



YEAR 12 UNIT 3 ENGLISH

SAC 1: Analysing Argument and Persuasive Language

Start time: 1:50 pm

Finish time: 3:40 pm

Total time: 110 minutes (includes reading, planning and writing)

MATERIALS:

Task Paper.

Answer booklet.

Your dictionary. You are not permitted to borrow another student’s dictionary.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. You have a total of 110 minutes to complete the task.
2. Complete the task in the answer booklet provided.
3. Organise your time to read, annotate, plan and write your analysis.
4. Allow yourself sufficient time to revise, edit and proof-read your work. Use the checklist on the back page to help you.
5. Finished writing must be written in ink, not pencil. Legible and neatly edited writing is expected.
6. In addition to the details you provide in the box below, make sure you write your name at the top of page 1 in your answer booklet.
7. Submit your finished analysis inside this task paper.
8. Note: The texts appear in order of publication and not importance!

REQUIREMENTS FOR UNDERTAKING THE SAC:

9. Students are warned against attempts to bring into the SAC slips of paper inserted into their dictionary, text, blazer, pencil case, etc.
10. Students are advised to avoid placing themselves in a situation where any doubt may arise as to the authenticity of their work.

Any student found cheating either during or after the SAC will forfeit his marks.

TASK:

In a coherently constructed piece of prose, analyse and compare how the use of argument and persuasive language attempt to position readers in particular ways in the print and visual media texts that present a point of view on the issue debated in the media regarding 2050 zero emissions.

Approximate length: 800 – 1000 words.

Student’s Name:

Class: 12 EN

Teacher’s Name:

Getting to zero net emissions in 2050 is going to be tough – but Labor committing to it is a damn good thing

by Greg Jericho

It won't be an easy task, but achieving zero net emissions will have a huge payoff for both the economy and the nation.

When we look at the path to zero net emissions by 2050 two things stand out – firstly it is exactly in line with Labor's old policy of a 45% cut by 2030, and secondly the government's target of a 26% cut is woefully below what is needed.

This week, Anthony Albanese announced that Labor will commit to achieving zero net emissions by 2050.

And let's state clearly – this is a damn good thing.

You might want to argue that we need to get to zero net earlier, and that's a worthy argument, but let us not get silly and suggest this target shows the ALP is somehow hostage to fossil fuel companies. This is a massive step for our economy.

Last year Australia expelled 532m tonnes of greenhouse gasses. Aiming to get to zero net in 30 years is not something you can dismiss as a sign of a party doing nothing.

The government is currently refusing to set any target. Instead, the prime minister is talking up his "technology over taxation" approach.

There is a very easy way for the government to demonstrate it agrees with the science on climate change and is committed to reducing emissions – set a target to reduce emissions that agrees with the science.

The IPCC made this pretty clear for governments in its "summary for policymakers" report released in October 2018.

It stated that to limit global warming to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels, "human-caused emissions of carbon dioxide would need to fall by about 45% from 2010 levels by 2030, reaching 'net zero' around 2050".

We should pause here and note that within six months of this very clear statement, the Coalition went to the election with a target of a 26% cut from 2005 levels by 2030, while the ALP went with a target of a 45% cut.

And of course the focus of the debate from most of the media was on the cost of the 45% cut rather than why the Coalition was ignoring the science.

A damning moment for our media.

Boris Johnson of all people has committed to zero net emissions by 2050, but our government will not, cowed as it is by people such as senator Matt Canavan who tweeted this week: "There is a simple reason that Labor won't cost its net zero emissions policy because net zero emissions = net zero jobs!"

As the Australian Institute's Matt Grudnoff noted, "net zero jobs" actually means any jobs lost will be balanced by job gains, which is perhaps not what Canavan is trying to argue.

This brings me to the second point – this is not an astonishing target. It is in effect just what the ALP was already planning.

Getting to zero net emissions by 2050 goes along the same path as aiming for a 45% cut by 2030, as we can see in the graph.

I say this not to discount the policy, but to highlight that given it is in line with what the ALP was already targeting and also is what a conservative government in the UK is planning, the big issue is not that the ALP has this target, but that the government does not.

It is based on the science and it also will greatly benefit our economy.

I have written in the past that getting to zero net zero emissions is going to be tough. If it was easy it would have been done already, so let us not lie and say it can be done with no pain.

It will require a huge change in our economy. But the good news is it will hugely benefit our economy and nation.

The CSIRO has estimated that if we continue on our current path, our GDP out to 2060 will grow by just 2.1% annually; but if we target zero net emissions by 2050, our economy will be so transformed and improved that our GDP will grow on average each year by 2.75% and real wages will be greatly improved.

Doing nothing is not the answer – it is economic degradation.

We must get to zero net emissions by at least 2050, and the ALP target – which will need strong interim targets as well – must be the baseline from which all climate-change policy debate occurs.

Greg Jericho writes on economics for *Guardian Australia*

Editorial

Emissions targets are easy, but the ‘how’ is hard part

Anthony Albanese has taken a big rhetorical step, committing Labor to the transformative carbon neutral target of net zero emissions by 2050. In placing this forward marker, the Opposition Leader joins premiers, chief ministers and Boris Johnson, host of the UN climate summit in November. All aboard the Glasgow express! In a speech on Friday, Mr Albanese said his target should be “non-controversial”, adding climate change was real and needed a real response. We agree, but targets are easy — it’s the “how” that counts. “We are disappointed that after more than a decade Australia still hasn’t settled our long-term emissions reductions policy,” the Business Council of Australia says. “That’s why we continue to advocate for a credible policy that puts us on track to reach net zero emissions by 2050.” To get there we must invest \$22bn a year, every year, on technology.

Having been repudiated by voters last May, with all policies on the table, Labor must tread carefully when it comes to policy formulation ahead of the next federal election. Although, as key stakeholders told Labor’s poll post-mortem, Bill Shorten’s failure to tell voters what his ambitious emissions target — by 2030, a 45 per cent cut on 2005 levels, with 50 per cent of power from renewables — would cost was a major factor in the party’s miserable primary vote of 33.3 per cent. To be credible in this space, Labor not only will need to explain the costs and benefits, it also will have to present a strategy to get to net zero. More than 70 countries have pledged to achieve the target but few have detailed how.

Mr Albanese noted our “climate wars” had seen a decade wasted on getting cleaner and cheaper energy for families and business. It’s true, the fractures within the major parties have failed to get a policy consensus on least-cost, market-based carbon dioxide abatement. But political dysfunction has, somehow, not been able to impede genuine progress in transitioning to a lower emissions economy. Companies and households have got on with the job. A nationwide wave of wind and solar developments has put Australia on track to become one of the world’s biggest users of renewable energy, Paul Garvey reports on Saturday. Such is the frenzy of new projects that parts of the electricity grid are unable to accommodate the power now being generated. Australian households are purchasing rooftop solar panels at a rate unmatched anywhere in the world. More than \$20bn has been committed to new renewables projects across the nation in the past two years.

The pace of change means the nation’s progress is being closely watched and has become known internationally as “the Australian experiment”. Modelling by Bloomberg New Energy Finance, based on the pure economics of clean energy, not policy, predicts Australia will sit just behind Europe as one of the world’s most renewable-powered regions, with 84 per cent of our power to come from clean sources by 2050; it could reach 50 per cent by 2030 without any new policy. This week mining giant Rio Tinto said it would build its first solar farm and battery installation in the Pilbara. It also may electrify its fleet of mining trucks and trains. Even without a carbon price, the company is backing solar over gas on efficiency and cost.

Despite all the bluster about a lack of clear policy in Australia, in reality the market is moving, as it should. Scott Morrison said on Friday that current policies were driving the move to clean energy. He pointed to a \$500m hydrogen energy strategy; billions on the Snowy 2.0 project for pumped hydro; funds for the MarinusLink interconnector between Tasmania and Victoria, and the Battery of the Nation project. He inked a \$2bn deal with NSW for new gas capacity and clean energy pilot projects. This evolving plan, funded by taxpayers, is the latest iteration of Tony Abbott’s direct action. When you factor in federal and state fuel taxes, exploration bans, clean energy targets and schemes, and all manner of regulation, there is an implicit carbon price that influences behaviour. We often hear business yearning for certainty or threatening a capital strike. Yet people still take risks and make long-term investments. That’s the nature of capitalism; it creates and destroys — perhaps that’s the only certainty.

Who can predict what the world will look like in 2050? Leaders continually refine their game plans. For now, the Morrison government’s play on climate and energy policy is to back human ingenuity. It points to the “bottom-up” uptake of clean energy by households and business as evidence the market is reducing emissions. The Coalition, like Labor, is navigating the fraught politics of coal-fired power. Yet finance capital is making decisions on this, regardless. A middle way for emissions reduction could be found through innovators, such as the boron-hydrogen fusion project we wrote about on Friday. The Coalition has opted for an investment road map, to examine more than 100 technologies including hydrogen, carbon capture and storage, biofuels, lithium production and advances in agriculture to cut methane emissions. The Prime Minister is betting applied science will take the heat out of climate politics, as well as the planet.



SAC