

Stories From An Ambidextrous Past: A Post-Truth Analysis Of The HBO Series
'Chernobyl'

Dissertation submitted to Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in English

CICIL SANDRA BENNY

Register Number: 180011002130



The Post Graduate Department of English

Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara

2020

Certificate

Certified that this is a bonafide report of the project entitled *Stories From An Ambidextrous Past: A Post-Truth Analysis Of The HBO Series 'Chernobyl'* done by Cicil Sandra Benny (Register No. 180011002130) for the fulfillment of the requirement for the M.A. degree in English under Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam during the year 2018-2020.

Project Guides:

Dr. Rose Merin

Ms. Lissy Kachappilly

Assistant Professor

Head of the Department

Post Graduate Department of English

Post Graduate Department of English

Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara

Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara

Declaration

I, Cicil Sandra Benny, hereby affirm that the dissertation titled *Stories From An Ambidextrous Past: A Post-Truth Analysis Of The HBO Series 'Chernobyl'* is a genuine record of work done by me under the guidance of Dr. Rose Merin and Ms. Lissy Kachappilly of the Post Graduate Department of English, Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara and has not been submitted previously for the award of any masters or degree.

Date: 22-07-2020

Cicil Sandra Benny

Place: Thrikkakara

Register Number: 180011002130

Acknowledgement

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the valuable guidance and assistance extended to me from various quarters during the preparation of this dissertation entitled titled *Stories From An Ambidextrous Past: A Post-Truth Analysis Of The HBO Series 'Chernobyl'*.

I thank God almighty for enabling me to complete this dissertation successfully. I consider myself extremely fortunate to have had Dr. Rose Merin as my dissertation guide. I record my deepest gratitude to her for the useful comments, remarks, valuable guidance and relentless engagement through the learning process of this dissertation.

I would also like to express my thanks to all those who have influenced me and supported me in the task of preparing this dissertation.

I convey my gratitude to my family, who have supported me throughout the entire process, both by keeping me harmonious and helping me put pieces together.

Finally, I express my gratitude to other faculty members of the Department of English, Bharata Mata College, Thrikkakara and all my classmates and friends for their kind support and cooperation.

Cicil Sandra Benny

Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1-8
Chapter 2	The Theory Of Post Truth: Evolution And Analysis	9-16
Chapter 3	Chernobyl 1986: What happened And What Followed	17-24
Chapter 4	Truth And Lies Of ‘Chernobyl’: A Scrutiny Of The HBO Series	25-34
Chapter 5	Conclusion	35-41
	Works Cited	42-45

Introduction

“You think the right question will get you the truth? There is no truth. Ask the bosses whatever you want. You will get the lie, and I will get the bullet.”

The post-truth era has made 'truth' insignificant, a minute detail that can be converted according to individual perspectives and emotions. This paved the way for people with ‘skills’ to spin the truth to influence others which later developed into forms of self-deception and delusion. Moreover, It made people believe in the untruth that nearly all reputable sources would refute.

Post-truth is one of the most-and least-defined-words in our age. The post-truth trend was introduced to the notice of the media in November 2016, when the Oxford Dictionaries called it the 2016 Word of the Year. After a 2,000 percent increase in its use over 2015. Many observers in the English-speaking world quote the 2016 Word of the Year Oxford English Dictionaries entry: “post-truth is a public burial of "objective facts" by an avalanche of media "appeals to emotion and personal belief." The prefix “post” doesn't indicate a time passed instead demonstrates the irrelevance of truth in the contemporary world.”

The HBO Series ‘Chernobyl’ depicting the consequences of the nuclear catastrophe in the former Soviet Union in 1986 is a powerful portrait of the hopelessness in the conviction of truth that was nurtured by decades of authoritarianism. The central question raised by the series is that reality doesn't matter, so it won't be understood. Why risk searching the truth? This limited series entomb the attributes of the post-truth era as they question the point of telling the truth.

Certainly, every government in the world has been lying and hiding at one time or another. The Soviet Union may have been more merciless than most, but America has hushed up information regarding the Challenger disaster to a limited extent to hide any hint of failure after an innovatively deadly disaster, much like the Soviets did after Chernobyl. The United States tried to justify cruel and barbaric experimentation on black people, covered up chemical warfare tests in the manufacturing city of St. Louis, and also established a false legal system for a conflict that destabilized the whole Middle East and murdered hundreds of thousands of civilians in the Middle East.

If you're looking for the expense of legislative lies, history is overflowing with them and their related death tolls. Although the Soviet Union were to have syndicated around all kinds of falsehoods, Chernobyl may not have hit a strong tone. That will be a constant dramatization, not an example. It acts as a reminder of how a state dedicated to promoting misinformation can flourish even at considerable risk, as there is no free press or transparent internet to combat the propaganda.

The official, government loss of life of the Chernobyl atomic blast is 31. Since 1987, the percentage has not increased. The true amount appears elusive; however, it is measured somewhere in the region between 4,000 and 93,000. The 31 of the confirmed deceased were factory employees, paramedics and other first services. More than 600,000 people have been drafted by the Soviet government to work in the so-called Exclusion Zone, which covers 2,600 square kilometers, but despite reports of radiation, infection, and death, no records of their health have been kept. Throughout Belarus and Ukraine, where Chernobyl was based, there was a drastic rise in cancer levels, particularly among children.

The true legacy of Chernobyl, according to the creator of the popular limited mini-

series of HBO, is” the secrets and lies told by those in control of the Soviet Union.”

“The lesson of Chernobyl isn’t that modern nuclear power is dangerous,” According to the creator of the series Craig Mazin. “The lesson is that lying, arrogance, and suppression of criticism is dangerous.”

Despite the fact that he is generally viewed as a Hollywood satire author (and as a co-host of the Scrip notes podcast), Chernobyl sees showrunner Craig Mazin making seamless transformation to both dramatization and TV. he who took part in the creation of two scary movies and 'The hangover,' continuations has consolidated Chernobyl with a progressive spreading out and in an absolute demolishing record of how no matter how you look at it contamination and purposeful attacks on truth can leave a country powerless against disaster—one whose equals to the United States' present circumstance were not obvious when he began composing but rather that he currently grasps.

Mazin and his group prevailing with regards to making a circumspectly intensive re-production of life in the Soviet Union in the mid-1980s, the miniseries featuring Jared Harris, Stellan Skarsgård, Emily Watson, and Jessie Buckley, spiraling out of the April 26, 1986 failure, researching what occurred, immense endeavors to contain and tidy up the harm (counting the awful utilization of "biorobots". Humans who wiped off the reactor's rooftop in 90-second moves as a fence against lethal radiation harming), and the undertakings by the Soviet government to cover it up, even to the disservice of hampering the regulation and endangering more lives.

'Chernobyl' is a story of the 'cost of lies'. Significant ones like the design flaw that was left unfixed and concealed in the plant's reactor. Smaller ones like the intentionally incorrect radiation measurements released to the world and media by the Soviet government to make

the incident appear less serious but that ended up putting more people in the way of damage. The Chernobyl disaster was more about deceit, misdirection, and the rotting political and bureaucratic framework than it was about bad engineering or abysmal management and training (or, for that instance, that nuclear energy is necessarily positive or bad.)

In Mazin's Words, "We are experiencing something now that I used to think was mostly just a phenomenon in a place like the Soviet Union, which is a disconnection from truth. And the emergence of a cult of personality. And a distrust and debasement of experts who don't go along with whatever the official narrative is. It's so upsetting, and we don't know quite how to handle it. What I want people to consider is that no matter what it is we want to believe, and no matter what story it is we want to jam the world into, the truth is the truth. If you organize your life around some political party's list of things, you believe, or an individual that you think is going to come."

The show format as it starts with the accident and withholds the specifics of what led to it until the fifth season, which is carried out every night as a criminal trial of flashbacks; keeping the theory of why Chernobyl occurred afterwards. The role of nuclear power itself is often under-emphasized. In the first four chapters, we see the Soviet state in motion, struggling to confront the situation and concealing the magnitude. The design of the reactor was seriously flawed, but it does not give the impression that nuclear power is in itself unsafe; instead, it concentrates on the horrible reality at its core and discusses the cultural and political collapse that is taking place as individuals become persuaded that honesty is futile.

"What is the cost of lies? It's not that we'll mistake them for the truth. The real danger is that if we hear enough lies, then we no longer recognize the truth at all. What can we do then? What else is left but to abandon even the hope of truth, and content ourselves instead

with stories.”

This opening sentence of the series directly gives light to the post-truth nature of the Disaster of Chernobyl. What we've heard so far are stories, and in the apparent lack of the truth, we become content with these fictional editions. In Mazin's opinion the narrative in itself is not a toxin. He thinks that the narrative has become weaponized.

“Narrative is a beautiful thing. It's how you understand the world, it's how we relate to each other, and it's how we organize our memories. It is how we arrange our knowledge of the history of our culture. The problem is when we weaponize it, and the Soviets were masters of weaponized narration¹.”

Truth, the unvarnished, objectiveness of fact, is the protagonist of Chernobyl, “What happens when we have our own Chernobyl, or another 9/11, or something worse, and the credibility of government becomes essential to the survival of the state? “We have to distill our own" truth "from the Chernobyl docudrama because the recent centralization of power and wealth has been accompanied by an integration of specialized information. As in the Soviet period, the truths offered from podiums or television screens have become suspects. As Soviet experience reveals, the first victim in a disintegrating empire is legitimacy.

Without a doubt, the actual Chernobyl, where on April 26, 1986, the core of the nuclear reactor No. 4 detonated and liquified down, contaminating swaths of the then Soviet Union and Europe for decades, may offer a plot with a foregone conclusion. Yet Chernobyl, the novel, excels in deferring the information. The cataclysmic imagination is simultaneously suspended and invited to run amok. Certainly, more than one truth— the "Truth"—lives here. This reality is, for example, the transgressions of the Soviet system, its malfunctioning

¹ Narration in itself has become a weapon in the post-truth world used to protect oneself and attack others.

systems, and a few rotten apples, rather than the inherently unstable "peaceful atom" or nucleocracy. Various facts and myths, typical from the outset of divergent regional perceptions of Chernobyl, have been locked in place

To illuminate these unknown facts, the series provides a series of first-hand accounts of the meltdown itself, as well as those of individuals who were privy to subsequent cover-up and clean-up. It casts an unflinching gaze on the unspeakable revulsion of radiation poisoning, as well as a critical lens on the culture of Soviet law, positing that terror, lack of responsibility, blind confidence, and willing oblivion all led to the initial catastrophe and what followed. While criticism is leveled at the Soviet hierarchy, Chernobyl also shows how to further tragedies were only prevented due to the will and sacrifice of ordinary citizens.

Chernobyl has demonstrated that the catastrophe tale goes further than the question of historical fact, as it sought to demonstrate one of the key shortcomings of the Russian military, inherited from the Soviet Union – the loss of diplomatic skills in a crisis. Crisis is also an indicator of the interaction between state agencies and the population. Those are the factors that play a crucial role in determining the vector of the partnership. The falsehoods propagated at these times contribute to the disbelief of masses in Government as well as the Official and objective versions of the truth. The series celebrated soviet bureaucratic aversion to the truth which in turn contributed to multiple narratives with specks of facts in it and led us to a post-truth world where the truth became futile.

The visual indications and aural signals of the show offer a significant point regarding our current political experience of the post-truth era's politics of invisibility. The "invisibility" defined by Kuchinskaya is not inherently a denial or concealment of the truth. On the contrary, sometimes it is a documentary that gives a rational description of a particular

historical event presented as occurring “not here” and “not to us”, is part of a “policy of invisibility.”

Throughout the case of Chernobyl, “the policy of invisibility” is not merely a method of concealing knowledge or a trite effort to escape liability. It's about creating an effective story that the people would conclude is the reality.

The HBO story of Chernobyl was instrumental in undermining the "culture of invisibility" that endured the fall of the Soviet Empire. The size and sophistication of the Chernobyl answer represents not so much the amount of series output, but the effectiveness of the prior catastrophe silencing technique “The half-life of silence is often longer than the half-life of radioactive atoms.”

The Chernobyl disaster has occurred in the past, but the processes for responding to emergencies have not improved. The same force of invisibility continues to push individual and environmental incidents out of social awareness. However, the dynamics of the modern data world exacerbate the shielding of knowledge and entail the transformation of these powers

The series, for all its inescapable historical errors, was able to remind the Russian-speaking audiences that Chernobyl is here and today, and that it affects them. This offensive by the “forces of visibility”, also mobilized different factions. “The defensive “machine of invisibility” began to operate again. “The outbreak of condemnation of the show – which comes down to the suggestion that this is another phase of intelligence warfare against Russia – has been reminiscent of attempts to cut the size of the tragedy more than 30 years earlier. This criticism was followed by requests to Roskomnadzor, the Russian State Media Regulatory Authority, to prohibit the show, as well as demands for its producers to be

prosecuted for political exploitation and libel.

Chernobyl at the same time depicts the political corruption and obfuscation of the day and carries echoes of today's discourse about post-truth and fake news. The following chapters intend to analyze HBO's narrative of Chernobyl as a historical drama under the post-truth doctrine and 'politics of Invisibility' to observe how the elements of the post-truth that were present during the time of Chernobyl disaster is portrayed in the series. It examines how events, calamities, and coverups such as 'Chernobyl' paved the way into a world of post-truth even before the latest multi-media narratives came into being.

The Theory of Post Truth: Evolution and Analysis

“The very concept of objective truth is fading out of the world. Lies will pass into history.”

—George Orwell

Post-truth in its most coherent definition is a philosophical and political concept for the disappearance of harmonized objective standards for truth and the circuitous slippage between facts or alt-facts, knowledge, opinion, belief, and truth.

The phenomenon of “post-truth” soared to general attention in November 2016, when the Oxford Dictionaries named it 2016’s word of the year. After a 2,000 percent spike in its usage over ¹ 2015, the decision seemed apparent. The Oxford Dictionaries characterize “post-truth” as “relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief. “The prefix “post” is meant to demonstrate not so much the notion that we are “past” truth in a temporal manner (as in “post-war”) but in the context that the truth has become overshadowed — that it has become obsolete.

The idea of truth, in theory, returns to Plato, who forewarned us (through Socrates) of the hazards of absurd claims to wisdom. Ignorance, Socrates felt, was remediable; “on the off chance that one is uninformed, one can be enlightened. The graver threat originates from those who have the hubris to think they already know the truth, for then one might be impetuous enough to act on a falsehood.” It is necessary to give a minimal meaning to truth all times.

Conceivably the most famous is that of Aristotle, who said: “to say of what is that it is

not, or of what is not that it is, is false, while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true.”

Typically, scholars have battled for a considerable length of time about whether this kind of "correspondence" view is precise, whereby we ascertain the truth of a statement just by how well it fits our circumstances. “Other prominent conceptions of truth (coherentist, pragmatist, semantic) reflect a diversity of opinion among philosophers about the proper theory of truth, even while—as a value— there seems little dispute that truth is important.” (McIntyre,7)

Everyone commits mistakes and says untrue things without meaning to do so. All things considered, one is articulating a "falsehood" instead of a lie, for the mistake isn't purposeful. A further step beyond this is “willful ignorance,” This is when we don't know whether it is real, but we do say it regardless, without having to take the time to figure out if our evidence is accurate. Right now, we may reasonably reprimand the speaker for their negligence, for if the facts are effectively accessible, the individual who expresses a lie appears at any rate in part answerable for any obliviousness. Next comes lying, when we advise a misrepresentation with a plan to misdirect. This is a significant achievement, for we have here traversed into endeavoring to deceive someone else, even though we realize what we are stating is false.

By definition, each untruth obtains an audience. We may find ourselves not responsible for articulating a misrepresentation if nobody is listening (or on the off chance that we are certain nobody will believe in it), yet when we expect to restrain somebody into thinking something that we recognize to be false, we have moved on from the negligible "presentation" of facts into their adulteration. Is that what post-truth is about?

It had previously characterized everything as a matter of “respecting truth, “Through adopting certain methods of investigation — a methodology that has traditionally given way to genuine beliefs. If somebody maintains that truth doesn't make a difference, or that there is nothing of the sort as truth, I don't know there are many we can say to them. One experiences the sense that post-truth isn't so much a case that truth doesn't exist as those realities are not good enough for our political perspective.

A corrosive consequence of contemporary casual attitude towards the truth is that there is no accepted way of testing our conflicting narratives towards each other: all we can say is that those who disagree with us are malicious, corrupt or liars.

The Oxford definition centers around "what" post-truth is the possibility that emotions in some cases matter more than facts. Be that as it may, identically, it is as significant as the following inquiry, which constitutes the reason why this repeatedly happens. Somebody doesn't dispute a conspicuous or effectively confirmable fact for reasons unknown; the individual does so when it is to further their potential benefit. At the point when an individual's convictions are compromised by an "inconvenient fact," at times, it is advantageous to critique that assumption. This can happen either at a cognizant level or, on the other hand, at an obvious level (because sometimes the individual we're trying to convince is ourselves), but the fact is that this is in a way. The post-truth relationship to the facts happens only when we try to assert something more essential to us than the truth itself.

Therefore, post-truth is a form of moral hegemony, through which the practitioners seek to persuade others to have faith in something whether or not there is appropriate proof for it. In fact, this is a recipe for democratic dominance.

While it may seem mysterious and baffling, the post-truth concept is neither

incomprehensible nor impregnable. However, nor is it so straightforward that it tends to be comprehended in a solitary word: Trump. Even though the Brexit vote and the US democratic presidential race may seem inseparably bound up with the post-truth, these were not the reason for it rather the outcome. According to Ralph Keyes, “Post-truthfulness exists in an ethical twilight zone. It allows us to disassemble without considering ourselves dishonest “If our actions are in conflict with our beliefs, what we are more likely to do is re-engineer our values “Since we do not want to think of ourselves as unethical, we simply “devise alternative approaches to morality.”

Keyes points out that we possess a cultural acceptance of lying and we demonstrate it through the euphemisms of deception. “We no longer tell lies. Instead, we ‘misspeak.’ We ‘exaggerate.’ We ‘exercise terrible judgment.’ ‘Mistakes were made,’ we say. The term ‘deceive’ gives way to the more playful ‘spin.’ At worst, saying ‘I wasn’t truthful’ sounds better than ‘I lied.’” Keyes believes the use of these euphemisms is a recent cultural phenomenon that he describes as ‘euphemasia’.

The usage of terms like “poetic truth,” “nuanced truth,” “alternative reality,” or “strategic misrepresentations” is on a spike. In our technological age, driven by a digitalized dimension of lying, we are now accustomed to talking about “virtual truth”. Most of us are truly ignorant of the widespread deception that surrounds us – even the deceit and trickery that are part of our understanding of the past. When it comes to authenticity, Keyes views the academic community as the source of much ambiguity. Postmodern philosophers often reject objective truth and assert that all truth is pure fabrication and invention of culture. Officials in control are actually inventing the truth to justify their power. The postmodernists argue that in this rationale, deceit is a form of liberation.

Keyes clearly clarifies the obvious: “Asking what constitutes truth is an appropriate topic for intellectual inquiry, but it doesn’t follow that the difficulty of identifying what is objectively true gives us the license to tell each other lies.” (Keyes,142,145)

Right now, we can undoubtedly say that we are living in the post-truth era-A time when the very pillars of democracy are shaken by the art of deception. We live in a modern era where covert technologies leverage big data and social media, distort, polarize and entrench opinion. There is an atmosphere in which trust has evaporated, conspiracy theories have flourished, media authority has wavered and emotions matter more than facts. But another critical question is Where did all of this begin? Is it just a product of exponential evolution of social media or did it begin before that?

The term post-truth first appeared with the emergence of neo-liberal economic policies in the early 1990s. It gained currency throughout the two decades that followed and reached its peak usage with the American presidential elections of 2016. In 1992, Serbian-American author Steve Tesich stated that the Americans were so traumatized by Watergate, Iran-contra and other scandals that they began to turn away from the facts and wearily crash with its repression.

“We are rapidly becoming prototypes of a people that totalitarian monsters could only drool about in their dreams. All the dictators up to now have had to work hard at suppressing the truth. We, by our actions, are saying that this is no longer necessary, that we have acquired a spiritual mechanism that can denude truth of any significance. In a very fundamental way we, as free people, have freely decided that we want to live in some post-truth world.” (Steve Tesich)

Post-truth was foreshadowed by what has befallen science in the course of the last few

decades. As far as the authority of its technique is concerned, the logical outcomes are currently being criticized in a transparent manner by armies of non-experts who do not agree with them. It is essential to call attention to those logical outcomes which are routinely investigated by researchers themselves, however, that isn't what we are discussing here.

The media now is all around arranged to reflexively present "the different sides of the story" on any "questionable" coherent issue. Along these lines, the people remain befuddled. The particular usage of realities that prop up one's position, and the absolute excusal of realities that don't, shows up to be a fundamental piece of building up the cutting-edge post-truth reality. Post-truth has numerous family histories, some of which start from philosophical requests and others from political practicality. In the current post-truth air, in which "elective realities" are shipped out to shield shaky positions and charges of "fake news" are leveled against political enemies, the association among realities and fiction has slung to the forefront of open and scholarly talks. Be that as it may, outrageous its arrival, the intentional conflation of truth and deceives evil closures is not really new, as saw by a lot of coinages showing up throughout the last century to depict it, for example, "terminological inexactitude" (Winston Churchill), "doublethink" (George Orwell), "strategic misrepresentation" (Harvard Business School), or "alternative facts" (Kellyanne Conway). In any case, the main issue with the notion of post-truth is its recommendation that there is—or has ever been—an unproblematic 'truth' to be removed from. A century of logical thought through disciplines, Psychoanalysis, phenomenology, poststructuralism, and deconstruction have put emphasis on the notion that reality is available in the first place.

On one hand, Nazi Germany was an extreme even among autocratic regimes, let alone among post-truth practitioners, but it does serve as an example of how far post-truth regimes

can go. Narratives matter, but institutions matter too - and whether intentional or not, modern politicians and campaigns behave in such a way as to fuel dangerous narratives of the post-truth. On the other hand, Post-truth is a mode of decentralization or democratization as it blows away the structures, creating anarchy of its own. It is rendering something to be the Truth. Post-truth climate reveals a condition where voices of the masses are heard, and voices of the others are silenced. Many matters and few don't. Here we have now reached a stage of evolution that is "beyond honesty."

Post-truth essentially constructs the framework of a 'politics of invisibility where if anything is invisible it won't be considered in formulating the truth. Especially what's going to be written down in history. And certain powers decide what should be visible and what should be invisible.

In her book *The Politics of Invisibility: Public Knowledge of Radiation Health Effects After Chernobyl*, Olga Kuchinskaya highlights the fact that waves of "visibility" and "invisibility" overpower us many years after the disaster. "Production of Visibility" conflicts with "Production of Invisibility" – and the victor in this conflict depends on resources accessible to advocates and adversaries of visibility. The invisibility identified by Kuchinskaya is not inherently the lack or camouflage of the facts.

A declaration that an event has taken place – such as President Putin's comment on the 2000 Kursk submarine disaster ('It sank.') – can illustrate precisely how describing a crisis can make it invisible. Invisibility remains a kind of narrative code that creates a distance between the viewer and the event. The 'production of invisibility' continues to reproduce this distance in each alternative interpretation. It is exceptionally difficult for someone inside the production system to move outside the boundaries of this classification. Only outsiders will

understand the secret dimension of our lives. This mention of politics of invisibility directs us to the conclusion that elements of post-truth were already there in Chernobyl in 1986 even before the strategic use of post-truth narratives of the Nazi regime during the time of the second world war.

Chernobyl 1986: What happened And What Followed

The accident at the Chernobyl nuclear facility in April 1986 seemed to be the result of the defective configuration of the Soviet reactor combined with the critical mistakes by the plant administrators. This was the immediate outcome of the Cold War alienation and the resulting absence of any safety culture.

The 4th reactor of Chernobyl was destroyed by the explosion, killing 30 operators and fire fighters inside a quarter of a year and a few additional deaths later. One person was in a split second killed and a second passed away in a medical clinic not long after getting wounded. Another individual reportedly died from coronary thrombosis at the time. Acute radiation syndrome (ARS) was initially diagnosed and associated with the clean-up in 237 people on site, and was subsequently verified in 134 cases. Of these, 28 people died as a result of the ARS within weeks of the incident. Around 1987 and 2004, nineteen more employees subsequently died but their deaths cannot automatically be connected to toxic radiation without further evidence. No off-site citizens experienced intense radiation impacts while a small yet unknown thyroid cancer was reported after the incident in patients who were children at that point. It was possibly due to radioactive iodine fallout intake. Wide parts of Belarus, Ukraine, Russia and beyond have also been polluted to varying degrees.

The Chernobyl tragedy was, in itself, a rare incident and the only occurrence in the history of commercial nuclear power where radiation-related deaths occurred. The architecture of the reactor is unique and hence the accident is of little interest to the rest of the nuclear industry outside the Eastern Bloc. However, this led to major changes in the culture of

safety and industrial coordination, especially among East and West, before the collapse of the Soviet Union. Former President Gorbachev said that “the Chernobyl disaster was a more important factor in the dissolution of the Soviet Union than ‘Perestroika’.” – his liberal reform plan.

“On 25 April, before a routine shutdown, the reactor crew at Chernobyl 4 began preparing for a test to determine how long turbines would spin and supply power to the main circulating pumps following a loss of main electrical power supply. This test had been carried out at Chernobyl the previous year, but the power from the turbine ran down too rapidly, so new voltage regulator designs were to be tested. A series of operator actions, including the disabling of automatic shutdown mechanisms, preceded the attempted test early on 26 April. By the time that the operator moved to shut down the reactor, the reactor was in an extremely unstable condition. A peculiarity of the design of the control rods caused a dramatic power surge as they were inserted into the reactor the interaction of very hot fuel with the cooling water led to fuel fragmentation along with rapid steam production and an increase in pressure. The design characteristics of the reactor were such that substantial damage to even three or four fuel assemblies would – and did – destroy the reactor.

The overpressure caused the 1000 t cover plate of the reactor to become partially detached, rupturing the fuel channels and jamming all the control rods, which by that time were only halfway down. Intense steam generation then spread throughout the whole core (fed by water dumped into the core due to the rupture of the emergency cooling circuit) causing a steam explosion and releasing fission products to the atmosphere. About two to three seconds later, a second explosion threw out fragments from the fuel channels and hot graphite. There is some dispute among experts about the character of this second explosion,

but it is likely to have been caused by the production of hydrogen from zirconium-steam reactions.

Two workers died as a result of these explosions. The graphite (about a quarter of the 1200 tons of it was estimated to have been ejected) and fuel became incandescent and started some fires, causing the main release of radioactivity into the environment. The 1991 report by the State Committee on the Supervision of Safety in Industry and Nuclear Power on the root cause of the accident looked past the operator's actions. It said that while it was certainly true the operators placed their reactor in a dangerously unstable condition (in fact in a condition which virtually guaranteed an accident) it was also true that in doing so they had not violated some vital operating policies and principles since no such policies and principles had been articulated. Additionally, the operating organization had not been made aware either of the specific vital safety significance of maintaining a minimum operating reactivity margin, or the general reactivity characteristics of the RBMK which made low power operation extremely hazardous. The accident caused the largest uncontrolled radioactive release into the environment ever recorded for any civilian operation, and large quantities of radioactive substances were released into the air for about 10 days. This caused serious social and economic disruption for large populations in Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine. Two radionuclides, the short-lived iodine-131, and the long-lived cesium-137 were particularly significant for the radiation dose they delivered to members of the public. It is estimated that all of the xenon gas, about half of the iodine and cesium, and at least 5% of the remaining radioactive material in the Chernobyl 4 reactor core (which had 192 tons of fuel) was released in the accident. Most of the released material was deposited close by as dust and debris, but the lighter material was carried by wind over Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, and to some extent

over Scandinavia and Europe. The casualties included firefighters who attended the initial fires on the roof of the turbine building. All these were put out in a few hours, but radiation doses on the first day were estimated to range up to 20,000 millisieverts (mSv), causing 28 deaths – six of which were firemen – by the end of July 1986.

The next task was cleaning up the radioactivity at the site so that the remaining three reactors could be restarted, and the damaged reactor shielded more permanently. About 200,000 people ('liquidators') from all over the Soviet Union were involved in the recovery and clean-up during 1986 and 1987. They received high doses of radiation, averaging around 100 millisieverts. Some 20,000 of them received about 250 mSv and a few received 500 mSv. Later, the number of liquidators swelled to over 600,000 but most of these received only low radiation doses. The highest doses were received by about 1000 emergency workers and on-site personnel during the first day of the accident. Several organizations have reported on the impacts of the Chernobyl accident, but all have had problems assessing the significance of their observations because of the lack of reliable public health information before 1986.”

The above said are part of the official explanations of how things went down on April 25th, 1986, however many things were effectively hidden before the public at that time which eventually came into light partially if not in full.

A haze of material blew across Scandinavia at the end of April. The guilty party was reactor number 4 in one of the main nuclear power plants in the Soviet Empire, Chernobyl. The disaster didn't blast into the features at the moment, as fiascos for the most part do in the Western world. Mishaps inside the Soviet Union, for some reason, gradually emerge.

The press was undoubtedly as the result of information from their diplomatic correspondents, foreign staff and agencies that understood that a few days before, a terrible

accident had occurred. Scientists have discovered and traced radioactive fallout from Sweden to the surrounding area of Kyiv.

“Serious accident hits nuclear power plant in the Soviet Union,” reported the Financial Times, quoting the official announcement from the Soviet news agency, TASS, that “one of the reactors at Chernobyl had been damaged.” It printed a map of northern Europe on the nuclear site, quoting statements from the Swedish authorities angered by the lack of notice from the Soviets. It also offered some information on the capability and architecture of the reactor concerned. The Times was somewhat more thrilled (“Huge nuclear leak at the Soviet plant,” “Overheating nuclear fuel raises fear of possible meltdown,” “European alarm” and “Moscow acts”), and managed to give the news much more notoriety

The next day the press had got its second wind. Incidentally, so had the international markets. All articles published on parliamentary sessions in which “outbursts from all sides” had expressed frustration at the lack of information coming from the Soviet Union. A cautionary report in the Financial Times struck a peculiar tone in the controversy. Heading “When total publicity served only to alarm and confuse,” It has caused confusion, fear, and skepticism. Furthermore, the paper said that pictures of American satellites revealed that the roof of the reactor had been blasted off. In a long article describing the design of the Soviet reactor and illustrating its method, the science editor of FT still had little definitive to say about the cause of the accident, but stressed its seriousness: “Those I spoke to yesterday about the problem of fighting a major fire in such a reactor expressed nothing but horror at its magnitude. No one had any ideas.

The Telegraph headlines read: “25 000 flee nuclear plant disaster”, “Help us plea by Moscow” and “Meltdown could kill 10 000 in 10 years”, It was printed, along with a cartoon

depicting Death looking for appointments for the year 2006. The Guardian observed that better protective measures for nuclear reactors might provide investment opportunities. Almost every page of the paper had a reference to the disaster. Washington reported American pressure on the Soviets to reveal all possible details on the incident.

The editors of the second day-The trigger for the reactor fire was found. A power station guy, he said, "dozed off on the job." This has been recorded in headlines such as "Help us plea as Russians writhe in nuclear agony" and "Nuclear nightmare." The Star, with more pride than objectivity in covering the same Soviet plea for assistance, published the headline "HELP! Russia's disaster plea to the West. Only our experts can save the day." The Star said that the Soviet Union must tell the truth and then, inexplicably, "No decision on Sizewell can be taken until all the causes and consequences of the Chernobyl incident are analyzed. And surely the Soviets will realize this." The Daily Express, with the story of a "nuclear nightmare" demanding "suicide squads on edge of hell". The paper said that 100 000 were doomed, while the Daily Mail stayed calmer, "2000 dead in atom horror". Contradictions and confusions were everywhere. It was initially "suggested that a sleepy worker may have missed the first alarm".

"The editors of Most of the papers reported a news program on Soviet television showing the Chernobyl reactor with fire out and under control, but there was still no word from the Soviet High Authority. Nearly all the papers held the US argument that the second reactor was in distress, an assertion based on satellite images that claimed to indicate "hotspots" elsewhere on the ground. "So much for 'glasnost,' the Russian word which means 'openness,'" said The Guardian, reiterating anxieties about the tatters of information released from Moscow. His leader hacked away on the topic, claiming that Gorbachev's achievements

in foreign public relations have been obliterated overnight.

The press conference in Moscow demonstrated two sides one side would be the Soviets, arguing that the coverage by the Western media of the disaster was misleading and shameful “slanderous inventions around the Chernobyl nuclear accident”—and, At the other side, there were claims that the Soviets had tried their utmost to conceal what was difficult to hide.

There is little compensation for the advancement of events from this point of view: the valiant efforts of the Soviets to seal off the bottom of the heart, eventually successful, and the slow appearance of further details, culminating in the shockingly frank acknowledgment, for Moscow, of the almost incredible, arrogant mishandling of the reactor that rendered the tragedy unavoidable. The newspapers have handled these developments in a typical way.

There are important lessons that need to be taken from the coverage from the first few days of this global catastrophe. First of all, whatever the coverage of the incident in the newspapers, there was not a single term unsympathetic to the poor Soviet citizens. There was, of course, certain tough stuff to tell about engineers and technologists in the Soviet Union, but none of them might have mentioned, and most definitely believed, about their counterparts. And the other countries. It was evident their frustration with a story that has annoyed them with their lack of relevant information from the very beginning. The tabloids did the same for their readers. They knew that the disaster was worse than the Soviets had admitted. The vocabulary they used was often sordid and may have insulted many, which was often the result of their annoyance to a country who never gave up too much information.

Even though we were able to dig up many facts about the Chernobyl incident in the later years, there are still many things in the shadows and it is well-proofed evidence of the

before the expert use of the strategy of politics of invisibility by the Soviet Union administration. Way term post-truth became popular, the bureaucracy of the USSR was able to utilize its methods to propagate its version about the Chernobyl as the truth.

Truth and Lies Of 'Chernobyl': A Scrutiny of The HBO Series

The motif of falsehoods — the denial of reality by a self-preservation regime — encompasses "Chernobyl" in such a manner that is critically important to today's society.

"Chernobyl" should be called the most important political show of our day, as it illuminates the central problem of the Post-Truth era: the relentless sledgehammer of mistruths that drowns what is real. The danger is that people who are flooded with moral nonsense from the press and politicians that lose the ability to take care of the distinction between right and wrong, repeating what is false. This occurred in the Soviet Union. "When it all turns gray and slow, there's no battle worth fighting."

There's a line in the TV series Chernobyl that makes perfect sense to those who reported on what was the Soviet Union's nuclear catastrophe of 1986 – yet that still causes shock: "The official position of the state is that a global nuclear catastrophe is not possible in the Soviet Union."

It was impossible, so in the months following the catastrophe, the soviet authorities put up its pretense. It disassembled, tricked, and manipulated. Investigations in the disaster struck area in the late 1980s after some Russian nationals insisted that the authorities in The U.S.S.R. covered up the severity of the human catastrophe of millions – especially infants – infected with radiation when the Reactor 4 nuclear power plant exploded, spraying a wave of radioactive consequences across the U.S.S.R. and a massive area of Europe.

The Chernobyl miniseries is a convincing portrayal of how the tragedy occurred, focused entirely on the testimonies of those involved, many of whom subsequently died

afterward. It stands true but only scuffs the surface of yet another, more grim reality – that, in their despair to save face, the Soviets were prepared to sacrifice any number of men, women, and children. As the radiation Spewed out of the fuel-fired reactor core plant, local residents mentioned that they had noticed Communist sycophants moving their families to Moscow to safety, while the residents were urged to carry on as if nothing had happened. in Pripyat, a suburban town planned for Nuclear power plant staff, windows were held unlocked, youngsters were playing outdoors, and farmers were planting.

The plume of poisonous radioactive fallout was just fog from a nuclear power plant explosion, the citizens were informed. It took 36 hours to decide and evacuate the area by which time some were already showing signs of radiation sickness.

“On the TV news on 29 April – more than three days after the catastrophe, with the reactor fire still burning – Chernobyl was the sixth item. “There has been an accident,” the female presenter stated. “Two people have died.” School Children in Belorussia and Ukraine – the worst hit by fallout – were instructed to continue with their May Day celebrations and parades, even as the rain brought radioactive particles down on them.”

Today, Chernobyl is a tourist spot. A great many guests gallivant around the Ghost city of Pripyat, taking snaps of the disintegrating lodging squares, dried pools, study halls, and abandoned roads. The Soviets were not by any means the only ones who lied. France's specialists retained data about the radioactive cover over its domain, and Hans Blix, at that point executive general of the International Nuclear Energy Authority (IAEA)– despite everything blamed for limiting the threats following the disaster discharged an explanation that settlements around Chernobyl would "be ok for inhabitants" after a short time. Protester researcher Andrei Sakharov was likewise beguiled. “To my shame, I at first pretended that

nothing much had happened,” he said.

Several physicians believed that there was a significant rise in the number of tumors and leukemias. Kids were raised with unusual deformities, like "frog's legs," with limbs bent outward. Others had cardiac abnormalities, and thyroid cancers were believed to have been triggered by radioactive iodine. And yet, authorities insisted that all of this was "poor food and poverty" and was unrelated to Chernobyl. Many doctors insisted there had been a spike in the number of cancers and leukemias.

For the Russian audience perhaps not always consciously, the key theme of Chernobyl was not the events of the past but the forces of invisibility that are still at work today. Certainly, any attempt by outside observers to tell us a controversial version inevitably leads to a discussion of historical authenticity.

Particular attention is paid to how far external observers can avoid stereotypes, understand the everyday life and values of the main character involved or show the cognitive complexity of their relationships.

This series represented a foreign point of view of the Chernobyl incident, more importantly, it talks about the cost of lies and the stories that were fed to the world with a little bit of truth in them to conceal the whole truth. Because the repercussions of the publication of the whole truth might have torn apart the kingdom of the USSR which was ironically the later outcome of the incident.

The art behind "Chernobyl" conveys — dialogue, graphics, acting, music. You barely notice the series' wrecking statement to the finale. But the creator and writer of the show, Craig Mazin, was, like his protagonist, vocal about the fact and what it means. "We are now living in a global war on the truth," Mazin told the Los Angeles Times. "We look at this

president who lies, not little ones but outstandingly absurd lies. The truth isn't even in the conversation. It's just forgotten or obscured to the point where we can't see it. That's what Chernobyl is about."

At its heart, HBO's "Chernobyl" is a remarkable story of brave individuals fighting against a government that, by its definition, is intended to thwart anyone who opposes Scientists who are suited to the KGB secret police of the Soviet Union in their search for the cause of the disaster. Representatives of the Commission responsible for investigating the Chernobyl disaster have tapped their phones. They're being brazenly insulted in public. They're being illegally held. Scientists and scientific experts Mikhail Gorbachev's Soviet regime need to be able to uncover the truth that their own government has routinely stymied and silenced.

Young novice people in technical jobs, Questions regarding the safety and protection of critical nuclear installations — most prominently, Soviet-made RBMK reactors — are brushed aside or hidden under layers of bureaucratic red tape.

The dosimeters that were available to the plant workers to measure harmful radiation are extremely cheap and inadequate. They can detect up to 3.6 roentgens per hour. The worst impacted areas of the facility had radiation rates of more than 20,000 r / h. The higher-quality Chernobyl dosimeter, capable of detecting up to 1,000 r / h, is locked in a safe and the first personnel to think about didn't have the key to use. When it's finally found out, the second it's turned it burned out from either radioactive fallout or technical failure.

Among the most disturbing early scenes of the HBO series is four hours after the initial explosion. The local Pripyat Executive Committee's voice of dissent says the city should be evacuated Party men say that radiation rates are "mild" and "limited to the plant itself."

Chernobyl Created by Mazin depicts the elements of a post-truth world which was at play during the horrific days that followed Chernobyl. There were many post-truth strategies at play in the covering up of the true horrors of the Chernobyl, efficiently represented in the series.

Post-truth communication: A catchword that undoubtedly deserves meticulous interest and acute specification, especially if we are not to be struck off stability by a worldwide phenomenon that aims to do just that.

We can say that post-truth is not just the opposite of the truth, but it is more complicated. It is best known as an omnibus term, a word for communication that includes a mixture of separate but intertwined phenomena

The disturbing influence in public life stems from its composite characteristics, its blend of various components in ways that defy standards and perplex its receivers. Post-truth has transgenic properties. For example, it's a form of discourse that involves old-fashioned deception, where speakers tell stuff about themselves and their environment that are at variance with the beliefs and values that they keep in their heads. Liars' Alchemy Attempt: When someone says lies, they deliberately declare things that they "know" not to be true, for effect.

In the series, the initial episodes portray that Anatoly Dyatlov refuses to believe the core has exploded despite eyewitness accounts and he reports this lie to his superior officers. In a later episode, The KGB chief Comrade Charkov once again solidifies this by saying "we will have our villains, we will have our hero... We will have our truth." It need not be 'the truth'. It just needs to be satisfactory when it is presented to the world.

In a conference with the Soviet government, senior party officials laughed off the level of radiation at the plant as "chest X-ray equivalent." However, a single fragment of graphite

rubble from the collapsed reactor core contains more than 4 million chest X-ray radiation. When Legasov communicates this startling fact to the government, he is labeled an "alarmist" and a "hysteric." Legasov is one of the top nuclear experts in the country and his warnings fall on deaf ears. He was initially dismissed primarily on the grounds that his work was contradictory to the agreed lies of the Communist Party Leadership.

Post-truth often contains what is generally considered bogus modes of democratic debate. This involves communication that disperses and invalidates worries regarding factuality. It is shared, relying on the premise that it is appropriate to those in the discussion.

Post-truth often relies on buffoonery, and humorous information items designed to reflect and distract attention of the voting population and interrupt the ambient noise of mainstream political affairs. The post-truth portion contains moments of twaddle, profanities, and rambling. It celebrates witticisms, sophistry, and blithe overstatements (like Marine Le Pen's description of the European Union as "a huge prison").

Strikingly, there is sufficient conversation about the significance of "truth," by which statements are typically meant to be self-confirming meanings, thus demonstrating that reality is going to attract rogues.

In Chernobyl, The Soviet Union officials utilize Valery Legasov to present their version of the truth in Vienna and the entire world. While his narrative was half true. It solely blames the workers and management and ignores the fatal flaw in the design of the reactor.

"The West is now satisfied that Chernobyl was solely the result of operator error. Which it essentially was." They believe and propagate their truth instead of "the truth."

Another one of the post-truth strategies well presented in the series is Engineered silence. Silence is not accidental. Post-truth performances rely on their silence output. They

alert us, in the words of Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset, that:

“... the stupendous reality that is language cannot be understood unless we begin by observing that speech consists above all in silences.”

The proponents of post-truth communication relish things unsaid. Their bluff and bluster are designed not just to capture general attention. Simultaneously, it masks from public consciousness issues (such as that economic inequality, the militarization of government, and the escalating mortality of non-human species) that it does not allow us to consider, or that theoretically creates questions regarding nature and content of post-truth politics.

Post-truth dialogue advocates delight things unspoken. Their misdirection and empty rhetoric are not just intended to capture general attention. This engineered silence is not just the result of the "sustainability" of post-truth discourse.

Any moment in post-truth discourse that uses signs and text backed words is deliberately influenced by what is unsaid, or what is unsayable. Therefore, the communicative outcome that the post-truth champions is indeed the marginalization of silence: mere bubbles and wind in the deep seas.

In the Pripyat local executive committee meeting, Comrade Zharkov efficiently portrays the soviet union's strategy of Engineered Silence. “When the people ask questions that are not in their own best interest, they should simply be told to keep their minds on their labor and to leave matters of the State to the State.”

During that time, it was fine to withhold information. At one moment, the minister of coal industries says that “They didn't tell me, because I don't need to know. Do you need to know? Or have you heard enough?”

Nobody expected anything more from such a totalitarian government system. But that's not possible today. people demand information and they are well aware of their right to information. That is why the recent obsession of reporters and other public broadcasters and the rest of the media with "breaking news" stories about "fake news," "alternative facts" and "missing evidence" is so dangerously misleading.

A fascination with breaking news unwittingly transforms them into a post-truth poodle, and a silence about less pressing and less apparent problems, wider structural trends, "slower" episodes marked by punctuated loops.

Rewarding post-truth as a type of combative legislative issues wearing a layer of numerous hues, as a bricolage of untruths, horseplay, and quiet, urges us to get a handle on its vaudeville quality. Be that as it may, post-truth is something more than diversion, or the "specialty of invention" or "tyranny of duplicity" controlled by creation and inactive utilization of items. While the ancestry of post-truth is mostly detectable to the universe of corporate publicizing and showcase driven amusement, it holds intensive political characteristics. The post-truth wonders capacities as a cutting-edge weapon of political control in the possession of the ground-breaking, or those set on ascending the stepping stools of control over others.

Post-truth isn't only about winning decisions, coexisting with companions, or drawing in with political opponents. It gives progressively vile ramifications. It is a gaslighting exercise.

Gaslighting is typically a favored deceptive and aggressive mindset technique with the intention of disorienting and destabilizing individuals, whatever it takes to gain and sustain a position of dominance over anyone. We try to manipulate people's self-doubts, to destroy

their opportunity to see the future negatively, to weaken their capacity to make decisions, to push them backwards. Durable to application. When this happens, the victims of gaslighting no longer trust their own judgments. We give into the manipulator 's strategies. This is the moment when the truth becomes futile in the post-truth era.

The worst and most poignant scenes in Chernobyl are embedded in the helplessness of people after years of authoritarian rule. The fourth episode, named 'The Happiness of All Mankind,' begins with an elderly lady milking her cow as a Soviet officer asks her to evacuate.

Many years of falsehoods weigh vigorously on her. "No," she says, over and again. after a long lifetime that included narrow escapes with Bolshevik progressives, German officers, and Stalin's starvations, each carrying their own deceives her doorstep. For what reason should she accept the state is paying special attention to her benefit or life now? There will consistently be "more warriors, more starvation, more bodies. "Ultimately, her dairy animals get the shot.

The trooper is right, obviously, that she ought to evacuate to spare her life, yet the elderly person—like Dyatlov, and like such huge numbers of her comrades—is worn out by the absence of truth for so long.

This makes us ask the Question-What renders the post-truth unique from that of the past? The meandering discourse is intended to entrap and seduce, which is why post-truth opponents emit warnings and send out stern alerts about the harmful attractions of the vaudeville display of democratic disingenuousness, deception, buffooning and secrecy.

Post-truth contentions are regularly fiery, loud, and set in high moral tones. Post-truth is said to be the start of the finish of current politics as it remains in existing democracies.

There is discussion of a rising "post-truth era. "More than a couple of pundits cautioned that the spread of post-truth is the harbinger of another "despotism." Essentially sprang from old despotism. Others talk about populist autocracy or "fascism- lit" government.

The sketchy portrayals show small comprehension of the verifiable inceptions of the present float towards the government by gaslighting. Politics as the art of obfuscation, turmoil, and designed public silence really isn't new. Lying in governmental issues is an old craftsmanship. Think about Plato's "noble lie "or on the other hand Machiavelli's proposal that a successful ruler must be "a great pretender and dissembler."

Advanced converging of text, sound, and picture, the development of modest replicating, and the expanding simplicity of arranged information spreading across tremendous separations progressively are amazing drivers of post-truth debauchery.

Creative methods and devices of correspondence are its states of probability; they empower its creation, quick course and retention into the body legislative issues of majority rules systems, and well past the politics of invisibility that was and is at work at the Chernobyl successfully hid the truth of horror of Chernobyl from their people and the world. They used all the post-truth strategies in their arsenal to keep it going. They created a truth and propagated it vehemently and succeeded at it. That is why we will never know the actual human cost of Chernobyl.

Conclusion

“Post-truth is a reliance on assertions that "feel true" but have no basis in fact.”

(The Economist, 2016)

The combined effect of the lack of care whether the world would facilitate their assertions and the apparently complete lack of negative response to these false statements has led many to believe that there is a phenomenon, where authoritative people "feel emboldened to try to bend reality to fit their opinions, rather than the other way around."

(McIntyre, 18)

Post-truth reflects the characteristics of politics. Reality no longer appears to be all that people think about, so decisions are embraced not on the grounds of whether they can be validated or valid, but instead on the basis of personal opinion so politics. Post-Truth politics is the name of a system in which political leaders can make a claim without respect to the world or fear of potential consequences for such claims. It defines a political environment in which sentiment and philosophy appear to have replaced reason.

Instead of denying reality and evidence as foundational and essential principles for the validity of decisions, post-truth politics is the product of a sharply polarized culture that specializes in the systematic use of political media, and is used by prominent individuals who seek to advance their self-interest. However, even though everyone accepted the points made forward here, this would not fix the issues of current society

Political leaders take their right to lie as a given, perhaps particularly when the lies are transparent."(Higgins, 2016: 9). All of it is unique: the discourse on post-truth pierces this direction. Deeply in our worldly lives, what's been generally called the private domain ceases to really be personal. It is no longer a sanctuary or a counterbalance zone, in the way (say.) It

represented a particular moment of rebellion to complete control in the age of the typewriter or in George Orwell's 1984, when Winston was nevertheless able to escape from the sight of the Big Brother to the corner table of the scribble.

The contemporary social upheaval of populism is exacerbated by the organizational decomposition of democracy, integrated with growing public dissatisfaction with politicians, political parties and "policy."

Strengthened by the inability of political institutions to respond successfully to undemocratic problems such as the influence of cross-border corporate capital, the deterioration of social disparities, and the dark money pollution of elections, opulence is proving to be a luxurious offer for politicians, groups, and governments to peddle the rhetoric of the "sovereign nation."

Instead of just being induced with lack of respect for the facts, the post-truth crisis seems to be the product of societies within a democratic structure that could be more polarized than ever before. Such cultures appear to have vastly different perceptions on how the environment works. That is the product of extensive pressure from people with some political or financial agendas, which enhances the government-existing views, and this shows the authenticity of those views, which initially had none, and the metaphysical basis of those convictions by postmodernism. Even so, whereas the conceptual risk of a political climate that is utterly disinterested in the truth seems to be absent.

In the contemporary times surviving through a pandemic, as it happens Covid-19 has become an arena of post-truth. "The mandarins who are managing this pandemic are fond of speaking of war. They don't even use war as a metaphor. They use it literally."

As the pandemic worsens, it's not just the virus itself threatens mortal life. The

corruption, cronyism, and incompetence of those in power are adding fuel to the fire. The public deserves to know more than just case counts and death tolls. Which are not accessible for the public?

There is an immense resemblance in what happened in the Soviet Union at the time and what is happening in the world at the moment. The size of the situation, the tragic effects of government indifference and the degree of human courage needed to defend ordinary people are astoundingly close. The lessons of our time, embodied in this engrossing five-hour plotline, are inexorable.

To Russian viewers, although not always knowingly, the main focus of Chernobyl may not have been the occurrences of history, but the forces of invisibility which are still at work today. Definitely, any efforts by foreign observers to tell us an edition of our collective memory is problematic and invariably result in a change of direction. Discourse of historic legitimacy. Specific attention is being paid to the extent to which external observers can avoid stereotypes, understand everyday life and the values of the main character involved or demonstrate the cognitive complexity of their relationships.

Chernobyl's more than just the expense of political lies: that obviously represents the era in which we exist in post-truth. it's also about climate change, and it's about the fact that we can't be deceived by the rules of science. That's really what occurred in the Soviet Union: A group of academics discovered a structural error in the Chernobyl reactor, but their findings were considered a state secret. At present, scientists have shown that our earth is burning up, so there's a crisis coming if we don't curb pollution. But most of the ones in charge of operating the human race — our elected officials — are ignoring the warnings, especially in America. Only last week, the Energy Department mentioned fossil fuels as "the molecules of

U.S. freedom" and, of course, Trump is preparing to withdraw the United States of America From the Paris Climate Agreement.

"To be a scientist is to be naive," notes Legasov, the protagonist of the series, in his last recording. "We are so focused on our search for truth. We fail to consider how few want us to find it. But it is always there, whether we see it or not, whether we choose to or not. The truth doesn't care about our needs or wants. ... It will lie in wait for all time."

The right-wing response to "Chernobyl" has displayed that Mazin 's point is about the United States and denial. Initially, the conservatives praised the series on what they assumed was their portrait of "leftism" hypocrisy, but situations abruptly started changing.

When Mazin stated that "Chernobyl" was, however, about the "contamination of Trump", they responded that Mazin did not understand what he was speaking about, even if he had created a plan that they had just celebrated. A very odd conversation began with Stephen King. "It's impossible to watch HBO's Chernobyl without thinking of Donald Trump,"

This connection effectively declares the connections of the post-truth era to the tragedy of Chernobyl. In Mazin's Words "Chernobyl was a failure of humans whose loyalty to (or fear of) a broken governing party overruled their sense of decency and rationality,"

The English political theorist William Davies suggests that the era of primacy of rationality over emotion that started with the scientific revolution has come to a close. "Contemporary notions of truth, scientific expertise, federal administration, experimental evidence, and progress are all legacies of the seventeenth century," Davies writes. But It has, he argues, "run around." The press is far less trustworthy than ever; mainstream politicians are marginalized or doubted; organizations of all kinds are regarded as completely disinterested in

seeking to do anything other than the maintenance of their privilege; populist politicians have grown worldwide. The results are significant social conflict and seemingly irresolvable tensions over the nature of truth.

When the world demanded answers, Soviet leadership instead chose to blame, hide its lack of preparedness, risk workers' lives, and lie about the danger. Eventually, the deception ceased at Chernobyl. Russian scientist Valery Legasov bravely blew the whistle, and a dozen other failed nuclear reactors were eventually retrofitted. Yet saying the truth cost him his life.

The closing words of Legasov strike a chord in both the Chernobyl and COVID-19 crises of contemporary times.: "Where I once would fear the cost of truth, now I only ask 'What is the cost of lies?' "The expense of deception and lies in today's world is mirrored in our lives at risk, the inept governmental reaction to the coronavirus, and our feeble democracy, which is endangered by a culture of mistruths that emanates from the federal authorities and its administration.

Chernobyl reached a crucial juncture in Soviet history just a year after Mikhail Gorbachev rose to power, pledging to overhaul the repressive authoritarian state by "glasnost" and "perestroika," transparency and restoration. But when Ukraine's reactor erupted and began spouting fatal radiation, the Soviet system quickly returned to familiar habits of selfish falsehoods, deceptions, and confidentiality.

Long time and many lives elapsed before the authorities had acknowledged a disaster, even after authorities in parts of Scandinavia started reporting alarming spikes in radiation. The first official bulletin is still a masterpiece of totalitarian understatement: "An accident has occurred at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant as one of the reactors was damaged. Measures are being taken to eliminate the consequences of the accident. Aid is being given to those

affected. A government commission has been set up."

People understood enough to read between the lines: "commission," "measures are still being taken" and the trepidation of all the disaster. People recognized that their existences were in jeopardy, and that anxiety exceeded the worries by which the federal government implemented its power. The propaganda apparatus lost hold of the story and found itself forced to dribble out evidence and threats, even though the old practice of blaming the West managed to remain — as it does to this day — with allegations that Americans and Western Europeans were using Chernobyl to weaken Soviet legitimacy and foment a "campaign of hatred." It was weeks before Mr. Gorbachev officially acknowledged it.

In the Soviet Empire, Chernobyl turned to be a critical moment hastening the collapse of an empire which was built upon deception and secrecy. The handling of the coronavirus will also enjoy its moment of redemption, too, and the pandemic is likely to leave a deep impact on affected regions of the world, including our country. The handling of the pandemic by the world nations displays the post-truth-ness of contemporary times and vividly evokes the memories of Chernobyl.

This project is set out to analyze the notion of post-truth. Its goal was to find out whether the elements of post-truth were present in the era of Chernobyl and has Craig Mazin succeeded to demonstrate these elements through his limited series. It tried to question whether beliefs are formed based on ideology and opinion rather than based on reality and whether the notion of truth has become irrelevant in the face of a horrid catastrophe in a totalitarian regime long before the term post-truth became popular. It achieved this by first determining what truth can be taken to mean, and secondly, through looking at the origins of post-truth, analyzing the relation between post-truth the reports on Chernobyl and 'Chernobyl'

recreated by Mazin. This project looked at the official reports on the Chernobyl incident, other investigations, and research papers written on Chernobyl along with its portrayal in the HBO. His analysis has demonstrated that there is no substantial difference between the role of facts and the truth in modern politics and past politics. As long as we agree that we are living in a post-truth era where truth is what is satisfactory and not the factual evidence, we need to acknowledge that these elements of post-truth were already in play even before the gulf war (which is treated as the origin point of the post-truth era) and present in 1986 during the Chernobyl nuclear catastrophe.

Works Cited

Adams, Sam. "The Creator of Chernobyl on Viewers Taking Away the Wrong Lessons." *Slate Magazine*, Slate, 4 June 2019, slate.com/culture/2019/06/chernobyl-finale-hbo-miniseries-craig-mazin-interview.html.

Aristotle. *Aristotle Metaphysics*. Clarendon Press, 1994.

Asmolov, Gregory. "How HBO's Miniseries Showed Russia's Facebook Generation That They Too Are Children of Chernobyl." *OpenDemocracy*, 28 June 2019, www.opendemocracy.net/en/odr/chernobyl-communication-crisis-en/.

Boehm, Eric. "Chernobyl Is About What Happens When Citizens Believe Telling the Truth Is Futile." *Reason.com*, Reason, 3 June 2019, reason.com/2019/06/02/chernobyl-is-about-what-happens-when-citizens-believe-telling-the-truth-is-futile/.

Chernobyl | Chernobyl Accident | Chernobyl Disaster - World Nuclear Association, Apr. 2020, www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/chernobyl-accident.aspx.

DAncona, Matthew. *Post-Truth: the New War on Truth and How to Fight Back*. Ebury Press, 2017.

Gasset José Ortega y. *Man and People: Authorized Translation from the Spanish*. Allen & Unwin, 1959.

Herbert, Roy. "Chernobyl Disaster: How the Soviet Union's Cover Story Was Blown." *New Scientist*, 23 Apr. 1987, www.newscientist.com/article/2201677-chernobyl-disaster-how-the-soviet-unions-cover-story-was-blown/.

Higgins, Kathleen. "Post-Truth: a Guide for the Perplexed." *Nature*, vol. 540, no. 7631, 2016, pp. 9–9., doi:10.1038/540009a.

Keane, John. "Post-Truth Politics and Why the Antidote Isn't Simply 'Fact-Checking' and Truth." *The Conversation*, 29 Aug. 2019, theconversation.com/post-truth-politics-and-why-the-antidote-isnt-simply-fact-checking-and-truth-87364.

Keyes, Ralph. *The Post-Truth Era Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life*. St. Martins Press, 2004.

Kuchinskaya, Olga. *The Politics of Invisibility: Public Knowledge about Radiation Health Effects after Chernobyl*. MIT Press, 2014.

Maass, Peter. "What the Horror of 'Chernobyl' Reveals About the Deceit of the Trump Era." *The Intercept*, 5 June 2019, theintercept.com/2019/06/05/what-the-horror-of-chernobyl-reveals-about-the-deceit-of-the-trump-era/?comments=1.

McIntyre, Lee C. *Post-Truth*. The MIT Press, 2018.

Mohler, R. Albert. *Culture Shift: the Battle for the Moral Heart of America*. Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, 2011.

"Oxford Word of the Year 2016: Oxford Languages." *Home*, languages.oup.com/word-of-the-year/2016/.

Roy, Arundhati. "Arundhati Roy: 'The Pandemic Is a Portal': Free to Read ." *Financial Times*, 3 Apr. 2020, www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fe-fcd274e920ca.

Television. "HBO's 'Chernobyl' Drives Home The Deadly Perils Of Statism." *The Federalist*, 30 May 2019, thefederalist.com/2019/05/24/hbos-chernobyl-drives-home-deadly-perils-statism/.

Towhey, Jessica R. "Will HBO's 'Chernobyl' Miniseries Impact Perceptions of Nuclear Power?" *InsideSources*, 24 June 2019, www.insidesources.com/will-hbos-chernobyl-miniseries-impact-perceptions-of-nuclear-power/.

Wendland-Liu, Joel. "HBO's 'Chernobyl': Writer Craig Mazin's Imploding Ideological Superstructure." *People's World*, 31 July 2019, www.peoplesworld.org/article/hbos-chernobyl-writer-craig-mazins-imploding-ideological-superstructure/.

"Will HBO's 'Chernobyl' Miniseries Impact Perceptions of Nuclear Power?" *InsideSources*, 24 June 2019, www.insidesources.com/will-hbos-chernobyl-miniseries-impact-perceptions-of-nuclear-power/.

Willsher, Kim. "The Truth about Chernobyl? I Saw It with My Own Eyes..." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 16 June 2019, www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/jun/16/chernobyl-was-even-worse-than-tv-series-kim-willsher.

Zimdars, Melissa, and Kembrew McLeod. *Fake News: Understanding Media and Misinformation in the Digital Age*. The MIT Press, 2020.