

“Both texts emotively demonstrate the negative consequences of London fog/smog”. How far do you agree with this statement?

In your answer you should:

- discuss what each text says about the effects of fog/smog;
- explain how far they present these as negative;
- compare the ways the texts present their ideas about the fog/smog.

Both texts agree with the statement to an extent, but Text 2 creates a more emotive demonstration of the consequences of fog than Text 1.

Text 1 describes the effects of fog as “a choking sensation”, which is quite a formal, scientific statement which does not create a strong emotive response in the reader. It also does not present the consequences as being very severe, as it is only described as a “sensation”. However, Text 2 describes the effects as “so toxic that it stings your eyes and leaves you gasping for breath”. Using adjectives like ‘toxic’ emphasise how dangerous and poisonous the fog is, whilst verbs like ‘gasping’ suggest that many people were struggling to breathe or were even suffocating due to the fog, which

seems far more shocking and serious than the first text, especially when this is part of a triplet that was separated as a paragraph by itself to draw the reader's attention to it.

Both present the fog as negative. Text 1 uses personification: "sometimes the brown masses rise and interpose a thick curtain between earth and sky", which creates a sense of fear in a Victorian reader because the idea of a large crowd was threatening. But by describing the fog as metaphorical "curtain" undermines any fear that is created, as it seems harmless and gentle instead. On the other hand, Text 2 describes how the fog created "more civilian casualties than were caused by any single incident during the war". By comparing its effects to the recent World War, the author is emphasising how deadly the fog was, and that it was more of an enemy to them than even the Nazis.

Whereas Text 1 only describes the fog as "a complex phenomenon", suggesting it is just an unusual event, in a very formal and unemotive manner, Text 2 describes it as "some post-apocalyptic nightmare", which uses hyperbole to emphasise the terrible impact the fog had. Describing it using nouns like 'nightmare' suggest how terrifying it is, and the adjective 'post-apocalyptic'

implies it has totally destroyed everything and nothing remains. This would be shocking for the reader and make them feel awful.

Overall, Text 2 agrees with the statement more than Text 1 because it creates stronger images that would mean the readers would feel more shocked and horrified by the London fog, whilst Text 1 only describes it in a rational, scientific manner which presents the facts about it rather than making the reader feel any strong emotions.