

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

Cassian Sparkes-Vian<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of the West of England, Bristol

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

A very interesting analysis and the correlation between climate change denial and performative right wing nationalism is interesting and under explored. Some superficial issues with typos and such towards the end but I appreciate the plain English approach which makes for a clear and coherent argument.

I have a few issues which I think would benefit from consideration:

1. There is a lack of a specific research question or clear body of research data. There is plenty of corroborating evidence for the points made, but the premise implied by the title - that the Copenhagen conference was a significant focal point for the current era of post truth - needs a more specific body of data surrounding the conference itself and a way of establishing that it broke from the previous era. These issues are explored in general rather than specific terms.
2. The section on nationalism with respect to the Copenhagen conference is largely discussed in terms of those in opposition to the then US President. The fact that the traditional and official position of national power was being undermined by corporations and politicians mobilising nationalist rhetoric is worth exploring in more detail if this conference is to be set as the focal point.
3. Structurally the role of capital and capitalism, which is a significant part of the argument and a useful one, needs to be clearly presented in terms of both climate denial and nationalism in order to make clear capitalism's relationship to the development of a post-truth media ecology. Is the argument that capital and nationalism have united against scientific reality in a manner comparable to capital and nationalism against labour under fascism?
4. Towards the end there are a few areas in which there is too much generalised assertion - for example the claims about agriculture in respect to climate change. Given that there is widely available evidence to support these points it would be useful to include a broader range of sources.

Overall it's an interesting piece of work but the author needs to either reconsider the title and implied question, so it's framed more as an overview of intersecting ideologies and their relationship to fake news (I think it works well as a piece of this kind), or refocus the analytical portions more clearly on the Copenhagen conference and its media impact.