

In the following paper I reflect on a meeting with three friends. We discussed climate change in general as well as the chosen question for this assignment, which is: **“What has been done to solve climate change as an existential threat?”** Three of the “interviewees” are students studying in different fields and will be called person A and B. Person C is not a student, but has studied in the past.

Person A, I would argue, knows most about the issues of climate change and is also active in demonstrations and a climate organization in her home country. She expressed her concern about the lack of urgency in tackling climate change and the need for global cooperation to address the issue. Person A also highlighted the importance of individual actions to tackle climate change, such as reducing carbon emissions by using public transportation and switching to renewable energy sources. She also mentioned the Paris Agreement, as a crucial step towards addressing climate change. However, she argued that its policies and plans are not efficient enough to really tackle the problems. Additionally, I asked her if she thinks if the SDGs do include more extensive plans to really tackle the problem of climate change, to which she did not know an answer or have an opinion.

Person B, who is well-versed between the connection of climate change and the global economic system, had a different perspective. He argued that the focus on individual actions is not enough to address climate change as an existential threat. Person B emphasized the importance of government policies and regulations in driving change. He stressed that governments need to set clear targets and policies to reduce carbon emissions and promote sustainable practices. Person B added that corporations also have a significant role to play and should be held accountable for their impact on the environment. In general, person B put a bigger emphasis on the importance of global action, and the cooperation between the public and private sector than person A.

Person C is, I would say, not as interested in the topic of climate change, added, next to agreeing with points from person A and B, some misconceptions to the conversation. They, for example, suggested that climate change is a natural cycle that the earth goes through and that human activities have little to no impact on it. Person C also suggested that renewable energy is not cost-effective and unlikely to replace fossil fuels as the primary source of energy. Especially, person C’s view that the current change of the climate is not caused by humans took me back, because I did not think that person C would be such a strong climate change denier. Additionally, when person A and B voiced their disagreements with person C, person C did not really take on their arguments but dismissed them.

I took more of an observer-position in this part of the conversation, since I tried to take some notes to be able to summarize them here. However, I tried to ask some additional questions and themes we have already discussed in the course. I got the impression that my additional questions did not meet sufficient answers from my friends, meaning that I felt like they did not know much more about climate change and especially policies aimed to tackle them, to be able to answer them. For example, did I ask about carbon taxes to which person A and C did not have an answer. In general, I must say that I got the feeling that person A and B did have a clear surface level of education on the topic of climate change, which I feel is very common, and I would also say I am more so in the group of surface-level education. However, I was taken aback that person C did not have many opinions on the topic we discussed, and, especially mostly no answers to my additional questions.

In conclusion I must say that the conversation was, as already mentioned, more so surface-level and that, especially person A did have strong opinions but did not have clear arguments to support them. However, I feel like, that person A is quite representative of my generation, with which I mean that due to the fact that we grew up with the constant threat and topic of climate change, we do have some knowledge, and some of us are eager to demonstrate for better climate policies and engage in the dialog, we do not have sufficient knowledge to support our views.