Part 2: Analysis

In understanding the topic of climate change, a reader needs to first look at the topic from all angles. The three articles that have clashing ideas that will be discussed are, “’Get scared’: World’s Scientists Say Disastrous Climate Change is Here” written by Zack Colman and Karl Mathiesen of politico.com, “Are We Really Running Out of Time to Stop Climate Change?” by Rafi Letzter of livescience.com, and “Why Apocalyptic Claims About Climate Change Are Wrong” written by Michael Shellenberger of forbes.com. All these articles contain different types of persuasion or tactics to enable the reader to agree or see their view.

To start off, Zack Colman and Karl Mathiesen attempt to threaten the reader that climate change is too late to fix. They claim in the title that disastrous weather is upon us and have a picture of a Greece wildfire as the cover picture. This already would bring the reader to a feeling of distraught. They carry on with statistics of top scientists explaining that those number mean that the consequences are inevitable. They then explain that the consequences would affect billions of people, later in that sentence they also state that it will lead to war. While there is no evidence for such a bold claim the reader is only left to feel scared that a war is now inevitable. As they go on to provide a picture of trees burned down due to a drought in California. They make no mention of the photo but continue to talk about the Paris Climate Agreement, making the reader now feel that the article starts to turn very political. As they go on for the last page of the article, they go over conversations and statements made by certain Senates and pledges made by others. The reader is left to feel that changes must need to happen within the government.

The second article by Rafi Letzter questions whether we are really running out of time or not. As the cover picture shows a photo of a baby holding a sign during a climate change strike. This appeals to reader that they need to do the necessary things for the next generation. As Rafi attempts to comfort the reader and makes an understanding that climate change can’t just be stopped and that it’s already here yet there’s still hope to help. The author goes on to explain the specific deadlines made by the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). The deadlines being that change is needed to happen by 2030 to truly have a chance to eliminate or better the world from climate change. This makes the reader feel as if the time is now and if anyone must do something it would be them and their generations calling. He continues to nail in the fact that this is not a case of “Can we stop this coming?” because it’s already here. He explains that the deadline of 2030 to hold the world to a 1.5-C warming increase by the end of the century is much more manageable short- and long-term problems. This makes the reader understand that the most crucial time for change would be now, the time of the next 9 years can affect the next 100 whether good or bad. He ends with explaining that the notion of 2030 can be misleading yet gets people into the streets. While that can make the article seem misleading in a whole now, it’s easy to understand that change is truly crucial with the facts he stated.

The last article to be looked at is, Michael Shellenberger of Forbes.com. He begins the article stating that climate driven fires have made koalas functionally extinct and goes on to say that life on earth is dying. This makes the reader sad thinking that beautiful animals are going extinct and its due to climate change, making the reader almost angry because it’s just the start of climate change and other possible extinctions. He quotes a climate change activist saying that the world will end in 12 years of we don’t address climate change. Being such a bold claim it’s hard to truly believe such claim as a reader when that is said with no evidence or even any further talk of it. He then goes on to tell a story of activists of climate change being “beat up” and claiming that a genocide like the Holocaust was happening again on a far greater scale and in plain sight. As a reader this could feel almost insensitive to compare two things and could be deemed inappropriate to compare by some readers. Michael goes on to talk about his environmental organization and states the things they have done within the organization. As a reader it feels ingenuine to begin to promote your own organization in such article. He then goes on to quote an interview with a BBC spokesperson and a “visibly uncomfortable XR (Extinction Rebellion) spokesperson”. As the interview seems to shut down the XR spokesperson disproving their theories. He finishes the article the same way it was started by explaining the problems facing extinctions, as the reader gets on the same page and understands that there are other reasons change needs to occur.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Portion** | **Ideal Criteria** | **Overall Feedback** |
| Introduction | * Engaging * Shows importance of question * Indicates major parts and content |  |
| Background | * Uses credible, neutral sources * Effectively and sufficiently explains essential information * Written objectively in own words * Well organized and focused paragraphs with transitions * Minimal error | It’s tough to find objective sources on this topic. Most emphasize the human cause (which is debated) and make climate change sound very scary and urgent. You’re better off using Wikipedia.  You need to use paragraphs, separate ones, when you write something like this. This is very, very important and a basic part of what good writing is all about. |
| Analysis | * Smooth transition from background * Summarizes accurately and in own words two opposing answers and one objective answer to the question * Recognizes bias * Reasonable observations about how all sources make their arguments impactful * Well-organized and focused paragraphs with transitions * Minimal error | Nice transition paragraph.  You start off strong with the first article, including some summary information and good analytical observations explained well.  The second article is also treated pretty well (although you need to reword the part highlighted in yellow that’s too close to the original).  It’s the last article that needs the most attention. I think you might have misread it. Shellenberger does not believe we need to be so worried about climate change. He makes numerous points critical of claims like the first article made. Reread that one and take some notes so you can revise that part especially. |
| Response | * Smooth transition from analysis * Incorporates strong points from sources * Draws a reasonable and well-supported conclusion, answering the question * Provides satisfying conclusion to the project * Good transitions between focused paragraphs * Minimal error |  |