the political blackmail from oil use.

>

> Now, I realize that the greens will want to use any chance

> they can, but really, as important as alternatives are, they cannot

> do a thing for us in the short term.

>

> Why don't we do this:

>

> Get enough of our own oil to take the power away from oil

> as a weapon, and develop alternatives at the same time.

>

> Seems reasonable to me, but every time we talk about it,

> someone starts saying geothermal, hydrogen, solar, wind,

> etcetc like those things mean a damn in the near future, when
> everyone knows they don't. So develop them, yes, but first,
> oil independence. Seems to me that anything else is foolish
> and dangerous.
>
> What do you think?
>
> DC
>
>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 00:58:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh. We need to get our shit together, that's for sure.

Not news to you, but here's another look at peak oil:

<http://www.arabnews.com/?page=7§ion=0&article=103243&d=6&m=11&y=2007>

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

DJ wrote:

> I think methane is the answer. It's always been here and it's always gonna
> be here as long as we are all full of shit, and since that will be the case
> as long as we eat and breathe, don't you think it's time to get our shit
> together?
>
> ;o)
>
>
> "Jamie K" <Meta@Dimensional.com> wrote in message news:47586ebf@linux...
>> "Plenty of oil" is relative to demand, difficulty of extraction, and
>> ramifications of atmospheric effects.
>>
>> "Plenty of oil" is also relative to the price we are willing to pay in
>> terms of dollars, armed conflict and political intervention.
>>
>> All of that taken into account, betting the farm on oil is a short term
>> gamble at best.
>>
>> For longer term viability we need to invest heavily in developing other

>> sources of energy, using energy more efficiently, and developing
>> strategies for polluting less in the process.
>>
>> Oil is not sustainable in the long run, nor will it last forever. But we
>> have the opportunity to use it to help transition to a sustainable future
>> now, if we're smart. Or squander it and wonder what happened later, if
>> we're not.
>>
>> Cheers,
>> -Jamie
>> www.JamieKrutz.com
>>
>>
>> DC wrote:
>>> Good points. One thing I would add is that there is plenty of oil out
>>> there, and
>>> we need to get that oil so we can move away from OPO ASAP.
>>>
>>> Alternatives should be developed as well, but the emphasis
>>> must be on our own oil supplies in the short term. The issues at
>>> hand are too large and too important to not act now.
>>>
>>> Every SINGLE administration the OPEC oil embargo has utterly
>>> failed at this vital task and now we are paying for it...
>>>
>>> DC
>>>
>>> "Mike R" <emarenot@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>>> Yeah DJ, troubled is right. This whole damn thing just rips me up,
>>>> thinking
>>>> about it, trying to understand my feelings about the "war." I've got no
>>>> good answers, but here are some of the questions that vex me:
>>>> -Doesn't the world really run on oil? It ain't just our cars, it's that
>>>> trucking
>>>> industry, the shipping industry, the industry that makes all the parts
>>>> for
>>>> all the other industry, it's in the damn keyboard I'm typing on now. So,
>>>> is switching, within our lifetimes, over to an alternative fuel source
>>>> really
>>>> possible such that we have no dependence on OPO (other people's
>>>> oil)? -In the world of geopolitics, our relationships with Russia and
>>>> China matter
>>>> (to them and to us) -but how much, and for how long? -Is some quantity
>>>> of oil or economic "stability," or "dominance," worth
>>>> even
>>>> one life? Funny creatures we are.
>>>> MR
>>>>

>>>>
>>>> "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>>>>> <http://rinf.com/alt-news/war-terrorism/us-signs-deal-for-long-term-occupation-of-iraq/1850/>
>>>>>
>>>>> (sorry Kim....it's OT, but troubling)
>>>>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 01:10:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hey DeeJ,

My wife and I have this discussion regularly. You should know the answer to this, but it seems to me that between the new discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico and the oil shale, and other opportunities, we should be able to put enough pressure on the oil producers to remove the political blackmail from oil use.

Now, I realize that the greens will want to use any chance they can, but really, as important as alternatives are, they cannot do a thing for us in the short term.

Why don't we do this:

Get enough of our own oil to take the power away from oil as a weapon, and develop alternatives at the same time.

Seems reasonable to me, but every time we talk about it, someone starts saying geothermal, hydrogen, solar, wind, etc etc like those things mean a damn in the near future, when everyone knows they don't. So develop them, yes, but first, oil independence. Seems to me that anything else is foolish and dangerous.

What do you think?

DC

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [dc\[3\]](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 06:11:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks

You know, I believe that we need alternatives, and that a lot should be spent finding them, but we are in a real fix because it is so hard to find and refine our own oil. Our own oil IS the geopolitical issue of our age. Now show me a candidate who gets it...

DC

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>The Barnett shale formation is being explored in a very serious way in

>Texas. there are huge deposits of shale in western Colorado. they will be

>developed, but not before the price of developing it gets so ridiculous
due

>to bureaucratic red tape that only the majors will have th4e money to play

>the game and then the prices will be fixed by them. No way around it. the

>nvironmental lobby in western Colorado is going to add 20% to the production

>costs of f recovery and that will be passed along. Good or bad??? Doesn't

>matter. It will happen. there are 128,000 gas wells oprojected to be drilled

>along the western slope of the rocky mountains in the next 10 years. I'm
so

>usy here I can hardly find time to get in the studio these days. 16 hour

>days are getting old.....16 hour per day billing averaging 6.5 days
a

>week is not. My studio could never bring in that kind of revenue. There

>aren't that many people these days that know how to do what I do. The young

>people who were getting into this field in the late 70's bailed out when
it

>went belly up in '82 and then everyone went into the computer field. I'm

>among the last of a dying breed.

>

>

>

>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47588f84\$1@linux...
>>
>> Hey Deej,
>>
>> My wife and I have this discussion regularly. You should know the
>> answer to this, but it seems to me that between the new
>> discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico and the oil shale, and other
>> opportunites, we should be able to put enough pressure on
>> the oil producers to remove the political blackmail from oil use.
>>
>> Now, I realize that the greens will want to use any chance
>> they can, but really, as important as alternatives are, they cannot
>> do a thing for us in the short term.
>>
>> Why don't we do this:
>>
>> Get enough of our own oil to take the power away from oil
>> as a weapon, and develop alternatives at the same time.
>>
>> Seems reasonable to me, but every time we talk about it,
>> someone starts saying geothermal, hydrogen, solar, wind,
>> etcetc like those things mean a damn in the near future, when
>> everyone knows they don't. So develop them, yes, but first,
>> oil independence. Seems to me that anything else is foolish
>> and dangerous.
>>
>> What do you think?
>>
>> DC
>>
>>
>>
>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 10:09:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

need anyone to carry your briefcase...or water in the summer?

On Thu, 6 Dec 2007 17:32:26 -0700, "DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:

>The Barnett shale formation is being expolored in a very serious way in

>Texas. there are huge deposits of shale in western Colorado. they will be
>developed, but not before the price of developing it gets so ridiculous due
>to bureaucratic red tape that only the majors will have the money to play
>the game and then the prices will be fixed by them. No way around it. the
>environmental lobby in western Colorado is going to add 20% to the production
>costs of recovery and that will be passed along. Good or bad??? Doesn't
>matter. It will happen. there are 128,000 gas wells projected to be drilled
>along the western slope of the rocky mountains in the next 10 years. I'm so
>busy here I can hardly find time to get in the studio these days. 16 hour
>days are getting old.....16 hour per day billing averaging 6.5 days a
>week is not. My studio could never bring in that kind of revenue. There
>aren't that many people these days that know how to do what I do. The young
>people who were getting into this field in the late 70's bailed out when it
>went belly up in '82 and then everyone went into the computer field. I'm
>among the last of a dying breed.

>
>
>
>

>"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote in message news:47588f84\$1@linux...

>>

>> Hey Deej,

>>

>> My wife and I have this discussion regularly. You should know the
>> answer to this, but it seems to me that between the new
>> discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico and the oil shale, and other
>> opportunities, we should be able to put enough pressure on
>> the oil producers to remove the political blackmail from oil use.

>>

>> Now, I realize that the greens will want to use any chance
>> they can, but really, as important as alternatives are, they cannot
>> do a thing for us in the short term.

>>

>> Why don't we do this:

>>

>> Get enough of our own oil to take the power away from oil
>> as a weapon, and develop alternatives at the same time.

>>

>> Seems reasonable to me, but every time we talk about it,
>> someone starts saying geothermal, hydrogen, solar, wind,
>> etcetc like those things mean a damn in the near future, when
>> everyone knows they don't. So develop them, yes, but first,
>> oil independence. Seems to me that anything else is foolish
>> and dangerous.

>>

>> What do you think?

>>

>> DC

>>
>>
>>
>

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 17:31:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Some did, some didn't, but it was the CIA who taught them first the fundamentals and then the advanced tactics of insurgency, secure communication, and so on. This was to give Russia 'it's Vietnam.'

Relying on any other country for anything important is, to some extent, a danger. The US is blessed with staggering resources of our own that we use a good deal of. Some of the stuff is cheaper to get from somewhere else. However, as dangerous as relying on Saudi Arabia to keep gas in the tank might be, relying on Japan and China to keep our credit markets liquid is probably just as bad an idea. But it's pretty hard to demonize the people who build most of the stuff we buy so they're getting a free pass in the gloom and doom department.

TCB

"DC" <dc@spammersinhell.com> wrote:

>

>"TCB" <nobody@ishere.com> wrote:

>>

>>It made a lot of people a lot of money for 80 years. And don't forget the
>>helpful role played by our US spooks in 'radicalizing' those wacky middle
>>easterners.

>>

>>TCB

>

>Like they need much help...

>

>I think we can all agree that our dependence on that region
>for energy sources has given rise to much foolishness and
>danger to all of us.

>

>DC

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [DJ](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 18:39:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:ht6il3ddmo55pukivr0hgl3libav028oc8@4ax.com...
> need anyone to carry your briefcase...or water in the summer?
>
>

It's nice being able to pay off some major bills but it won't last forever.
You make hay while the sun shines in this business. It (literally) could
change tomorrow. I remember times when they would pull the plug on funding
projects in November and there would be no work again until late February.
Nothing is taken for granted around here.
;o)

Subject: Re: Any of you guys see this?
Posted by [TCB](#) on Fri, 07 Dec 2007 21:18:26 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Commodities are called volatile for a reason. Good you're getting lots of
work, DeeJ. I wish there were a way I could get into the \$/BTU spread of
oil v. NG getting back in line. Retail investors like us can't though.

TCB

"DJ" <animix _ at _ animas _ dot _ net> wrote:
>

>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:ht6il3ddmo55pukivr0hgl3libav028oc8@4ax.com...
>> need anyone to carry your briefcase...or water in the summer?
>>
>>
>
>It's nice being able to pay off some major bills but it won't last forever.

>You make hay while the sun shines in this business. It (literally) could

>change tomorrow. I remember times when they would pull the plug on funding

>projects in November and there would be no work again until late February.

>Nothing is taken for granted around here.
>;o)
>
>
