

# Review of: "When did post-truth begin? From climate change denial to war-mongering nationalism"

Kathrin Renate Braun<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universität Stuttgart

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of: When did post-truth begin? From climate change denial to war-mongering nationalism

The paper starts from the assertion that we do live in an of post truth, alternatively referred to as distorted information, deliberately mistaken information, misinformation, 'nebulous politics', propaganda, denial, fake data, or the deliberate distortion of reality. The diagnosis is supported mainly by a study which found that fake news travel faster on Twitter than accurate news. Honestly, I had a hard time to figure out what kind of scientific argument the paper is making. The question it seems to tackle is given as: "When, and where, did this new turn of global misinformation, begin?" However, I had several issues with this question. For one, the paper does not specify which phenomenon exactly is meant by "this new turn to global misinformation". It does not try to differentiate between terms such as deliberately mistaken information, misinformation, nebulous politics, propaganda, denial, fake data, or distortion of reality, this all seems to be one and the same thing. Second, the paper does not engage the critical analyses on the post-truth concept; Vogelmann 2018 is the only literature listed, but it is not discussed either. In the meantime, there is more in that vein (Farkas and Schou 2020; Braun 2019; Krasni 2020; or see for instance the talks at <https://betweenthebubbles.podbean.com/> ). Hence, it is not clear the beginning of what exactly is looked for. Third, it is unclear what would count as "the beginning" and how we would be able to know that something is in fact the beginning of something new and not a further manifestation of something old. Also, it did not become clear how and why modernism, the Cartesian paradigm, and citizenship rights for animals, and nationalism came into play here. The paper tries to do too much at the same time. It might have been more coherent and precise if it had confined itself to the story of systematic manipulation and propaganda on the part of the US government and US corporations against international treaties to limit climate change. Although, in this case too, it might need to explicate quite clearly which question exactly is under study here.