

Colombia in Times of Post-Truth: The Case of The National Center of Historical Memory. A Philosophical Reflection*

[English Version]

Colombia en tiempos de posverdad: el caso del Centro Nacional de Memoria Histórica. Una reflexión filosófica

A Colômbia em tempos de pós-verdade: o caso do Centro Nacional de Memória Histórica. Uma reflexão filosófica

Received 21 July 2022. Accepted 24 October 2022

› How to quote:

Cárdenas, L. (2024). Colombia in Times of Post-Truth: The Case of The National Center of Historical Memory. A Philosophical Reflection. *Ánfora*, 31(56), 81-96. <https://doi.org/10.30854/anfv31n56.2023.980>
Universidad Autónoma de Manizales. L-ISSN 0121-6538. E-ISSN 2248-6941. CC BY-NC-SA 4.0

Leonardo Cárdenas Castañeda**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4888-2324>

CvLAC https://scienti.minciencias.gov.co/cvlac/visualizador/generarCurriculoCv.do?cod_rh=0001335747

Colombia

Abstract

Objective: The present article aims to examine the issue of post-truth in the Colombian context, focusing specifically on the National Center for Historical Memory (NCHM). Emphasis will be placed on the practical consequences that arise from adopting theses such as relativism and negativism. **Methodology:** This article follows an analytical orientation, wherein the elements that justify the significance of objective facts (defined as independent of any opinion, belief, or ideology) are presented. These objective facts serve as benchmarks to counterbalance judgments, such as the assertion made by the

* Article associated to the research Project «Contenido empírico en el estructuralismo metateórico». Code 0327022. Funding: Universidad de Caldas. Declaration of interests: The author declares no conflict of interest. Data availability: All relevant data can be found in the paper.

** Professor in the Philosophy Department of the Universidad de Caldas (Manizales - Colombia). Doctor of Philosophy from the Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana (Medellín). Member of the Tantalus research group of Universidad de Caldas. Email: leonardo.cardenas@ucaldas.edu.co

former director of the NCHM, suggesting that a privileged point of view to determine what can be considered a fact is lacking and that, ultimately, facts are established by consensus. **Results:** In the analysis of the post-truth phenomenon in Colombia, one significant aspect of concern emerges: the peril of rejecting facts and pitting subjective perspectives against objective truth in the process of reconstructing Colombia's history. **Conclusions:** The key point to be drawn from this study is that negationist relativism, which plays a crucial role in the post-truth phenomenon explored by Acevedo, can be traced back to the postmodern school of thought.

Keywords: Colombia; National Center for Historical Memory; objective truth; denialism; postmodernity.

Resumen

Objetivo: el presente artículo tiene como propósito examinar el problema de la posverdad en el contexto colombiano, específicamente en el Centro Nacional de Memoria Histórica (CNMH), haciendo énfasis en las consecuencias prácticas que traen la adopción de tesis como el relativismo y el negacionismo. **Metodología:** así pues, a partir de una orientación analítica se presentarán los elementos que justifican la importancia de los hechos objetivos (entiéndase esto como independientes de cualquier opinión, creencia, ideología), que sirvan de jueces para neutralizar juicios, como, por ejemplo, la del anterior director del CNMH, según la cual no tenemos un punto de vista privilegiado para determinar si algo puede contar como un hecho y que, en cualquier caso, estos se fijan por medio de un consenso. **Resultados:** al analizar el tema de la posverdad en Colombia, tomando el siguiente aspecto principal de discusión, se halla el peligro que conlleva rechazar los hechos y oponerse a la verdad objetiva para reconstruir la historia de Colombia. **Conclusiones:** el punto central que se concluye es que dicho relativismo negacionista, como pieza clave de la posverdad con el que Acevedo se compromete, tiene sus raíces en la escuela posmoderna.

Palabras clave: Colombia; Centro Nacional de Memoria Histórica; verdad objetiva; negacionismo; posmodernidad.

Resumo

Objetivo: o objetivo deste artigo é examinar o problema da pós-verdade no contexto colombiano, especificamente no Centro Nacional de Memória Histórica (CNMH), com ênfase nas consequências práticas da adoção de teses como o relativismo e o negacionismo. **Metodologia:** assim, com base em uma orientação analítica, apresentaremos os elementos que justificam a importância dos fatos objetivos (entendidos como independentes de qualquer opinião, crença, ideologia), que servem como juízes para neutralizar julgamentos, como, por exemplo, o do ex-diretor do CNMH, segundo o qual não temos um ponto de vista privilegiado para determinar se algo pode contar como um fato e que, de qualquer forma, estes são fixados por meio de um consenso. **Resultados:** ao analisar a questão da pós-verdade na Colômbia, considerando o seguinte aspecto principal da discussão, encontramos o perigo de rejeitar os fatos e de se opor à verdade objetiva para reconstruir a história da Colômbia. **Conclusões:** o ponto central que se conclui é que esse relativismo negacionista, como peça-chave da pós-verdade com a qual Acevedo se envolve, tem suas raízes na escola pós-moderna.

Palavras-chave: Colômbia; Centro Nacional de Memória Histórica; verdade objetiva; negacionismo; pós-modernidade.

Introduction

The leap to stardom of the term “post-truth” dates back to 2016, coinciding with two globally recognized events: Donald Trump's victory in the US elections and the campaign in Great Britain to withdraw the United Kingdom from the European Union (Brexit). The common recipe for both events has been: appealing to the passions of citizens, and seeking relevant facts that feed or justify those passions. As a result, the facts ultimately depend on emotional opinions, rather than the other way around. In the case of the Trump victory, as English journalist Matthew D'Ancona (2019) recalls, the popular slogan was “Make America Great Again” (p. 20), and in the case of Brexit the slogan was “Recover Control” (p. 20). Of course, for Trump to feed the popular sentiment of America's greatness, he resorted to undermining confidence in his Democratic Party opponents by repeatedly promoting the unfounded claim that his rival Hillary Clinton ran a child sex trafficking ring with Obama out of a pizza parlor. This conspiracy theory is known as *Pizzagate* (Kuznia et al., 2020), just to mention one of many hoaxes that helped Trump win the 2016 election.

Now, “Regaining control” for Brexit promoters consisted, for example, of unearthing “the Kalergi plan”; the old conspiracy theory suggesting a worldwide plot to “flood” Europe and especially Britain with African and Asian workers to wipe out the white race. Of course, there are many more lies and conspiracy theories in all this, but the point is that the repetition *ad nauseam* of that pile of garbage is intended to fuel popular indignation, and thus political decisions can ultimately be reduced to a merely frenzied or passionate affair.

The Colombian case has not been excluded from this post-truth phenomenon. In fact, Juan Carlos Vélez, the pro-Uribe manager of the NO Campaign for the peace plebiscite, advocated the emotional slogan that “we have to go out and vote,” supported by conspiratorial ideas that the peace process was the triumph of Castro-Chavismo—a term attributed to the Chilean historian Fernando Mires or to the leader of the Democratic Center and former president of Colombia, Álvaro Uribe (Universidad de los Andes, 2018). In other words, Castro-Chavismo promoted the peace accords in Colombia, and the base document of the Havana agreement was inspired by gender ideology. However, although the peace agreement has been a clear example of post-truth in Colombia, especially due to the lies hammered by its opponents, this essay will not address this particular event. Several recent research papers, such as those by María Fernanda González (2017) and María Daniela Jiménez (2017), have already examined the relationship between the peace process and the post-truth phenomenon. What is interesting as

a theme for investigation are distinctive features that fuel post-truth. This refers to the denialism —as alluded to in this paper, concerning a particular historical fact, although it can also have a broader connotation, especially when denying certain natural events. Additionally, the essay will explore the relativism that postmodern thought has cultivated.

These traits are represented by the National Center for Historical Memory by its former director Darío Acevedo, who does not miss an opportunity to deny the armed conflict —recall that he was the head of the NCHM from February 2019 until July 7, 2022. Acevedo's reasons for denying the conflict center on relativism. In his view, there is not a privileged point of view to determine whether something can count as a fact, and in any case, these are fixed by consensus—as will be shown and substantiate in Section 3 of this article. Therefore, the fundamental interest of this work is to analyze the issue of post-truth in Colombia, focusing primarily on one aspect: the danger of rejecting facts and opposing objective truth in the process of reconstructing the history of the country. The point is that this negationist relativism with which Acevedo engages has its roots in the postmodern school.

Before embarking on this work, first delving into the definition of “post-truth,” is crucial to clarifying the true meaning of this concept. “Post-truth” is not synonymous with “lie,” although the two terms are closely related. Language, especially political language, is rife with falsehoods, yet these two terms can be distinguished independently. The person who lies possesses the intention to deceive their interlocutor, offering a version that deliberately does not correspond to the facts. However, the novelty of post-truth is that “facts become subordinate to our political point of view” (McIntyre, 2018, p. 41). Facts serve only insofar as they feed feelings or favor emotions; otherwise, they are worthless.

Thus, as the Italian philosopher Maurizio Ferraris (2019) puts it, “post-truth is a radically new phenomenon with respect to classical lies” (p. 49). The novelty of post-truth is not so much that what is said does not conform to the facts, but that what is said depends on a private convictions and emotions. The alignment of personal preferences with actual events is irrelevant. In short, according to the Oxford dictionary definition, “post-truth” is “the idea that feelings sometimes matter more than facts” (McIntyre, 2018, p. 41).

Given this presupposition, the author will demonstrate that this characteristic of post-truth is deeply ingrained in Colombian institutions. Therefore, it is essential to not only unravel the way in which it has spread but also analyze its epistemological roots and potential implications for culture in general. Clearly, the phenomenon of post-truth in Colombia can be studied from other governmental entities —such as the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Research, which is a very particular case, since it is paradoxical that the director of this portfolio until

the year 2021 had positions against the proceeding of science— and from other events in Colombian national life. To analyze the issue of post-truth in Colombia, examining the role of the media and "fake news" that sneak into social networks and virtual platforms would also be interesting. However, as already stated, this paper has the fundamental purpose of examining the issue of post-truth via the National Center for Historical Memory, namely its previous director.

The National Center for Historical Memory's Denialism Stance

In 2011, the National Center for Historical Memory was established to preserve the memory of the armed conflict. Since then, it has published a number of reports detailing numerous tragedies that have occurred in Colombia from the middle of the previous century to the present. However, it is strange that the former director of this entity has negationist inclinations toward the armed conflict. I.e., precisely the agency in charge of describing the historical development of the armed conflict, the different actors that have participated in it, the different victims that it has left throughout the national territory has been headed by a person who does not believe that there has been an armed conflict in Colombia, but rather that what has occurred has been a systematic attack by illegal groups against the State. One of Acevedo's arguments for supporting this negotiator's point of view is as follows: "The truth is not unique and there shouldn't be official truths [...] If a section of the population is going to be stigmatized for any reason, then those who are already stigmatized may also become stigmatized" (Bolaños, 2019, paragraph 5).

No one can claim to be in possession of the truth, according to Acevedo, because there are multiple versions of the truth regarding the conflict in Colombia: what is true for the government is false for the armed groups and for the victims; what is true for the victims is false for the government and the armed groups; and what is true for the armed groups is false for both the government and the victims. Therefore, according to Acevedo, there exist a variety of truths, but none of them stand out over the others because there is no official or single truth; therefore, all facts have the same historical significance and truth is relative to the position one decides to take.

Precisely, Acevedo's denialism, which is justified in the idea that there is no objective truth, but that it is relative, is one of the foundations of the phenomenon of post-truth, because if the truth cannot be privileged from any point of view, then the value for objective Truth disappears and whatever is preached as true is nothing more than euphemistically calling opinions and passions. Philosopher Victoria Camps (2017) says the following about this aspect:

Given that truth is no one's monopoly, that it is virtually unattainable, that the views are diverse and plural, since we are in the postmodernity, in the age of weak thought and liquid society, why worry about seeking the truth? (p. 95).

Camps' approach is based on a premise that is interesting to analyze: the legacy that postmodern thought has left to post-truth. Philosophers like Vattimo and Rovatti (1988, pp. 9-13) and Vattimo (2009, pp. 21-33) have considered that reason and truth have been part of the absolutist or universalistic attributes of modernity and have weakened the different perspectives that human beings have on the world, so if one leaves aside these universal values, one can accept all the points of view, all the values, all approaches. In summary, the best remedy according to Vattimo (2009) for universal ideas is relativism. Of course, this relativist thesis, which Vattimo himself refers to as "weak thinking," seems to have the following appeal: it seems to be tolerant of all points of view because it privileges none and holds that there are no absolute truths; consequently, neither the authority of reason nor the authority of truth can be the arbiters of one's own beliefs and opinions. In other words, everything is valid after relativism has been accepted. There is no such thing as objective truth after that.

The point is that the practical effects of relativism are devastating because if the standard of objective truth is rejected, one won't be able to determine whether the bubonic plague under the Bizanian Empire was real or whether the Holocaust committed by the Nazis actually occurred. If everything is a matter of "perspectives," Hitler's truth on the purported "purification of the race" is just as real as the Holocaust committed against the Jews. This emphasis on relativism has two flaws. The first is that since every position must be balanced according to relativism, such opinions are incongruous. If this equilibrium is achieved, stating a fact is as simple as denying it; if some people accept certain facts, others will disagree, as has happened with the Holocaust. Alejandro Ordóñez, Colombia's attorney general from 2009 to 2016, held conflicting views on acknowledging the Jewish Holocaust, aligning himself with the Lefebvrist church to which he belongs (BLU Radio, 2013). A second principle of relativism is that since all points of view are equally valid, each one will have its own supporting facts. This tenet is no less dangerous than the first.

In other words, the facts that don't fit with one's beliefs, opinions, or ideologies should be rejected and replaced with other "alternative facts." When Gerardo Macas said, "these are my principles, and if you don't like them, I have others," (p.1) in 2020, he was quoting Groucho Marx. In the age of "post-truth," the issue is more or less as, these are the facts, and if they don't satisfy the person's point of view, other facts are available. This can be recreated if one recalls two episodes from the recent past. In 2008 Alvaro Uribe's presidential advisor, José

Obdulio Gaviria stated that in “Colombia there are no displaced people, but rather they are migrants” (Delgado, 2011). This was to support Acevedo's negationist theory that there was never an armed conflict between the government and guerrilla groups in Colombia. Instead, Acevedo claims that migration was the result of terrorist attacks against the country's government, making it impossible to discuss displacement.

The second episode takes place in the year 2020. This time it was Colombia's President Iván Duque who, in response to bloodshed across much of the country, claimed without qualification that “massacres” “are not a problem there; rather, ‘collective homicides’ are the norm” (Vanguardia, 2020; Deutsche Welle, 2020). He then replaced this claim with another that appeared less arrogant. Both cases, the one that “in Colombia there are no displaced people but rather they are migrants” and that in Colombia “there are no massacres, but rather collective homicides” are nothing more than choosing for their liking the facts that best suit the official position. Lee McIntyre (2018) summarizes this kind of event: “the particular use of facts supporting the position itself and the complete rejection of those that do not, seems to be an integral part in the creation of the new reality of post-truth” (p. 60), or as Valdés Villanueva (2018) states in the presentation for the Spanish edition of McIntyre's book, in the era of post-truth “the distinction between facts and opinions becomes diffuse” (p. 20).

One possible objection to this statement is that the examples exposed belong to Colombia's political right, as if post-truth were a phenomenon that only concerns this political spectrum. The obvious reason this article is focused on the right and especially on Uribeism approach is because it is the political ideology that has ruled the country over the last twenty years, although it is necessary to point out that post-truth is also something that leftist ideologies have also embraced. For example, the trend that in 2020 the defunct FARC denied the forced recruitment of children to integrate their lines (45 Segundos Noticias, 2020), despite the fact that the Special Jurisdiction for Peace (JEP) found that between 1971 and 2016 this guerrilla group recruited at least 6,230 boys and girls (El Espectador, 2020).

In a famous essay, “Politics and English Language,” George Orwell (2009) accepted that this euphemistic phenomenon is owned by political language, since it was created only to deceive, manipulate, and project an appearance of solidity to what was pure smoke. Orwell (2009) stated:

Political language has to consist largely of euphemism, question- begging and sheer cloudy vagueness. Defenseless villages are bombarded from the air, the inhabitants driven out into the countryside, the cattle machine- gunned, the huts set on fire with incendiary bullets: this is called *pacification*. Millions of peasants are robbed of their farms and sent trudging along the roads with no

more than they can carry: this is called *transfer of population* or *rectification of frontiers*. People are imprisoned for years without trial, or shot in the back of the neck or sent to die of scurvy in Arctic lumber camps: this is called *elimination of unreliable elements*. Such phraseology is needed if one wants to name things without calling up mental pictures of them. (p. 370-371).

This quote seems to be the script that our Colombian politicians have repeated, since there is a clear parallel between the “there are no massacres, but rather collective homicides” by Duque and Orwell’s “rectification of frontiers.” What should be made clear is that the post-truth, whether the one by the left or the right, has its formulas for denying the facts, and if the facts do not match its ideology, then they create others that do. Chomsky is right agreeing with Martínez (2018) when he states that in the contemporary world “people no longer believe in facts” (para. 1), at least not from an objective point of view.

Armed Conflict: Does a Fact Depend on Consensus?

Returning to Acevedo’s denialism attitude toward the armed conflict, it can be seen that this approach is not far from postmodern philosophers, because the rejection of the idea of an objective truth is supported by the benign appearance of relativism; the point of view of one who denies the armed conflict is as true as that of the one who stated it. Based on the facts, these points of view can be constructed whenever one’s opinion allows; the facts meant the same way that opinions, beliefs, ideologies, or feelings are expressed. Matthew D’Ancona (2019) states: “There is no stable and verifiable reality, there is only an endless battle to define it, the fighting of your ‘facts’ against my ‘alternative facts’” (p. 25). This denial of the facts is what the Spanish philosopher Arias Maldonado (2017) calls “post-factualism,” “the loss of the persuasive value of facts in the public debate, so that these would no longer be determinants for the configuration of private beliefs” (p. 66).

This aspect calls for attention because Acevedo has stated that the armed conflict in Colombia does not exist, because there is no high consensus on this fact, there is not a unanimous agreement that determines whether in this country there was conflict or not. Acevedo states: “There is no consensus between us. Law 1448 recognizes the presence of an ‘armed conflict’, but it warns against official truths that are more owned by dictatorial regimes” (Hernández, 2019,

para. 28). As this article has tried to show, Acevedo is a committed relativist, and that generates two quite questionable assumptions; one of them is that the facts are determined by a consensus, it depends on an agreement, either between ideologies, parties, cultures, civil society, etc. This means that since the facts are relative to what each person determines, then objectivity is impossible. There is nothing that impartial facts are independent of, neither a scheme of perception nor an ideological affiliation, which is why they have to be a subproduct of an agreement between parties.

Clearly, the idea of consensus to resolve the objectivity of facts is a rather weak argument. In the Middle Ages, it was established by consensus that the sun revolved around the earth and, it had been also determined by the clerical authority. Even though this consensus could have been stated as a belief or religious doctrine, its own misconception was discovered. With the new astronomy it was revealed that it was not the earth but the sun that is static. This is a simple example to show that objectivity is neither a matter of consensus nor agreement, much less of authority. Likewise, Acevedo cannot defend responsibly that armed conflict does not exist simply because there is no great agreement on this fact. The armed conflict is an openly objective fact that does not correspond to any consensus; it has nothing to do with what right parties, left parties, church, congress, the president, or Acevedo state. The phenomenon of the armed conflict is an event that Colombians have endured for more than sixty years, despite the fact that the director of the National Center for Historical Memory claims to be unaware of it. It is necessary to remind him of the words of Aldous Huxley (2000): "Facts do not cease to exist because they are ignored" (p. 288).

This relativism approach, the thesis of consensus, is contrary to that of one of the most important canons of Western rationalist tradition that has been defended by philosophers such as Searle (2003); it is the conception of ontological realism that holds that "Although we have mental and linguistic representations of the world, in beliefs, experiences, judgments and theories, there is a world 'out there' that is entirely independent of those representations" (p. 22). Thus, when one abandons the fundamental principle of realism and instead embraces the relativistic doctrine of consensus on facts and truth as a matter of faith, "post-truth" becomes imminent. As previously mentioned, professor Arias' notion of "post-factualism" exemplifies that when one loses the value of facts in public debate, a fertile ground for facts is vulnerable to the opinions and desires of individuals, sects or political parties.

Acevedo justifies his denialism by making a second assumption, he contends that discarding the thesis of the objectivity of facts in favor of consensus helps to distance oneself from certain authoritarian positions that insist on the existence of official truths and facts. In Acevedo's view, accepting a proposition based on

the consensus of what qualifies as fact and what does not emphasize an attribute of relativism to which he adheres. Despite the perception that relativism may ensure tolerance and respect for all perspectives, Acevedo's assertion of this unfounded. Stating that anyone who upholds the objectivity —of facts, truth or even moral judgment— automatically adopts an authoritarian and intolerant stance is a misconception. There is no inherent contradiction in affirming that a specific action is just or unjust, regardless of individual or cultural perspectives, while simultaneously expressing regret for an authoritarian invasion of a country of forcefully imposing “what people consider to be right. The acceptance of the objectivity of moral values does not inherently imply intercultural or interpersonal” imposition and control (Arango, 2005, p. 19). Similarly, one can assert the existence of facts independent of personal schemes of representation or linguistic frameworks while acknowledging the undesirability of a certain political ideology or religious sect imposing their preferred facts upon people, as was witnessed with clerical authority during the Middle Ages. The thesis of the objectivity of facts is not linked to coercion or the mandate of any authority.

If the acceptance of the relativist idea allows for tolerance and progress, then the argument is self-defeating. Indeed, if relativism must advocate for respect and understanding of each cultural context, it would invalidate any form of criticism or censorship even in cases involving governments responsible for genocidal acts or purges. One must then be tolerant because of the lack of objective criteria to condemn such acts. According to Acevedo, people cannot arrive at a consensus regarding the existence of such acts, as the determination of what is right and what is wrong or what should be considered facts remains undefined. Does this mean unquestionably accepting that individuals should immerse themselves in each cultural context and condone the way these acts are committed? The inclusion of tolerance in the relativist idea is paradoxical, as nothing better facilitates a totalitarian government more than the absence of censorship and the possibility of criticism. In other words, relativists, possibly without realizing it, find themselves closer to intolerance and authoritarianism than they believe.

Relativism fails to provide a foundation for social dialogue due to the vast differences in individual viewpoints on facts, criteria of truth and moral judgments. Any attempt to establish objective parameters would be regarded as an authoritarian imposition of an official truth. Therefore, individuals cannot engage in discussions as no one can exert their points of view upon each other. The relativistic approach would entail staying silent and embracing a world governed by mere subjectivity. However, in a multiethnic and diverse world, individuals must engage in dialogue to establish rational common parameters that extend beyond their personal viewpoints. Relativism, understood as that dialogue of the deaf where no one has the authority to discuss or deliberate

about anything, fosters the advent of “post-truth” wherein truth itself assumes a subordinate role, beholden to the dictates of diverse cultures, ideologies, or sects. I fully agree with Matthew D’Ancona’s (2019) statement that:

The challenge lies in identifying a shared common ground for social, intellectual, and practical dialogue that garners unanimous consensus. Post-truth thrives on feelings of alienation, dislocation, and stultified silence. The most significant civic task individuals face is to eradicate that vein (p. 132-133).

Conclusions

Acevedo’s denialism, rooted in postmodern relativism, has detrimental and practical consequences, especially regarding the preservation of the country’s history, the very core responsibility of the entity he governs. The breeding ground lies in the relationship between relativism and denialism within a society that has become contaminated by post-truth. According to Luis Valdés Villanueva (2018, p. 23), “post-truth” creates a parallel reality when opinions and ideologies emotionally implicate themselves in shaping the recognition of facts.

Acevedo’s denialism with respect to the armed conflict painfully implies a failure to acknowledge the victims, as without the recognition of conflict itself, the identification of victims becomes negated. Denying the existence of the armed conflict equates to denying the presence of victims within that conflict. One of the consequences of Acevedo’s denialism has been the censorship of the exhibition “Voices to transform Colombia” —a showcase of cultural pieces representing the victims’ experiences and their resilient resistance against violence— and the later withdrawal of the archives of victims’ collectives by the NCHM. As highlighted by journalist Sebastián Forero (2022), Acevedo has regarded both these actions as biased initiatives.

The opinion expressed by the author of this paper is that Acevedo denialism of the Colombian armed conflict renders the various ways in which the victims attempt to recount for their war experiences meaningless. Nietzsche’s (2006) apparently innocuous assertion that “there are no facts but interpretations” (p. 7), which noticeably inspired postmodern thought, bears practical implications that may lead to the cultural and historical degradation. The prevalence of “post-truth” times is the rational outcome of the lighthearted dissemination of

the notion that facts and truth are non-existent. Postmodernists should be mindful of their responsibility towards culture. While the notion may sound appealing and forthright within classrooms, advocating that individuals should be skeptical about facts and regard truth as subjective can lead to adverse consequences. In this regard, the philosopher Daniel Dennett (2017), during an interview with Carole Cadwalladr, asserted that:

Sometimes, opinions can lead to dire consequences that may become reality. For the author, what postmodernism caused was truly evil. Postmodernists are responsible for the intellectual fad that made practicing cynicism of truth and facts respectable (para. 9).

Unforeseeably, the postmodernists may not have envisioned that their philosophy could serve as a source of inspiration to particular right-wing Policies, because their initial audience was the left-wing militants in France, followed by the United States and subsequently Latin America. This observation may highlight that post-truth is not inherently linked to a particular political standpoint, to this respect, postmodernity may be a distinct philosophical movement from the phenomenon of “post-truth.” Nevertheless, as examined in this paper through the relativist and denialist assertions of the former director of the National Center for Historical Memory, adopting the theoretical tenets of postmodernity seems to have exposed individuals to the contagion of post-truth which has permeated society. It could indeed be argued, in line with McIntyre (2018) that “postmodernism serves as the godfather of post-truth” (p. 159).

References

- Arango, P. (2005). *Introducción a la filosofía moral*. Editorial Universidad de Caldas.
- Arias Maldonado, M. (2017). Informe sobre ciegos: genealogía de la posverdad. En J. Ibáñez (Ed.), *En la era de la posverdad* (pp. 65–77). Calambur Editorial.
- Bolaños, E. A. (2019, 9 de febrero). *Darío Acevedo, del EPL al uribismo, perfil del candidato al Centro de Memoria*. El Espectador. <https://www.elespectador.com/colombia-20/paz-y-memoria/dario-acevedo-del-epl-al-uribismo-perfil-del-candidato-al-centro-de-memoria-article/>

- BLU Radio. (2013, 8 de abril). *La pregunta de Héctor Abad que incomodó al procurador Alejandro Ordóñez*. <https://www.bluradio.com/25268/la-pregunta-de-hector-abad-que-incomodo-al-procurador-alejandro-ordonez>
- Camps, V. (2017). Posverdad, la nueva sofística. En J. Ibáñez (Ed.), *En la era de la posverdad* (pp. 91-100). Calambur Editorial.
- D’Ancona, M. (2019). *Posverdad. La nueva guerra contra la verdad y cómo combatirla*. Alianza.
- Delgado, A. L. (2011). José Obdulio Gaviria y su visión de Colombia. *Amérique Latine Histoire et Mémoire*, 21, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.4000/alhim.3811>
- Dennett, D. (2017). *Daniel Dennett: “I Begrudge every hour I have to spend worrying about politics”* / Interviewed by Carole Cadwalladr. The Guardian. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/feb/12/daniel-dennett-politics-bacteria-bach-back-dawkins-trump-interview>
- Deutsche Welle. (2020, 22 de agosto). «*En Colombia no hay massacres, sino homicidios colectivos*». <https://www.dw.com/es/duque-en-colombia-no-hay-masacres-sino-homicidios-colectivos/a-54662098>
- El Espectador. (2020, 23 de julio). *Reclutamiento forzado: un delito que ningún grupo armado ha reconocido en Colombia*. <https://www.elespectador.com/colombia2020/pais/reclutamiento-forzado-un-delito-que-ningun-grupo-armado-ha-reconocido-en-colombia/>
- Ferraris, M. (2019). *Posverdad y otros enigmas*. Alianza.
- Forero, S. (11 de febrero de 2022). *El revolcón de Darío Acevedo para su recta final en el Centro Nacional de Memoria*. El Espectador. <https://www.elespectador.com/colombia-20/paz-y-memoria/dario-acevedo-del-centro-nacional-de-memoria-historica-nombra-directores-para-museo-de-la-memoria-y-otras-dependencias/>
- González, M. F. (2017). La “posverdad” en el plebiscito por la paz en Colombia. *Nueva sociedad*, 269, 114-126. <https://nuso.org/articulo/la-posverdad-en-el-plebiscito-por-la-paz-en-colombia/>

- Hernández, C. (2019, 21 de febrero). *Veto a cursos, la última crítica contra el director del CNMH*. El Tiempo. <https://www.eltiempo.com/politica/proceso-de-paz/criticas-a-ruben-dario-acevedo-por-negar-el-conflicto-y-vetar-cursos-academicos-325624>
- Huxley, A. (2000). *Complete essays, Vol. 2: 1926-1929*. Edhasa.
- Jiménez, M. D. (2017). En Colombia también triunfó la posverdad. *El Libre Pensador*, 24, 1-7. <https://librepensador.uexternado.edu.co/en-colombia-tambien-triunfo-la-posverdad/>
- Kuznia, R., Devine, C. y Griffin, D. (2020, 16 de diciembre). *Cómo las mentiras de QAnon están secuestrando la conversación en EE.UU.* CNN. <https://cnnespanol.cnn.com/2020/12/16/como-las-mentiras-de-qanon-estan-secuestrando-la-conversacion-en-ee-uu/>
- Macías, G. (2020, 4 de noviembre). *Estos son mis principios, y si no le gustan, tengo otros*. Diario de Sevilla. https://www.diariodesevilla.es/comics/principios-gustan_0_1516648493.html
- Martínez, J. (2018, 9 de marzo). *Noam Chomsky: 'la gente ya no cree en los hechos'*. El país. https://elpais.com/cultura/2018/03/06/babelia/1520352987_936609.html
- McIntyre, L. (2018). *Posverdad*. Cátedra.
- Nietzsche. (2006). *Fragmentos póstumos (1885-1889)*. Tecnos.
- Orwell, G. (2009). La política y la lengua inglesa. En: *Matar a un elefante y otros escritos* (pp. 370-371). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Searle, J. (2003). *La universidad desafiada. El ataque postmodernista en las humanidades y las ciencias sociales*. Bravo y Allende Editores, Universidad Central de Chile.
- Universidad de los Andes. (2018, 24 de abril). *Castrochavismo, mitos y realidades*. <https://uniandes.edu.co/es/noticias/en-el-campus/castrochavismo-mitos-y-realidades>
- Valdés Villanueva, L. (2018). Presentación. En: L. McIntyre, *Posverdad* (pp. 13-25). Cátedra.

Vanguardia. (24 de agosto de 2020). «*No hay Masacres, sino homicidios colectivos*»: *Duque*. <https://www.vanguardia.com/colombia/no-hay-masacres-sino-homicidios-colectivos-duque-BF2788333>

Vattimo, G. (2009). *Adiós a la verdad*. Gedisa.

Vattimo & P. Rovatti (eds). (1988). *El pensamiento débil*. Cátedra, Colección Teorema.

45 Segundos Noticias. (24 de julio de 2020). Pese a que las FARC niegan el reclutamiento forzado de menores, la JEP llama a versión a 14 exjefes de las FARC por este hecho. <https://45segundos.com/2020/07/24/pese-a-que-las-farc-niegan-reclutamiento-forzado-de-menores-la-jep-llama-a-version-a-14-exjefes-de-las-farc-por-este-hecho/>