

[**Title:** sum up the main point in reading those documents together + introduce nuances if there are some nuances in the documents]

Human response to climate change and its limits

[**Intro:** provide brief context to introduce the main point of every document and a main question linking them all. That question will frame your whole paper.]

Climate change triggers natural disasters that make us aware of the fact that the development of our societies and our increasing consumption have serious consequences on the environment. It is high time we faced our responsibility and reduced our greenhouse gas emissions. Document 1, a *BBC* article published in November 2025, draws attention to the net-zero target many countries are trying to reach, focusing on the UK's efforts to do so. Document 2, an article from *The Guardian* published the same month, denounces the fact that the USA and American media give a cold shoulder to climate issues although that country stands out as the biggest polluter over time, as shown in document 3, a bar chart indicating the parts various countries have played in global CO₂ emissions since 1750. **We may therefore wonder if human response to climate change is appropriate and can actually curb it or not.**

[**Compare the ideas from all the documents and organise them in 2 to 3 parts, using a dynamics** to move from one part to another: advantages / disadvantages – progress / regression – social and economic aspects / political stakes...]

In doc. 1, a climate reporter from the *BBC* explains what net zero is and how various countries, especially the UK, are working towards it. Leading scientists from the UN have shown that it is necessary to achieve net zero CO₂ emissions, that is to say, to remove as much CO₂ from the atmosphere as we produce. Reducing our emissions should be a priority. Successive UK governments have committed to do so, allowing the country to reduce its emissions by 54 % from 1990 to 2024. The UK has also pledged to reach net zero by 2050. The government therefore invests in technologies to capture CO₂ and entices the population to switch to clean energies and clean technologies. Yet document 3 shows that the UK ranks only fifth in the list of the world's biggest polluters so **we may wonder how efficient its actions are as regards a global phenomenon mostly fueled by countries which are less – if at all – committed to change.**

[**Transitions show that you are dealing with the main question, step by step]**

The USA, China and Russia are the biggest CO₂ emitters in history (doc. 3). Doc. 1 shows that China and Russia are at least aiming for net zero in 2060, and China is developing clean energies. On the contrary, the US under Trump's administration is withdrawing from former agreements to fight climate change such as the Paris climate agreement (doc. 1 and 2). Doc. 1 yet points out that richer nations, which have emitted far more CO₂ while developing than other, less developed countries, are expected to act for net zero sooner than poorer, less-equipped and less polluting countries. **The lack of commitment of the biggest polluters will make it hard for any initiative to prove efficient.**

To get everyone on board, the UN created the Conference Of Parties (COP), a yearly summit where the leaders of most countries gather to discuss global initiatives to address climate issues. Doc. 2 focuses on COP30 which took place in Belem, Brazil, last November. The journalist denounces the fact that not only did the US government omit to send a delegation to take part in the talks but the major American broadcasters did not show up either and little covered the talks, if at all. The head of Info Amazonia, a non-profit independent media in the area, cannot believe that well-off outlets like the « big four » did not come while his own outlet was there despite its small budget. The

journalist from *The Guardian* says he has been in touch with American journalists who would have liked to come but their bosses are cutting down budget to cover climate issues. American citizens are the victims of a corporate bias: they are only shown what the bosses of big news companies consider a priority. Trump's dismissal of climate change as « a hoax » is used as an excuse for avoiding to report on climate issues. It is true fighting climate change has a cost, whether it be to fly and house reporters around the world or, in the case of the UK, to invest 0,2 % of its GDP every year to carry out the plan (doc. 1). But that makes it all the more necessary for trusted media like the *BBC* to report on the government's plan to let people know what their country is doing and what for. It is also useful to set those initiatives in a global perspective. For that matter we learn in doc. 2 that 4,000 members of the media worldwide did attend COP30.

[Conclusion : answer the question you started with]

To conclude, while most countries in the world are committed to take actions to curb climate change, we can hardly expect effective change as long as the main polluters are climate deniers. Let us hope reliable media and educational strategies will help raise global awareness and trigger more appropriate, global efforts.

[!! Ce devoir est une proposition de corrigé qu'il ne faut pas forcément suivre à la lettre : il est volontairement trop long car il vise à recenser un maximum d'idées utilisables dans les documents pour rejoindre tout ce que vous avez proposé. Vous pouvez en laisser certaines de côté dans chaque partie pour **respecter le nombre de mots demandé.**]