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An Inconvenient Review

There are very little movies with of good as name as Al Gore’s *An Inconvenient Sequel.* By all means, it’s a tragedy that this movie had to be made. The original movie should have been all that was necessary. Knowledge about the ongoing climate crisis is fairly well known, the stakes are understood by a large amount of the United States. A [recent poll](http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Climate-Change-American-Mind-May-2017.pdf) found 39% of Americans find it probable that we go extinct from it, and only 13% of Americans deny global climate change.

But nothing has really changed. Moderate cap-and-trade proposals have died in congress, and the current administration is actively against any sort of progress – with the Secretary of Energy proposing subsidies for \*coal\*.

And that’s where this movie comes in. Aiming to reinvigorate the movement around Climate Change, it does so well. Rather than spending most of the time around potential scenarios like the last movie, which were largely seen as outlandish, this movie was based around what is currently happening to affect our weather, and what we are currently doing to stop it. Looking at recent catastrophic weather events to showcase the damage of volatile climate, it aimed to give emotional weight to the argument. To showcase the very real progress that can be done, a large amount of time was dedicated to the Paris Climate Accord negotiations and summit.

My biggest problem with it was how much the movie ignored discussions around energy consumption efficiency rather than just energy production. While its key to discuss green energy production and the political efforts to perpetuate fossil fuel production, energy consumption norms are often incredibly bad and are never discussed, for example, the immense government subsidies towards low-density automobile-dependent communities, or widespread greenhouse gas producing animal agriculture. In many ways I felt this movie was just speaking to choir rather than using its platform to argue for real change that isn’t already wanted by the audience that would spend its time watching a movie by Al Gore.