

= No Pressure ( film ) =

No Pressure is a controversial 2010 short film produced by the global warming mitigation campaign 10 : 10 , written by Richard Curtis and Franny Armstrong , and directed by Dougal Wilson . Intended for cinema and television advertisements , No Pressure is composed of scenes in which a variety of people in every @-@ day situations are graphically blown to pieces for failing to be sufficiently enthusiastic about the 10 : 10 campaign to reduce CO2 emissions . The film 's makers said that they viewed No Pressure as " a funny and satirical tongue @-@ in @-@ cheek little film in the over @-@ the @-@ top style of Monty Python or South Park " . Before its release , The Guardian described it as " attention @-@ grabbing " and " pretty edgy . "

The film was withdrawn from public circulation by 10 : 10 , on the same day it was released , due to negative publicity . Charities that had backed the film stated they were " absolutely appalled " upon seeing it , and several of 10 : 10 's corporate and strategic partners withdrew from partnership . Fox News called the film " a blood @-@ splattering display that has drawn anger from critics and sheepish embarrassment from its supporters . "

= = Background and production = =

The film was made in an attempt to challenge the " no pressure " attitude often displayed both by governments and individuals towards taking real action on climate change . 10 : 10 highlighted the urgency of action with claims that carbon dioxide emissions must be stabilised by 2014 ( within four years ) in order to avoid disaster , and that " 300 @,@ 000 real people " are already killed by climate change annually . Lizzie Gillet , 10 : 10 global campaign director , explained : " With climate change becoming increasingly threatening , and decreasingly talked about in the media , we wanted to find a way to bring this critical issue back into the headlines while making people laugh . We were therefore delighted when Richard Curtis agreed to write a short film for the 10 : 10 campaign " .

The film was shot on a location at Camden School for Girls , in the London Borough of Camden in North London . According to 10 : 10 , over 50 film professionals and more than 40 actors and extras provided their services at no cost .

= = Synopsis = =

The four @-@ minute film consists of a series of short scenes in which groups of people are asked if they are interested in participating in the 10 : 10 project to reduce carbon emissions . Those failing to show enthusiasm for the cause are gruesomely blown to pieces .

In the first scene , a bright and chirpy schoolteacher , played by Lyndsey Marshal , tells her class about the 10 : 10 campaign , and asks what they are doing to reduce their carbon footprint . She asks which students are planning to participate ; most raise their hands , but two children shrug apathetically . The teacher reassures them that this is " fine , it 's absolutely fine , it 's your choice " and there is " no pressure " , but then shifts the papers on her desk to reveal a red @-@ buttoned detonator , which she presses . The two children who did not want to participate explode , covering their screaming classmates with blood and body parts . The blood @-@ splattered teacher then goes on casually to explain the night 's homework to her horrified charges .

The second scene shows a group of white @-@ collar workers in an office meeting . The office manager similarly explains the purpose of the 10 : 10 campaign , and asks who will be participating . While most raise their hands , four raise their hands unconvinced . The manager reassures them that there is " no pressure " to participate , but he is then handed a detonator by an assistant , which he uses to blow up the four workers , splattering appalled co @-@ workers with gore .

The third scene is set on a football pitch during team training . The coach , played by David Ginola , asks the players to explain the 10 : 10 campaign that the team is participating in . They describe a range of energy @-@ saving measures which have been implemented by the team and its fans . However , the coach remains unmoved , remarking the campaign would distract him from football . A player tells him that there 's " no pressure " , produces a detonator and blows him up . Unlike the

witnesses depicted in previous scenes , the team is not at all surprised , and casually jogs away to resume training .

A brief interlude with captions explains the campaign , accompanied by music from Radiohead . In the final scene , the actress Gillian Anderson is finishing the voice @-@ over for the interlude just seen . The sound engineer asks her what she is planning to do to cut her carbon footprint . Anderson irritably remarks that she thought providing the recording was a sufficient contribution . The sound engineer repeats the film 's catchphrase , " no pressure " , and detonates Anderson before picking up to leave . The film ends with a shot of Anderson 's gory remains sliding down the sound @-@ booth window with the text " Cut your carbon by 10 % . No pressure . "

= = Reception = =

Upon its release , No Pressure provoked an immediate negative reaction in the media , and the resulting controversy became widely referred to as " splattergate " by bloggers .

In The Daily Telegraph , James Delingpole wrote that the film was an " ugly , counterproductive eco @-@ propaganda movie " and that " with No Pressure , the environmental movement has revealed the snarling , wicked , homicidal misanthropy beneath its cloak of gentle , bunny @-@ hugging righteousness " . The ConservativeHome website described it as " crass , tasteless and unfunny as it gets " , while Melanie Phillips in The Spectator commented on the intended humorous aspect of the film by writing that " The joke was only about blowing dissenters to bits and raining their flesh down on terrified people . Because exterminating human beings is acceptable to greens as a joke . From which we can only assume at best indifference towards and at worst a profound loathing of the human condition " .

American environmentalist and writer Bill McKibben lamented the film on the Climate Progress website , where he wrote " The climate skeptics can crow . It 's the kind of stupidity that hurts our side , reinforcing in people 's minds a series of preconceived notions , not the least of which is that we 're out @-@ of @-@ control and out of touch ? not to mention off the wall , and also with completely misplaced sense of humor " . McKibben added " There 's no question that crap like this will cast a shadow , for a time , over our efforts and everyone else who 's working on global warming . McKibben subsequently withdrew as an organisational partner of 10 : 10 . When The Daily Caller asked about the film , environmental organisation Greenpeace spokeswoman Jane Kochersperger stated that " as an organisation committed to non @-@ violence , I think you can imagine how Greenpeace views this material . At this time , the only people promoting the material are climate skeptics and think tanks funded by corporations known for lobbying against climate change legislation " . Five other environmental groups contacted by The Daily Caller did not comment on the film .

In The Independent , Dominic Lawson wrote " As often as 10 : 10 tried to pull the film off YouTube , their critics re @-@ posted it . This , at least , proves what a cataclysmic misjudgement Curtis had made . When you try to satirise the critics of your campaign , and it turns out that those very critics embrace your film as demonstrating exactly what they find unbearable about the climate @-@ obsessed eco @-@ lobby , then you know that you have kicked the ball into your own net " .

The film generated a huge reaction in the blogosphere . One comment to The Guardian read : " To suggest that people who disagree with you deserve to die is incredibly stupid . Imagine if some Christian group in the US did that to gays , Muslims or anyone else they disagree with . The outrage would be palpable . And deserved . "

The Guardian , which was a key collaborator with the 10 : 10 campaign since its launch and got exclusive rights to show the film première , responded to the criticism by stating that " the film may have been somewhat tasteless , but it was an imaginative attempt to challenge public apathy over climate change " . This statement originally ended " and , highly unusually for attempts to communicate about this subject , funny too " , but this was later redacted . A later report in the newspaper by Adam Vaughan said that the film , " intended as a tongue @-@ in @-@ cheek spoof of hectoring greens " , had created a huge amount of global coverage for 10 : 10 , in print and on the web . The report said that while many people had found the film hilarious , there was a " predictable

slating from climate sceptics " as well as furious reactions from some environmentalists . The report also went on to describe other , more reflective responses , which had focused on effective communication , psychology , satire , and ways of engaging with various audiences over climate change .

= = Withdrawal = =

Although originally planned to be shown in cinema and television advertisements , 10 : 10 removed the film from their website and YouTube later on 1 October 2010 . On Friday 2 October , 10 : 10 placed a notice on their website saying , " Many people found the resulting film extremely funny , but unfortunately some didn 't and we sincerely apologise to anybody we have offended . [ ... ] At 10 : 10 we 're all about trying new and creative ways of getting people to take action on climate change . Unfortunately in this instance we missed the mark . Oh well , we live and learn . " This was criticised as a non @-@ apology apology by Michelle Malkin in the Litchfield County Register and Andrew Revkin in an opinion piece in the New York Times . A spokesman for 10 : 10 also denied that the withdrawal had been planned from the beginning in order to generate publicity . After removing the video from YouTube , 10 : 10 issued a statement : " We won 't be making any attempt to censor or remove other versions currently in circulation on the internet " . Then , on Monday 5 October 10 : 10 director Eugenie Harvey issued a second , more comprehensive apology , stating : " We are ... sorry to our corporate sponsors , delivery partners and board members , who have been implicated in this situation despite having no involvement in the film 's production or release . "

ActionAid , a charity which co @-@ ordinates a schools programme with 10 : 10 , approved the decision to withdraw the film , and stated " Our job is to encourage proactive decisions at class level to reduce carbon emissions . We did it because evidence shows children are deeply concerned about climate change and because we see the impacts of it in the developing world where a lot of our work is . So we think the 10 : 10 campaign is very important , but the moment this film was seen it was clear it was inappropriate . "

In the wake of the film 's withdrawal , Richard Curtis admitted that the attempt to draw attention to the cause of lowering CO

2 emissions may have backfired . Curtis said " When you try to be funny on a serious subject , it 's obviously risky . I hope people who don 't like the little film will still think about the big issue and try to do something about it . "

= = = Withdrawal of sponsors = = =

Several sponsors withdrew their support of 10 : 10 as a result of the No Pressure film . Nick Sharples , Sony Europe 's Director of Communications , issued a statement saying , " we strongly condemn the No Pressure video which was conceived , produced and released by 10 : 10 entirely without the knowledge or involvement of Sony " , and cutting ties with 10 : 10 : " As a result we have taken the decision to disassociate ourselves from 10 : 10 at this time " . Kyocera and Eaga were removed from the list of 10 : 10 sponsors , and National Magazine Company was removed from the list of 10 : 10 media partners . At the same time , a spokesman for O2 , a partner of 10 : 10 , refused to disassociate itself from the group : " 10 : 10 is an independent organisation and we don 't ask for editorial control over the content of its campaigns . "

350.org , with whom 10 : 10 had been collaborating on the 10 October 2010 day of action , broke all current and future relations with 10 : 10 . In a press release , they said : " We respect 10 : 10 's previous work to encourage companies , schools , and churches to voluntarily cut their carbon emissions 10 % . Upon seeing the video , however , we have informed 10 : 10 that we can no longer remain partners on 10 October 2010 or any other initiative . 350.org maintains an absolute commitment to nonviolence in word and deed " .