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The Argument in “ An Inconvenient Truth” An incendiary documentary, “ An Inconvenient Truth” is a film directed by Davis Guggenheim based on the multimedia presentation of former U. S. Vice President Al Gore about global warming. The film depicts a horrifying picture of global destruction that global warming is doing to the earth. It also takes its viewers to a disconcerting appearance of our earth’s future. Nevertheless, the film is not about hopelessness but rather a rallying summon to protect the one shelter we all share.
Since former U. S. Vice President Al Gore has a number of claims in the film, let us scrutinize some if they are in line with scientific consensus. Here are the following claims:
Category 4 & 5 hurricanes have doubled in 2005 (Gore et al., An Inconvenient Truth). Earth & Space Science professor and Quaternary Research Center director Eric Steig states that this is a fact and there is no theoretical basis that this is a natural cycle (p. 5). Although there are different findings on this issue, a new study on these upswings associates with the rise of the temperature of the ocean surface. Scientists are still not in consensus on the possible cause of this issue. Heat waves will be more frequent and more intense as temperatures rise (Gore et al., An Inconvenient Truth). He presents a record of the temperature increase in correlation to the heat waves the globe experienced in the history. The data gathered prove that as the average increases, the extreme goes up as well. Global sea levels could rise by more than 20 feet (6 meters) with the loss of shelf ice in Greenland and Antarctica, devastating coastal areas worldwide (Gore et al., An Inconvenient Truth). Gore argues that the melting of Greenland and Antarctica, due to rise on CO2 level cause extreme flooding by 2050. Although scientists believe that if Greenland and glaciers in the Antarctic melt, this will cause an increase in the sea level which will cause the low-lying areas to submerge into water. But they have different estimates on when this would happen. Some say that if the temperature rises to 3C, which is 5. 4F within the next 100 years, there is a big possibility that Gore’s claim may happen (Nielsen-Gammon 22).
With all the claims mentioned and data presented, how does Gore intend to combat our devastating predicament? His main point is to lower energy consumption to decrease the greenhouse gas effect by the use of Electranet. This will replace our fuel-consuming engines found in cars, factory machines and the likes. Coming from an environmental activist point of view, this will definitely help reduce our greenhouse gases that are the main cause of global warming. However, apart from some inaccuracies in his claims, Gore also fails to discuss the root cause of the greenhouse effect; the companies that use so much energy for profit instead of sustainability should have been mentioned. Being a representative of a capitalist government, his views and resolutions on issues are all of a capitalist point of view. Had he pointed out that capitalism kills our one and only earth and suggested a better-sounding solution than Electranet, another form of society, the film would not have had grilled over the years.
With the facts presented, in spite of some inaccuracies, our mother earth is indeed wearing out and this is not a natural cycle. According to the data gathered, this is a direct result of the abuse of mankind to nature and is already taking its toll. “ An Inconvenient Truth” is already problematic enough to be absorbed so offering a sound solution to it would be convenient towards the real change we need. In hindsight, it may be inconvenient for him to admit that the government he represents is the main cause of his finding.
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