



An exercise in civil discussion

Posted by [Yankee](#) on December 9, 2005 - 12:33am

Topic: [Supply/Production](#)

Tags: [abiotic oil](#), [peak oil](#) [[list all tags](#)]

I know that some readers aren't so happy when we seriously entertain the abiotic oil theory here. Others of you, however, have compellingly argued (IMHO) that as the concept of peak oil becomes more prevalent, we're going to see more and more people rallying to the side of abiotic oil, well, because it's a lot more comforting than peak oil itself it.

I was looking around the web today, and I came across a website (which I probably should not even be linking to) that had a [small blurb](#) mentioning that [Rigzone](#) pulled Corsi's "Black Gold Stranglehold: The Myth of Scarcity and the Politics of Oil" off their website. In the comments, people there started to discuss abiotic oil, and one response in particular got me to thinking.

There is one thing that none of the peak oil advocates have ever adequately explained: if oil truly is running out, then why aren't the oil companies and industry in general scrambling to replace it with something better? Do you expect any rational person to believe that an entire civilization would willfully commit suicide in full knowledge of the consequences of its dependency on petrochemicals? The logic just isn't there.

It seems odd to me that this commenter would ask this question if he has done any reading at all about PO (and let's give him the benefit of the doubt). Maybe the oil companies aren't scrambling to come up with anything better because, well, there isn't anything better. At least, there's no one thing that's better, which would mean that oil companies would have to seriously diversify their R&D, and I don't see that they're prepared to do that. Or something like that.

But my bigger point here is this. If someone argued this viewpoint to your face, you wouldn't be able to call him an idiot and stalk away. You would have to systematically explain why the oil companies are not apparently "scrambling to replace [oil] with something better". So in all seriousness, what would you say to a person who asked you this question? How would you, a peak oil adherent, concisely explain to an abiotic oil proponent what the oil companies' current game plan is?

And just to close, here is (part of) the remainder of that comment:

However if you consider that the peak oil scenario provides a perfect cover for global depopulation as desired by the ruling elites of the oil industry (Rockefellers, etc.), then the pieces all start lining up.

Still, I want you to take this seriously.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 United States License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/us/).