

Movie Review

by Edwin X Berry, PhD

Not Evil Just Wrong

The feature-length documentary that reveals the true cost of Global Warming hysteria.

Close but no cigar. The movie covers some of the bases in the debate about global warming but leaves a lot of gaps.

The movie uses the DDT issue to show how excessive environmental activism led to unanticipated and unintended consequences. Specifically, it shows how activism - over an unproven claim by Rachael Carson that DDT causes thinner shells on bird eggs - led to the abandonment of DDT. The resulting loss of DDT caused malaria and death for millions of Africans. The movie's intended parallel is to show that activism to stop human emissions of carbon dioxide will also lead to human misery.

However, simply showing that the environmentalists were wrong on DDT does not prove they are wrong about carbon dioxide. The movie does not respond to this challenge as strongly as it could have and it spends far too much time on DDT for a global warming movie.

The movie does a good job of exposing the errors in the "hockey stick" temperature plot promoted by the UN IPCC since 1999 and still taught in America's university classes. Stephen McIntyre and Ross McKittrick explain the errors they found in the statistical analysis performed by Mann, Bradley and Hughes who created the hockey stick data. McIntyre and McKittrick showed that using random numbers from a phone book would produce the same hockey stick plot that Mann claimed for temperature data.

The movie suggests the primary benefit of coal energy is that it provides jobs. Lacking, however, is a comparison of coal energy jobs versus, say, wind energy jobs. The movie suggests that coal energy is cheap and wind energy is expensive but does not show a direct comparison. The movie spends far too much time showing what is supposed to be a typical American working class family without using the time to convey essential information.

The movie misses this key point: cheap energy is necessary to have a high standard of living. For coal and oil, carbon dioxide output is directly related to energy produced. If we limit carbon dioxide as Gore wants us to do, we limit energy and increase its cost, thereby lowering our standard of living. Increased energy cost will impact the world's poor much more than the rich. Therefore, carbon limits are detrimental to society and unethical.

When you boil it down to the basics, standard of living results from access to cheap energy. The Egyptians did not have supplementary energy like oil and

gas, and they could not make electricity or electric motors. The only resource they had to supply cheap energy was slaves. Today, our available energy resources give most of us the equivalent of hundreds of slaves. Rather than reducing our access to energy, we should be doing everything we can to increase our access to energy. I wish the movie had made this point.

Roy Innis, president of CORE, talks about the impact global warming legislation will have on the world's poor, but the movie fails to show why this will occur. Innis can make the case that carbon restriction laws are unethical but the movie does not give him this opportunity. Innis notes that Martin Luther King talked about a positive future while Gore talks about a negative future.

The movie shows schools teaching children that our SUVs are killing polar bears. While it does show polar bears are in no danger and that their populations have been increasing, it forgot to declare this government promoted brainwashing as child abuse. However, it does reveal the abusing psychological manipulation being used on children to promote an agenda.

The movie reviews the British court case against Al Gore's Inconvenient Truth and the fact that the court ruled that 9 of Gore's claims are false. But it does not reveal that all 35 of Gore's points were about to go down the drain with the first 9 but for the judge getting tired of it all and deciding 9 was enough.

The movie shows Gore's dire prediction that sea levels would rise 20 feet but it did not interview an ocean scientist who would have shown that this is but a figment of Gore's wild imagination.

The movie misses the opportunity to add that Gore's goal of a 90% reduction in our carbon dioxide emissions, lacking any new nuclear plants, means America will end up operating with only 10% to 20% of its present energy production. This limited energy production would put America below the present world average standard of living and make America a third world country and third-rate military power. You can't win a war using wind energy.

Pat Moore, founder of Greenpeace, talks about the fallacies of global warming, but the film fails to point out that Moore is a key environmental activist who quickly understood the fallacy of global warming and refused to go down that path.

Syun Akasofu of the International Arctic Research Center in Fairbanks, Alaska, is shown saying that glaciers began melting about 1850. But the movie missed the point that human carbon dioxide began to be significant after 1950. Putting these together, the fact that glacier melting began 100 years before human carbon dioxide was a factor negates the hypothesis that

our carbon dioxide caused the melting. On the flip side, the fact that the melting rate did not increase after 1950 destroys the alarmist claim that our carbon dioxide causes glacier melting. The necessary conclusion is that our SUVs do not cause global warming.

The movie further misses Akasofu's key research result: that mean global temperature has been increasing at the constant rate of 0.5 Celsius per century (neglecting cyclic influences) since the bottom of the Little Ice Age in 1660. The fact that this rate has been unaffected by human carbon dioxide emissions shows all the warming since 1660 is due to nature and not to humans.

The movie shows Gore saying we must turn over our sovereignty to the world government in order to accomplish limiting America's carbon dioxide emissions. This makes it very clear that the goal of the global warming scam is to invalidate the US Constitution and put America under the rule of the United Nations.

The movie shows an unnamed movie actor shedding tears over the damage we are doing with our SUVs but it does not follow up on the actor's statement, "In Fiji people are happy and they have no electricity." There is clearly no relationship of a modern industrialized country, especially one where the winters are cold and the populations are dense, to people living in Fiji.

The movie shows James Hansen of NASA looking foolish attempting to make a comment but it did not use the opportunity to show graphs of Hansen's past predictions that ended up being wrong and to show Hansen's ridiculous prediction in January 2009 that in order to save the planet we had only 4 years left to stop all coal burning and mining.

Richard Lindzen of MIT comments that smoke from coal plants is no longer black. The smoke was black years ago before advanced technology was added to remove the dirt from coal plant smoke. Today, smoke from coal plants looks white which is direct evidence that the dirt is gone. So coal energy is now clean. However, the movie does not explain that the EPA now defines carbon dioxide as "dirty." Therefore, even though coal plant emissions are technically clean they are not legally clean. This illogical legal conclusion is now responsible for stopping construction of new coal plants in America.

The two relevant and important pieces of information missing from the movie, in my opinion, are the failure to follow the money to show why global warming is being promoted in the absence of scientific support, and the failure to show the basic scientific method which would clearly show the fallacies of Gore's global warming claims.

In conclusion, the movie fills an empty spot in telling the truth about the global warming hoax. It is worth seeing and it should encourage you to seek more information.

After the showing in Kalispell, Montana, the organizer asked me to do an impromptu review of the movie and global warming. Relating to the movie, I listed the four scientific pillars that must all be proven true in order to support the global warming hypothesis.

First, temperature data must show clear increase in recent history. In other words, it must look like the Hockey Stick plot. But this has been discredited so the hypothesis fails.

Second, carbon dioxide data must also look like a hockey stick. But it does not because the data was cherry picked. Actual data show we had much higher carbon dioxide concentration in 1820 and 1940 than we do now. Therefore, the hypothesis fails twice.

Third, climate models must make accurate predictions. They do not make accurate predictions. Therefore, the hypothesis fails three times.

Fourth, the physics of heat transfer in the atmosphere used in the models must be valid. In fact, it has been shown to be invalid. The hypothesis fails for the fourth time.

A retired chemistry professor and former university dean stood up to present the case for global warming. However, he was not able to contradict any of the four pillars listed above or any of the key points in the movie. Therefore, he did not convince the audience and his case failed.

Edwin X Berry, PhD
Atmospheric Physicist
www.climatephysics.com

American Meteorological Society
Certified Consulting Meteorologist #180
American Physical Society
American Geophysical Union

Climate Physics, LLC
439 Grand Ave #147
Bigfork, MT 59911

*In a world of climate delusions
We bring you valid conclusions*

Copyright (c) 2009 by Edwin X Berry