

Great global warming swindle- aassignment assignment



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Repeatedly in the film, when global warming is discussed they use weak analogies with it to make global warming a positive thing; snazzy jazz music will play softly in the background and then attractive people in bikinis at the beach, giving the viewer the impression that a warmer temp is equivocal to beach paradise. It's a weak analogy and a generalization because a couple degrees warmer in Europe or a temperate zone may not be that tragic, but what about the consequences of a few degrees temperate increase closer to the equator where the average temperate is consistently high?

A few degrees warmer in Europe, or Minnesota might not be too tragic, but residents near the equator would undoubtedly disagree. A temperature increase on the Sahara desert, or anywhere along the equator would have definite tragic exults. Next the exuberant, expressive, and over-joked professor Phillip Scott, when discussing the medieval warm period, states that if the temperature goes up- great riches will occur all over. " In fact whenever you describe this warm period it appears to be associated with riches". However, the medieval warm period was a regional warming, NOT global.

Again it is a sign of the arguer missing the point while also giving a weak analogy. Furthermore, a couple fallacies can be found in the film when they show the Cokes, 2 Kenya Public Health Clinic outside Nairobi. This clinic utilizes a alarm panel to have electricity. However, the panel doesn't provide enough electricity for the clinic to use the lights and the refrigeration unit simultaneously on site. Its an appeal to pity- because these people lack adequate health resources, yet its also diverting the focus.

How is it solar energy's fault they don't have power? If solar energy didn't exist they would magically then have power? The solar panel is NOT harming the clinic. It is sending the message that being environmentally conscious is actually anti-human, thereby committing the fallacy of Red Herring by leading the audience off track. Overall this movie is a LARGE appeal to ignorance. Its claiming that humanity doesn't need to be held responsible for its own impact on the world around it.

One of the basic principles that responsible parents try to teach their children is the idea of personal accountability and being courageous enough to take responsibility for one's own actions. Simply dismissing humanity's impact on global warming is an appeal to ignorance and of weak induction. This movie greatly feeds off the viewers fear of change and subconscious. Repeatedly associating positive change with global warming by often showing lips of bikini-clad beachcombers, or when the terrific riches associated with the Medieval Warm Period is discussed- note the Sudden change in background music to a powerful symphonic orchestra.

Wealth is associated with temperature increase. An end to poverty, and disease. The basic premise is, why change our actions if we aren't causing any impact, and even if we are impacting the world- a few degrees increase in temperature wont hurt people. First denying the existence of the problem, and then admitting its existence but denying the gravity and true depth of the situation.