

Supervolcano

[Environment](#), [Earth](#)



Supervolcano 1. "Docudramas" like Supervolcano are valuable in the sense that they provide certain elements to the viewer that cannot be found in dramas or documentaries. For the drama enthusiast, it sparks an interest by presenting characters and a climactic plot to speed the informational aspect of the movie along. For the documentary enthusiast, it includes a plot "based" on factual information, and provides something to be learned. Supervolcano was a true "docudrama," and appealed to a wider variety of people. Although its plot was fictitious, the information about Yellowstone's volcanic potential, however far-fetched, was intriguing and urged the viewer to wonder about the future of Yellowstone.

2. The ratio of drama to documentary in Supervolcano was probably 80: 20. Although there was factual evidence presented in the film, it seems as though it was manipulated to fit the plotline, and did not actually coincide with any scientific theory. It could easily be construed that the normal fluctuations at Yellowstone are indicators of looming volcanic activity, but those fluctuations have also happened throughout history without consequences. The film, however, noted this fact and stated through the characters that the prediction of a volcanic event is never concrete or dependable. I feel the producers of this film created a successful docudrama in that they were able to present scientific information in a dramatic sense; making the film more widely acceptable.

3. The information given to the viewer on the evidence of the coming volcanic activity seemed to be pretty accurately based on the knowledge of volcanoes presented in this course. The evidence included an increase in seismic activity/ earthquakes; caldera swelling and irregular growth; bulges above the caldera; vegetation death; and the release of toxic

gases such as sulfur dioxide. These symptoms have been present on and around volcanoes that have erupted in the past, and are considered indicative of volcanic activity. - Hazards: inhaling volcanic rock dust/ash (essentially makes cement in the lungs); volcanic rock dust/ash accumulating on architecture (becomes twice as dense when mixed with rain); pyroclastic flow; volcanic gases and dust getting into the atmosphere;

4. Consider the specific scenes where seismic activity occurs, and when the scientists discuss the size and location of those earthquakes. Are those scenes realistic? Why/why not? - It seems realistic enough. For example, the readings of the seismograph. However, the stuff with the hologram projection computer program seemed like something from Star Wars.

5. How are scientists (specifically geologists) portrayed in this production? Do you think it's an accurate portrayal of current geologists employed in the US? How are the images consistent (or different) with your previous impressions of scientists in popular media? - In this production, the geologists are portrayed as young and hip. I'm not saying that geologists can't be young and hip, but it seems like these actors are at an age where, if they were to be employed by the U. S. government, they would need a little more education, work, and experience under their belts first.