**Coronavirus misinformation and the political scenario:
the science cannot be ‘another’ barrier**

Author

Dr. Marcelo Simões Mendes

Professor at the Sao Francisco University / Brazil

Psychology Course

Phone: +55(19) 2454-8000

E-mail: m_smendes@outlook.com

Adress: Av São Francisco de Assis, 218. Bragança Paulista, S.P., Brazil. CEP:12916-900

List of abbreviations: Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable.

Consent for publication: The author consents the manuscript for publication if it is accepted.

Availability of data and materials: Not applicable.

Competing interests: The author of this manuscript declares that he has no competing interests.

Funding: There is no funding in this manuscript.

Authors' contributions: The author contributed to the conception, design, discussion, and writing of this manuscript.

Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

Coronavirus misinformation and the political scenario: the science cannot be ‘another’ barrier

Abstract

The sensible and conflicting scenario of the pandemic postulated many challenges to societies around the world in 2020. Part of this problem refers to how the differences between politics and science are not comprehended in their particularities. The recognition of limits and power of science and politics can not only contribute to reaching the actions and strategies facing novel coronavirus but also optimized many domains of societies post-pandemic.

Keywords: ideologies; power; health.

Background

The range of consequences provoked by the novel coronavirus pandemic is not only situated on health field¹⁻³ but also all domains of society, such as economic⁴, work⁵, families⁶, education⁷, migration⁸, and politics⁹. This complex scenario implies we considered different levels of vulnerability¹⁰, recruiting specific resources for singular needs.

In times of few certainties and many uncertainties, the precedence and quality of the knowledge can determine life or death. Especially from the field of uncertainties, different interests can conduce the social attitudes to terrible subsequent consequences.

In the political domain, the discussions were crossed by multiple themes and different levels of understanding. From perspectives of conspiracy theories^{11,12} until politics of social distancing¹³, most of the time, the politicians were judged and attacked whereas few times were defended.

Politics and science: profound connection in different domains

The relationship of interdependence between politics and science provided a troubled disputed throughout history. On the coronavirus pandemic, this functioning was not different. However, Stevens¹⁴ warns that total confidence in science at the level of determining politics means not understanding what science is.

A substantial reason that fosters this context of vulnerability is not to refer to false information, but how to own proprieties of some area of knowledge – including science and politics – are not understood in their conjectures. This comprehension implies recognized the principles and limits each area so as not to assume the same position as what is being criticized (e.g., the historical debate between science and religious).¹⁵

The recent editorial published at Science, Thorp¹⁶, argued the role of the antiscience movement to propagate misinformation and disinformation as a substantial barrier for advances in research on the novel coronavirus. Mainly the editorial focused on the relationship between misinformation and political scenario.

Despite the primordial importance of science contributing to reliable information on the contemporary scenario of ideological wars, another domain has interfered with the increase of misinformation and disinformation: the political polarization. The actions of political parties supported by correspondent interests from media have been collaborated for strengthening of these obstacles not only due to the development of false information but also due to the elaboration of half-truths.

Extreme polarization on the contemporary political scenario has increased not just due to a pole or other but because of a profound relationship that supports then. There is a parallel relationship between the left and the right conjunctions in the political area. However, the alienated conceptions proliferate when the totality of the representations on the right is identified in the opposite totality on the left – and vice versa.

This operation happens by logical implications: if something can exist just as itself or in its opposition, there are no possibilities for qualifying the singularities and pluralities. Thus, the right political position presents specific characteristics that differ from left political positions that have been built throughout history.

Conclusions

I disagreed with Thorp¹⁶ when he argued that the only way to win this battle is to harness the same tools that are being used to bring down the science. This is the same mechanism that supports the political polarization and collaborates with misinformation and violence. The best tool to win this battle is by science itself, with the recognition of its limits and its powerful reach.

List of abbreviations: Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable.

Consent for publication: The author consents the manuscript for publication if it is accepted.

Availability of data and materials: Not applicable.

Competing interests: The author of this manuscript declares that he has no competing interests.

Funding: There is no funding in this manuscript.

Authors' contributions: The author contributed to the conception, design, discussion, and writing of this manuscript.

Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

References

1. Clark A, Jit M, Warren-Gash C, Guthrie B, Wang HHX, Mercer SW, et al. Global, regional, and national estimates of the population at increased risk of severe COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions in 2020: a modelling study. *Lancet Global Health*. 2020; doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30264-3
2. Javed B, Sarwer A, Soto EB, Mashwani ZuR. Impact of SARS-CoV-2 (Coronavirus) Pandemic on Public Mental Health. *Front Public Health*. 2020; doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00292
3. Giallonardo V, Sampogna G, Del Vecchio V, Luciano M, Albert U, Carmassi C, et al. Impact of Quarantine and Physical Distancing Following COVID-19 on Mental Health: Study Protocol of a Multicentric Italian Population Trial. *Front Psychiatry*. 2020; doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2020.00533
4. Pak A, Adegboye OA, Adekunle AI, Rahman KM, McBryde ES, Eisen DP. Economic Consequences of the COVID-19 Outbreak: the Need for Epidemic Preparedness. *Front Public Health*. 2020; doi:10.3389/fpubh.2020.00241
5. Coibion O, Gorodnichenko Y, Weber M. Labor Markets during the Covid-19 Crisis: A Preliminary View. NBER. 2020.
6. Prime H, Wade M, Browne DT. Risk and Resilience in Family Well-Being During the COVID- 19 Pandemic. *Am Psychol*. 2020; doi:10.1037/amp0000660

7. Colao A, Piscitelli P, Pulimeno M, Colazzo S, Miani A, Giannini. Rethinking the role of the school after COVID-19. *Lancet Public Health*. 2020; doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30124-9

8. Chakraborty I, Maity P. COVID-19 outbreak: Migration, effects on society, global environment and prevention. *Sci Total Environ*. 2020; doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138882

9. McCloskey B, Zumla A, Ippolito G, Blumberg L, Arbon P, Cicero A, et al. Mass gathering events and reducing further global spread of COVID-19: a political and public health dilemma. *Lancet*. 2020; doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30681-4

10. Boldt J. The concept of vulnerability in medical ethics and philosophy. *Philos Ethics Humanit Med*. 2020; doi: 10.1186/s13010-019-0075-6

11. Douglas KM, Uscinski J, Sutton RM, Cichocka A, Nefes T, Ang J, et al. Understanding conspiracy theories. *Political Psychol*. 2019; doi: 10.1111/pops.12568

12. Douglas KM, Sutton RM, Cichocka A. (2017). The psychology of conspiracy theories. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci*. 2017; doi: 10.1177/0963721417718261

13. Colbourn T. Unlocking UK COVID-19 policy. *Lancet Public Health*. 2020; doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30135-3

14. Stevens A. Governments cannot just 'follow the science' on COVID-19. *Nat Hum Behav.* 2020; doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0894-x

15. Feyerabend P. *Science in a Free Society*. Verso. 1978.

16. Thorp HH. Persuasive words are not enough. *Science.* 2020; doi:10.1126/science.abd4085