
Subject: Re: I hate winter...

Posted by [Jamie K](#) on Tue, 29 Jan 2008 07:39:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rich Lamanna wrote:

> Must be global warming. Anyone seen this? If you've got an hour check it
> out. It may take a minute or two to load.

Yep, the swindle movie is old news, we even discussed it here.

As I mentioned at the time, it ignores the main body of peer-reviewed scientific evidence for the sake of sensationalism. It was done that way deliberately by the producers, with no attempt at an objective look at the actual scientific evidence. Fair and balanced it ain't.

I do like the breathless announcer, fast cuts and dramatic music. It's always fun to see a one-sided polemic that ironically accuses others of being one-sided. I doubt anyone here is gullible enough to take it as an objective authority.

But anyway, here's more (follow the links):

From:

<http://climatedenial.org/2007/05/01/why-was-the-great-global-warming-swindle-so-persuasive/>
"The fans of the film would argue that it has been effective because it is true. But truth is not, of itself, persuasive. When we receive new information on a topic we have no idea whether it is true or not. We base our conclusions on how it was presented to us, whether it concurs with what we already know about that topic, how far we trust the person telling us, and how well that information fits inside our world view. We then seek to match our initial conclusions against the conclusions of our peers. So, although we think we seek truth, the process by which we reach opinions is equally capable of leading us in the wrong direction. It turns out that Swindle was a collection of rather crude distortions in an elegant package. We now know that the data was misrepresented, the charts re-arranged, and the interviews edited in ways that were designed to mislead."

From: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Great_Global_Warming_Swindle
"Although the documentary was welcomed by global warming sceptics, it was criticised heavily by many scientific organisations and individual scientists (including two of the film's contributors[3][4]). The film's critics argued that it had misused data, relied on out-of-date research, employed misleading arguments, and misrepresented the position of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."

From: <http://www.climateofdenial.net/?q=node/7>

available for purchase since late July 2007. The front of the programme giving a factual account of something, using film, contains at least five major misrepresentations of the scientific presents details of the five misrepresentations."

From http://www.medialens.org/alerts/07/0313pure_propaganda_the.p hp
"What we now have is an out-and-out propaganda piece, in which there is not even a gesture toward balance or explanation of why many of the extended inferences drawn in the film are not widely accepted by the scientific community. There are so many examples, it's hard to know where to begin, so I will cite only one: a speaker asserts, as is true, that carbon dioxide is only a small fraction of the atmospheric mass. The viewer is left to infer that means it couldn't really matter. But even a beginning meteorology student could tell you that the relative masses of gases are irrelevant to their effects on radiative balance. A director not intending to produce pure propaganda would have tried to
papersonline/channel4response)"

Cheers,
-Jamie
www.JamieKrutz.com

Rich Lamanna wrote:
> Must be global warming. Anyone seen this? If you've got an hour check it
> out. It may take a minute or two to load.
>
> <http://en.sevenload.com/videos/ha4PoKY/The-Great-Global-Warm ing-Swindle>
>
> Rich
>
> "EK Sound" <ask_me@nospam.net> wrote in message news:479e36ad\$1@linux...
>> Woke up this morning and the temp with wind chill was -59C >:(
>>
>> Why did I move here again???
>>
>> David.
>
>
