

Michael moore's bowling for columbine. documentary critique

[Entertainment](#), [Movie](#)



Bowling for Columbine is a hard-hitting, Oscar-winning, documentary made by documentarian and film producer Michael Moore who is on a quest to find out why there seems there is so much violence in the United States. This film is made in the wake of multiple tragedies involving firearms, such as the Columbine or Flint shooting. In this film, Moore explains multiple issues—one being the levels of gun violence, most especially, in the United States.

Another issue is the accessibility of guns in the United States which according to Moore is outrageous. The nature of violence becomes another issue pursued by Moore in Bowling for Columbine where he tries to pinpoint why the United States stands far above the rest of the world's developed nations in the terms of gun violence. There are multiple issues brought up in the documentary, but the almost immeasurable amount of gun violence, the quick, overly-easy accessibility to guns, and the mysterious nature of violence which rules of the United States tend to be the most prominent of film. There are many who would say otherwise to Michael Moore's claims in which he has made in the process of Bowling For Columbine. The most famous of these critiques is the David T. Hardy critique of the film where he goes into make his claim what is stated by Moore is not only a farce, but an extremely deliberate farce intended to sway audiences to his side of the stated issues of the film.

Gun Violence: one of the primary issues brought up in the documentary Bowling for Columbine ; One would be hard-pressed to find a scene not ultimately revolved around this topic whether directly or indirectly. Michael Moore demonstrates acquiring a gun at the bank; he visits a bank and asks for a bank account with a free gun. Moore also discusses Columbine with

Matt Stone, he ventures through a brief history of the US with a self-made cartoon that basically states when we encounter things we don't like we tend to shoot them. Moore also interviews Charles Heston whom is a former president of the NRA (National Rifle Association) on the issues of Gun violence, and finds Heston has no strong backing for the actions taken by him and the NRA. All of this seems to point towards one central issue: the extent of gun violence and most primarily the gun violence in America and the ignorance of this issue by Americans themselves. Hardy is his critique would greatly disagree with many of the points made by Moore. The first and most obvious critique made by Hardy involves the bank scene. Hardy makes the claim the bank scene is completely staged and utterly designed on a false advertisement created by Moore himself. Hardy continues on in his critique about the brief history of the US cartoon, pointing out that this cartoon, made by Moore and his team, is put in to skew Americans on the history of the NRA itself — equating the NRA to highly controversial organizations such as the KKK. Hardy makes claims about the NRA's coming to be, which was simply by act of New York legislature, and not former KKK members. President Grant signed anti-KKK acts while in office, and was eventually signed in as “ the eighth president of the NRA” (Hardy, Truth About Bowling for Columbine). This facts seems to automatically disputes any chance of the NRA and KKK being interrelated. Hardy also points out that the Charles Heston interview was greatly edited and skewed to make Heston look like a dumbfounded gun-nut, racist. Moore and Hardy's claims continue to battle on as it seems Moore makes one set of statements and Hardy counters with a different set of statements.

Gun accessibility appears as another issue brought forth into the limelight by Michael Moore. Simply stated, Moore pointed out how the easy access to guns contributed to the tragedies at Columbine and Flint, Michigan. The film exemplifies this issue several times in the course of its duration, Moore conveys this at the beginning of the film during the bank scene in which he requests the “ bank account with the free gun” and through several more points in the film such as during the montage at the start of the film of Americans buying and selling firearms, shooting guns, etc, or any one of the many times he questions citizens of their gun ownership, and some said small numbers like 3 or 4 while others gave seemingly more outrageous answers measuring up to over a dozen or so. Moore furthered strengthens his claims by visiting Canada and asking around about their gun ownership and accessibility, and Moore found the minimal to nonexistent difference when comparing Canada and America. This shocking fact seems to bring in the gun accessibility between nations is no different, but as Moore points out during the course of the film, the way American society operates is dangerous when given this level of gun accessibility. To David Hardy, these facts are entertaining and are certainly commercially successful but the facts are facts and Hardy's facts say that Michael Moore's facts are completely and utterly skewed. Of course, the bank scene has already been discussed, and thus the main things to critique in the accessibility of firearms are the several interviews and the comparison of Canada and America in relation to gun accessibility. Hardy's main nail in Moore's proverbial coffin in this case is how Moore seemingly tries to represent all of America with a few several second long interviews he shows in his film, which by most means would

make it false. Moore once again tries misrepresenting a whole nation's values and opinions when Moore goes to Canada and interviews and tests Canadians similarly to how he did in America. Hardy insists Moore is grossly misrepresenting both countries when it comes to gun accessibility. Moore tries to make his claim on Gun accessibility, but Hardy is here to refute it. Facts are facts is all which can be said.

The nature of violence in the USA seems to exist at a much greater and serious extent than any other developed country in the world, suggests Moore. Many people have their own claims as to why such an issue exists in the USA; whether the hard rock of Marilyn Manson causes the violence or maybe violent movies and violent videogames or quiet simply the fact of having a violent history. These reasons exist but considering countries like Britain have been around hundreds of years longer than us and have equal if not more violence in their media outlets, but still manage to stay better off. Moore in his documentary seems to point fingers at the media, and more specifically avenues of media like the news. The nature of violence in America has no one explanation and everyone has their take on it; Moore takes one approach, while the NRA and Heston take a different approach on this nation's violence so who's to say who's right? David T. Hardy surely has something to say about Moore's views on the nature of violence in the United States. Hardy takes a critical eye to statements Moore makes, making counterclaims of his own. Moore pulls some statistics and puts them in his film; this is all well and good, but Hardy points out these statistics may not be completely accurate as they are based on raw numbers rather than actual

specific statistics. Hardy then brings in evidence to counter Moore's claim of news media being a primary perpetrator insinuating violence into American society, and he counters this by pulling statistics of his own to defend news coverage of murder stating "When media coverage of homicides increased 600%, homicide rates fell." (Hardy, "Truth About Bowling for Columbine). Moore in the midst of the film also interviews Charles Heston, seemingly innocent, however Hardy points out Moore does a very sly job at editing this scene to deliberately mislead the audience and make Heston look like an "... idiot and a racist one at that" (Hardy, "Truth About Bowling for Columbine). The nature of violence is a mystery seemingly being unveiled by Moore, but Hardy counters him point for point leaving not only the nature of the US' violence still a mystery but bringing up new questions surrounding Moore's integrity.

A documentary means a purely nonfiction material made strictly to enlighten people on a topic or go into depth on material, and in the case of this film, Moore tries enlightening people on such issues as gun control, gun accessibility, and the nature of violence of America in the wake of the Columbine and Flint Tragedies. The extent of gun violence is discussed with Matt Stone, creator of South Park and Charles Heston, a former president for the NRA. Moore tests the levels of gun accessibility through interviews with citizens than compares it with a local neighboring country to see the amount of similar prevalence. Moore then also discusses all of the different points of view concerning the nature of violence in the USA. Moore works in this film to bring light to some issues in his documentary Bowling For Columbine,

leaving the viewer to hopefully discuss these issues, and move in a direction of change. After being synthesized with a well-known critique by David Hardy though, it may no longer be a question of discussing the issues that are brought up in Bowling for Columbine it may be a question of discussing the facts disputed between Hardy and Moore and finally coming to a final truth.