

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

Rubén Rivas de Roca García¹

¹ Universidad de Sevilla

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The text provides an insightful and challenging approach to the origin of post-truth. According to the author, the beginning of the concept is placed in the framework of the climate denial in the 2000s. Interesting arguments are posed, putting the focus on the role of nationalism. However, the article would benefit from a clearer structure. On this matter, a paragraph should be added with the structure of the article. I suggest to finish the introduction with this information.
2. The manuscript works as a sort of academic essay, being critical and subjective. This method is acceptable for the literature, but it has been left in recent years. Hence, I congratulate the author for his original proposal.
3. Despite the fact of being an essay, statements should be backed. One of the main problems for this article is sounding very opinionative in some excerpts. For instance, the critics of animalism do not properly overlap with the beginning of post-truth. I assume that this point should be better justified. Besides that, the concept of disinformation has been present since the policy of media deregulation in the 1980s. This context needs to be reinforced in order to understand why it was possible to spread fake news.
4. Regarding nationalism, the defense of national interests is little addressed. In the framework of the early 2000s, the financial crisis of 2007-2008 or the impoverishment of the middle class are factors to take into account. Specifically, the rise of nationalism in the US should include some mentions to Tea Party, which was an antecedent in 2008-9 of the later post-truth politics.
5. This paper allows that one can clearly learn a lot about the connection between the pervasiveness of business, national interests and climate change denial. The study is aligned with the academic tradition of essays, which have been key for the discussion on the political and social transformations of the world. Following Montaigne, this kind of approach furthers human understanding. Bearing this in mind, the author could make an effort to clearly differentiate theory from opinion. An example is the sentence "We are still paying the consequences of Rene Descartes' idea that animals are mindless automata lacking in sentience", which would be more suitable for a journalistic comment.
6. The conclusion is very short. It would be useful to have a discussion that contributes to the wider scholarly debate on the shaping of post-truth. Prior scholarship should be compared to the main findings of the article. In the same vein, another recommendation is to provide here future lines of research to foster the knowledge on the topic.
7. The list of references is appropriate, vast and up-to-date.
8. In short, this article or academic essay could mean a relevant contribution that addresses timely issues by expanding the evidence on post-truth from an original approach based on climate change denial and nationalism. As previously noted, a better flow is needed between the introduction and the theoretical framework (research questions would also



help), as well as more information on which is opinion within the data provided.