



## Perhaps we could ask for a little input ?

Posted by [Heading Out](#) on February 17, 2007 - 11:19pm

Topic: [Miscellaneous](#)

Tags: [3-d models](#), [avatars](#), [peak oil websites](#) [[list all tags](#)]

We are guilty here, on occasion, of being a little insular, in that there is a slow change going on in the world, in regard to the issues of peak fuel supply and public perceptions of it. When I first started writing for this site I would generally glance at three sites (other than the industrial ones) to see what was happening. They were (and are) [the Energy Bulletin](#), [the Peak Oil Board](#); and (for the Europeans) [Powerswitch](#). Others, such as [Rigzone](#); < a href=<http://www.ogj.com/index.cfm>> the Oil and Gas Journal and [Schlumberger](#) are for more of the technical issues, (I am not counting the ASPO and similar sites, since they send me newsletters) and from these and others like them we have compiled the list of sites that you see on the left hand side of the page.

Because they each have a different flavor, and each have their own foci of attention, you might want to spend an evening wandering down the list we have compiled, to see how those different folk that we have found, and which we now list, address the different issues. The voices, as you may note, are quite different in focus and you might wish to filter them to your own interests. (That is how I got into blogging – by making my own site, so that I had a list of such sites, from which I could draw, and then comment on what I was seeing).

So what makes this worthy of special comment. Well it is because the MSM, that we all love to moan and groan about, is starting to pick up on the issue of Peak Oil. The first regular journalist that I noted writing on the topic was [Tom Whipple](#) of the Falls Church News Press. His columns have always been worth a read. But then, I noticed that the [Houston Chronicle](#) now blogs on Energy issues, and just yesterday we were told that [The Wall Street Journal](#) has an energy blog. And so it seems an appropriate time to do a quick survey around and see if we can come up with regular columns or blog sites that we have missed on the list which you see down the left and bring it up to date. (And I recognise that I have not given some of the personal websites of some of our contributors, many of whom have much more information, of a focused type, than we do here - I hope they understand what I am looking for, and forgive me).

---

So for all you detective types out there, why not send us a note where you find folks that are regularly blogging on the subject, and we will see if we can't update the list. I await your comments and promise to look at almost all of them (depending on how many we get).

And for those of you who note that this is not one of the more informative of weekend posts, I am working on a techie talk on coal, that may pop up tomorrow. However it has required that I build some new 3-D models one of which took most of my afternoon.

---

So here is another little question – since we established, I guess last Monday, that everybody

here is fully aware of what is going on in all sorts of other sites on the Web (save only your humble servant) and since, for example, [Renderosity](#) had 1721 visitors on site as I wrote this (while we only had 150 (10:01 pm Saturday night EST)). I am modeling my technical objects in [Strata](#) since I learned it when they started and it is easy for my small brain to follow. Like everyone else, I suppose, I use [Poser](#) for my avatars, including [one](#) that . . . well never mind. So any way, here is the question, is it better, when you try and integrate these into a field model to use [Bryce](#) or [Vue](#) ?

Thanks

Oh, and while I can't image why I mention this, I watched "The Starry Messenger" in the [Ascent of Man](#) series this week. It related to the trial of Galileo.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 United States License](#).