



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



Episode 11: Political & Economic Interests Behind Climate Disinformation | Conversation with Jennie King at ISD

Procurement notices, funding, and grants to opportunities, lists of potential partners, insights into market trends, databases of development professionals, webinars, latest news, and much more. Stay informed and connected. Visit developmentaid.org today.

Hisham Allam

Hello, everyone. Welcome to DevelopmentAid Dialogues. I'm your host, Hisham Alam. Today, we delve into the critical issue of climate disinformation, a silent weapon that undermines the global efforts to address the climate crisis. Our guest today is Jennie King, Director of Climate Disinformation Research and Policy at the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, ISD. Jennie, welcome to the podcast. It's an honor to have you here.

Jennie King

Thank you so much for inviting me and letting me speak about this topic about which I am very passionate.

Hisham Allam

Thank you. It's our pleasure. Jennie, let's start by explaining the term climate disinformation. How does it differ from outright climate denial? And what variations do we see across different regions of the world?

Jennie King

Absolutely. Very important when you're talking about a problem to have a clear set of parameters of what we mean and why it matters. And I think the first thing to say is the distinction between misinformation and disinformation, both of which can pose a real threat to public discourse. And really, we need to pay attention to, but which vary in very important ways. And really the critical distinction there is that disinformation has intent behind it. So, there is an actor who has a willful desire to mislead the public in some form via content. And that could be, you know, speech, it could be written text, it could be images, doesn't matter.

Misinformation may well contain exactly the same kind of information, but it is shared unwittingly. So, there is no active desire to mislead. And I'm sure that all of us at one point in time will have been, you know, guilty of sharing something potentially without checking the sources or reading it properly.

And we might've had a genuine desire to inform people or to show intellectual curiosity, but actually the things that we shared were not accurate, and that is misinformation. And both of these are currently playing out when it comes to climate



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



and environmental topics. And in the work that ISD has done, and that indeed we have coordinated with our coalition climate action against disinformation, we found it very useful to think about the problem under three pillars of content.

The first is what you might call your kind of traditional climate denialism. And ultimately, these are claims that reject in some form, the fundamental data and evidence that we have about the climate crisis. So that includes the reality that climate change is happening at all. So, you know, the fact that temperatures are getting hotter, the fact that, um, there are more extreme weather events that are being exacerbated by climate change, the fact that we're seeing greater frequency and severity of natural disasters, you know, all of this form of environmental degradation is happening.

They also reject the idea that there is any sort of link between human activity and these phenomena, and particularly the link between fossil fuel emissions and climate change. And then alongside those things, there is also a kind of denial, um, or a refusal to believe that we need any kind of corresponding urgent action to meet the scale of this particular crisis.

And that kind of content is by no means new. It has been circulating really as long as we have known about climate change, going all the way back to the 1970s. And there have been billions of dollars invested, often by corporate actors, to try and create a fundamental misperception and confusion among the general public about that fundamental reality.

But that is by no means the only game in town and really the information landscape has evolved a huge amount in the past sort of 50 to 60 years. So, column two is a little bit more nuanced and this is content that is undermining in really profound ways. What scientific evidence is showing us. So it might cherry pick data.

It might remove data and evidence from its context in order to draw the wrong conclusions. It might also try to discredit the institutions and the experts that are leading our understanding of climate science. And so fundamentally it's trying to do something quite similar, which is to weaken trust and sort of the public mandate for having an evidence-based approach to the climate crisis. And then the third column is often the kind of trickiest, um, not only to understand, but also to, to challenge and to expose, and we call this content things that broadly seem to be supportive of climate action.

So, you know, not denying the climate crisis, but that are putting forward ideas which are actually in direct opposition to the scientific consensus. So that might include greenwashing, you know, claiming things that are sustainable, claiming things that are eco-friendly, applying labels like green when in fact they are polluting or in fact they are not contributing to the climate crisis, and it also includes the kind of false solutions lobby. So, people who are claiming that things are going to be game changing and are going to solve all of our problems, when in fact they're not dealing with some of those massive structural systemic problems that science tells us we really need to tackle if we're going to make meaningful progress in the years to come.

Hisham Allam

I didn't expect that it would be classified in this sophisticated way, and I think our audience also will be interested to know more about this. Now I would like to get information about the discourse of delay as a tactic to slow down climate action. Can you explain how this strategy works and why it can be so effective?



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



Jennie King

Absolutely. You know, as I said, the world has changed a lot since the 1970s and although for years, the disinformation campaign to convince the public that the climate crisis wasn't happening was very successful. Ultimately, that battle was lost. And if you look at most countries around the world, there is now a basic consensus that the problem exists and that we need to do something about it.

But that doesn't mean that we have the kind of ambitious legislative agendas and climate action on the table that is actually going to solve the crisis in this, you know, limited, yeah.

Hisham Allam

But why is the battle lost?

Jennie King

Well, I think in large part, it became a lot harder to make that argument because people could really see the lived reality of climate change playing out in their communities. It was much harder to deny the problem was happening when you know, the impacts of climate change were not being felt quite so directly in people's everyday lives, but it is now the case that really billions of people around the world are experiencing unprecedented droughts, heat waves, natural disasters, extreme weather, having limited drinking water, you know, resource scarcity, all of these things, which are ultimately stemming from the climate crisis.

And that has meant that, that the public conversation shifted and that actually we were able to embed that very basic understanding that this was a problem, that the scientific data was absolutely unequivocal, you know, 99 percent of the scientific community in agreement about the reality of the problem and that we therefore needed to do something. And as a result, all of those, you know, bad actors or people with vested interests who want to maintain the status quo, right, they want to keep us reliant on the carbon economy. They don't want to change those fundamental systems that drive our economies and our societies. They had to pivot their tactics and they had to direct their information warfare and their public influence campaigns in a completely different way.

And as a result, you saw all of these groups that have a lot of money and a lot of capacity behind them, shifting from that old school form of climate denialism into these much subtler, what we often call discourses of delay. And I think the best way to understand that is that there is a massive gap that exists between understanding a problem, and actually doing something about that problem and that gap is extremely vulnerable to information warfare to lobbying to, you know, malign activity from people that don't want to see policy passed. That don't want to see climate action taking place. And the reason why it's so successful is because you can mask it in a lot of language and vocabulary that feels really resonant to everyday people who maybe don't understand the incredibly complex scientific technicalities of climate science and climate solutions.

And I think that there are. Again, I'm not coming back to everything being defined by pillars, but there are four sort of key pillars of discourses of delay that have not only proven very effective, but where there has been huge sort of coordinated



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



efforts, in context across the globe. And they are redirecting responsibility. Pushing non transformative solutions, emphasizing the downsides of the transition. So, you know, all of the negative aspects of decarbonization and net zero, and then surrendering. So, saying that it's too late, that the problem is too big for us to solve. And if you want to have an even shorter version of those four pillars, you might say, not me.

Not like this, not now, and too late. And all of these tactics are basically trying to create the impression that the transition to a greener and more livable future is fundamentally unachievable, for whatever reason. Because it's not our problem, because it's too expensive, because it's too disruptive, because we don't have the right technology.

And that what you end up with is complete paralysis and inertia in the system. And you're never able to build the kind of momentum and public mandate that is needed for governments and for multilateral bodies to take action.

Hisham Allam

Who is benefiting from this delay?

Jennie King

Well, a number of people, I mean, there are many who have financial stakes in maintaining the carbon economy, right? Global oil and gas companies, polluting industries who are going to have to fundamentally challenge their business model if we're going to achieve the kinds of goals that are contained within the Paris Agreement. So, you know, there are lots of people for whom green transition poses a kind of existential threat to their ability to make profit. But also, what we're seeing now is that actually the number of people who stand to benefit from spreading climate mis and disinformation has really expanded in recent years. And that's because debates around the climate crisis have been co-opted into what we often call the culture wars. So, they are seeing it increasingly as being a polarized set of issues with tribes and, you know, differing opinions across the political spectrum.

And so now it's not just oil and gas companies who might see a benefit in confusing the public about the climate crisis. There are also people who are using this public debate to weaken faith in democratic systems. So, to say, you know, the climate agenda is actually just a way of stripping you of your freedoms and, you know, consolidating power within governments or within shadowy elites and making sure that you have no control over your lives.

So, it's not just a financial incentive, but there are now political and ideological and personal incentives for spreading this kind of content.

Hisham Allam

This immediately leads me to the next question. How does climate disinformation especially affect developing countries? Or vulnerable communities.



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



Jennie King

Well, at a very, you know, crucial level, if the global community is sort of stuck in this quagmire of mis and disinformation and is unable to proceed with really strong climate agendas and legislation and policy, then developing countries who are often at the forefront of the climate crisis are going to see those kinds of impacts worsen in the years to come.

And, you know, if you just look at the flooding in Bangladesh or droughts in sub-Saharan Africa, or, you know, many other places around the world, that is already a very present reality. And the longer that the world is delayed in making those substantial changes and putting in effective mitigation and adaptation strategies, the more that billions of people in less economically developed countries are going to suffer the consequences of that inaction.

I would also say that many of those countries contain natural resources, which are considered to be very strategically important for actors in the international community and as a result they often end up being the targets of information warfare coming from state actors so you know if you look at areas of sub-Saharan Africa that contain you know critical rare earth minerals or that still have untapped fossil fuels there is clearly a trade incentive for a number of states around the globe to convince the public that we should extract those resources, that we should, you know, maintain the carbon economy, that that's essential for human development, and as a result, they are going to flood the information space in those areas with misleading claims, anti-scientific claims, etc. So, I would say they're sort of, they're a key battleground, both on the information front, but also in experiencing the really severe realities of what the climate crisis looks like and what inaction means in practice.

Hisham Allam

While conducting research, which covers climate disinformation campaigns worldwide, have you identified any common themes or messages that pop up frequently?

Jennie King

Absolutely. And obviously these will vary by context. And I would say that there is a difference broadly within a number of contexts in the geographic global North or global majority countries.

Hisham Allam

Like one, give us some examples.

Jennie King

Yes, sure. So, I mean, one really common theme that we've seen is this idea that climate action as a whole is somehow anti-democratic. So, the idea that net zero sits on the opposite side of the table from human rights or from human development, or from individual agency, from, you know, enfranchisement, et cetera.



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



Um, and so rather than actually looking at the specifics of climate policy and having, you know, good faith debate about whether those are good ideas and what kind of impacts they're going to have as a community, you end up with these really sensational top line arguments, which say, you know, net zero is a global plot to enslave the public and you know, that is a really overarching conspiracy that has resonance in many contexts around the globe, and it will spiral out into lots of different local examples so that, you know, it will translate into pushback against a traffic reduction scheme or a, you know, efforts to clean up air pollution or, you know, a policy to try and incentivize the purchase of electric vehicles, you will always see the opposition movement coming back to this fundamental idea that governments or elites are trying to take away the things that you love and that they are prioritizing climate change over your wellbeing and your agency and your future. So that is one very kind of common thread that provides connective tissue among lots of different countries and across borders.

On the opposite side, you are also seeing, a growing movement in some global majority countries that claim that net zero agendas or, you know, even the Paris Agreement are fundamentally neo colonial or forms of Western imperialism, so that they are reproducing the kind of historical inequalities that were so common during the colonial era.

Hisham Allam

You mean in Africa?

Jennie King

And that have prevented, yeah, in Africa, particularly, but also in parts of South Asia, and that, you know, by inverted commas, denying countries the ability to use fossil fuels and to build their economies, that the climate movement is trying to keep them in a position of dependence on the West, and that it wants to stop people from, you know, being able to flourish and reach their full potential.

Hisham Allam

Sorry for the interruption. Do you think that these beliefs of denial come from the people themselves, or who are believing in the conspiracy theory, or it came from politicians, decision makers, who don't want to follow, the net zero, the green, perspectives. So, they are trying to convince their people that, don't believe these guys, we are okay, and this is the West who is trying to force us to follow their agenda.

Jennie King

I definitely think that there are geopolitical and ideological goals here, and that there are definitely a number of actors who are deliberately spreading these messages for exactly the reason that you've said, that they don't want to pursue a transition. They want to maintain reliance on, let's say, oil and gas and coal. And so you do see sort of coordinated, orchestrated influence campaigns that are trying to spread those messages. And what's very interesting in the case of, let's



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



say areas in sub-Saharan Africa, is that the kind of people who are making the argument that, you know, net zero is anti-human rights.

Some of them are coming from within the region. And they might be lobbyists for the fossil fuel industry, but actually a lot of them are also coming from the US and are affiliated with the fossil fuel industry. So, there is a kind of transnational effort to slow down progress and to embed in context specific ways, a fundamental mistrust of our transition to a more sustainable and livable future.

Hisham Allam

Do you agree that this spread of climate disinformation can significantly impact elections and policy decisions?

Jennie King

So, one thing that I would caution against is trying to neatly translate exposure to misinformation with voter behavior. So, it's very difficult to kind of to quantify the link between, you know, people have seen this conspiracy theory and maybe even believe this conspiracy theory.

And as a direct result, they are voting for X or Y party in the ballot box. I'm not sure that it's quite as neat a situation as that. And I would be very, very hesitant to try and draw those really, explicit causal links. What you can absolutely see, and we have, you know, scores, tens, hundreds of examples from different places around the world is the way that it has frustrated efforts to pass policy and, in some cases, has spilled out into actual, you know, real, um, observable harms.

And one really good example would be, um, the hostility around 15-minute cities, which, you know, really hit a kind of fever pitch in 2022 and 2023. And at its basic level, 15-minute cities are a really simple idea around urban planning, which says that people should live within a 15-minute walk of public services.

So, you should be able to access, you know, a doctor and a school and a park and leisure activities within walking distance of your house. And yes, there are environmental reasons for that because it reduces people's need to use cars, but actually also there's really important public health benefits and wellbeing benefits.

And it's an idea which has existed for quite a long time and been implemented in major cities like Paris with pretty much success and opposition from the public. But suddenly there was an effort to introduce something similar to 15-minute cities in a part of the UK, a city called Oxford.

And suddenly it became this lightning rod for not only the British. Conspiracy theorists and right-wing movements and, and those opposing climate action, but also for people all around the globe to use this as an example of the ways that the government is trying to, you know, change your quality of life and they took the idea of 15-minute cities, and perverted it, warped it, distorted it into the idea that it was about 15-minute prisons, that you weren't going to be able to leave defined zones, and you were going to be kept within your local area, and unable to have freedom of movement, and unable to have freedom of choice. And suddenly, you saw an opposition movement cropping up in context from Brazil to Australia to France to Germany to the UK to Canada and suddenly it was at the forefront of the news cycle and, policy makers were



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



really unprepared to deal with that level of mainstreaming of these really quite extreme and completely unsubstantiated conspiracy theories.

Hisham Allam

So, do you have in mind plans to prepare the policy makers to face this kind of mainstream wave?

Jennie King

In part, I think that there really needs to be a far more sophisticated and embedded understanding of how people's mistrust in government is going to make climate action more difficult and therefore how absolutely essential it is to have built in processes for public consultation and deliberation and genuine kind of dialogue with local residents or with citizens before you try to implement these really big policy agendas.

And I think not enough of that has happened and you are seeing now some really interesting models around climate assemblies or citizens assemblies or deliberative publics, that are trying to kind of change the way that we do decision making and policy making, but there is still an enormous way to go in policy makers understanding that people really have lost faith in the ability of systems to deliver change that benefit them and that that is your starting point that is the context that you're working with and if you are not considering at every stage of the process how you are going to generate buy in how you are going to explain to the public what these policies mean and also how you were going to listen meaningfully to their fears and grievances and concerns about those plans. That they are always going to be vulnerable to attack from bad actors and potentially from extremist movements.

Hisham Allam

Totally agree. Social media platforms also have become breeding backgrounds for misinformation. How do these platforms contribute to the spread of climate disinformation?

Jennie King

It's really interesting what we're seeing happen in the social media space. I've talked a lot about the carbon economy. So, people who are stakeholders in maintaining the status quo and continuing our reliance on fossil fuels. When it comes to the digital space, you then see stakeholders in the attention economy. And what I mean by that is people who have made a business model, who've made a kind of profession out of generating engagement online. So, they make money off of your likes, your clicks, your comments, your retweets, your buying of merchandise, your subscriptions, your followership, et cetera. And what we've seen play out over the last kind of 10 to 15 years is a really perverse incentive structure where the things that gain the most attention and engagement online are often the most polarizing, misinformative, hateful, sometimes extremist, sometimes violent. And what that means is that more and more people have been brought into this space where they are actively spreading misinformation in order to generate profit. And so you see this collision between the kind of traditional fossil fuel actors, the professional disinformation lobby, and these new decentralized sort of



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



entrepreneurial influencers in the online space who have weaponized climate because it's a way of gaining visibility and getting followers and ultimately that they are able to generate a profit out of that process.

Hisham Allam

As a co-founder of Climate Action Against Disinformation, could you elaborate on CAD's mission and highlight significant achievements in combating climate disinformation?

Jennie King

Absolutely. So, Climate Action Against Disinformation has existed for around three years and it is an alliance of over 50 organizations worldwide, a real spectrum of different types of organizations, those who are on the forefront of climate policy and action like Friends of the Earth or Greenpeace, organizations like ISD who really specialize in understanding the information space and threats to democracy, organizations who are much more interested in community engagement and outreach and potentially working with kind of vulnerable or underserved communities.

But what we are all united by is an understanding that misinformation is a direct threat to achieving climate action. And that if we do not tackle the information crisis, we are going to be in a much worse position trying to tackle the climate crisis. And so a large part of what we're doing is trying to, A, coordinate an evidence base so that we really understand the threat landscape and how it is translating into negative outcomes.

And then that we are coming up with meaningful and concrete solutions, sometimes for policymakers and for regulators, but also for those who are working at the grassroots. And I think that, you know, you can summarize this in two ways. On the one hand, we are trying to reduce the impact of bad actors on public life.

So make it less profitable to spread mis and disinformation, to expose the tactics and the narratives that they are using to make sure that they are not being platformed by mainstream media.

Hisham Allam

Can you give some examples just to make it more, uh, imaginable.

Jennie King

Yeah, yeah, absolutely. So, for example, we have put together big reports that track the evolution in narratives around really key public policy issues. And as a result, that translates into partly, making sure that the public has a much better awareness of how people are trying to influence them and what their wider agenda is. So the fact that, you know, this isn't just innocent information, it's coming from lobbyists, from the fossil fuel industry, and also that that can translate into new forms of regulation.



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



So we have seen a massive tightening of criteria around what you are allowed to say in advertising and what you are allowed to claim is sustainable or green and there is a much greater kind of accountability, structure and a lot more scrutiny taking place against corporate actors to make sure that they are not misleading the public in their marketing and PR.

And a lot of that has come from research like this CAB research that is showing sort of the amount of money that they are putting into lobbying activity in order to create confusion about the climate crisis and climate solutions. So, you know, part of it is that side of things, exposing bad actors, making misinformation unsustainable.

But then the other side of the equation is making pro climate communications better and stronger. So, you know, how can we really engage people meaningfully with climate science? How can we translate this incredibly complex and technical landscape into something that is digestible for everyday people who maybe have two minutes a day to try and understand the news and absorb what's going on? How can we talk in more constructive ways with the general public to build policy platforms and climate responses? Yeah, so that's, so it's like those two different sides, weaken the bad and improve the good.

Hisham Allam

What are some effective strategies to counter it? And how can we make sure that science-based information wins?

Jennie King

I think you need to view it as both a supply and demand side problem. So, it's not just the case that there are lots of people who are trying to spread misinformation. There is also a really obvious reality that people are receptive to these ideas and they're receptive because they don't feel like they're being listened to, and they don't feel like they're being heard by governments, by political systems. So, one of the things that you can do is create those models for public engagement and really get down to the community level and think about the climate crisis at a hyper local scale. So not this big, international problem.

What does this mean for a specific community? And how can you create better mechanisms for dialogue between, let's say, a local councilor or municipal authorities and their residents when it comes to tackling the climate crisis? The other is something that's called inoculation, which is basically pre warning people around the kinds of misinformation that they are likely to encounter when they are browsing their news feeds or looking at legacy media so that they understand the format and the objectives of that misinformation and that they are more resilient to identifying it and then maybe checking sources or sort of seeking out more credible information in order to form their opinion.

So, there is a lot of work that's happening now in experimenting with models for inoculation, both online and offline. I think there's a lot of work that can be done and that CAD has already done in improving the literacy of newsrooms. So do reporters, and journalists and editors in understanding the ways that they are also being manipulated by bad actors and that they are giving oxygen often to misinformation without intending to, and making sure that they can kind of improve the types of reporting that they're sharing with the public on the climate crisis.



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



So, there's a whole range of different types of activity that target different audiences and really use all of the mechanisms that we have at our disposal to try and improve the information landscape.

Hisham Allam

Media literacy is critical for people to evaluate information, how can we better equip people to tell facts from fiction about climate change?

Jennie King

I think, you know, some of the solutions to this are simpler than we and one of them is that we all operate too fast a pace in the online environment. So one of the biggest pieces of advice that I give to people, and I used to work in education ISD, I wrote curricula for schools around online harms.

And when you get down to the fundamentals of media and digital literacy, a lot of it is about understanding your emotional relationship to content and the fact that we are all consuming things at kind of hyper speed and that our brains are just not built in a way that we can process and navigate information effectively at that kind of pace.

And so I always say to people, try and introduce friction into your online experience. And what I mean by that is to increase the gap that exists between you coming across a piece of content and you doing something with that content, whether it's sharing it or commenting on it or screenshotting it or getting angry about it, just take a breath and try and ask yourself some basic questions about the content.

Where is it coming from? What might the intention be? Can I verify the sources? Is it backed up by other sources by other credible sources? And also, is it eliciting a really strong emotional reaction in me, positive or negative? Because if it is, maybe it's the case that somebody is trying to manipulate me.

They are trying to cause outrage. They are trying to provoke anger. They are trying to, you know, breed controversy and division. So partly it's about interrogating the information itself, but also, it's about being a lot more self-reflective on our responses to content and how that might indicate that things are, you know, misinformative or disinformative.

Hisham Allam

So, you rely on the fact checking process on the newsrooms or on the audience themselves

Jennie King

I don't think it's an either-or situation. Um, fact checking is never going to be able to deal with the scale of information that exists in the public domain. And I think it is a massive mistake to try and say to fact checkers who are already incredibly overwhelmed that they have the responsibility for creating a healthy information environment.



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



All of us have a responsibility to you know, think critically about the information that we are given and to try and, try and have well informed opinions that are based in evidence and I absolutely agree that that is really difficult in an information space that is so noisy and so saturated, but there are you know, tons of scientific bodies and expert bodies that are working hard to try and create digestible forms of communication about the climate crisis. And so, I don't think that we lack good information, but it's about trying to weed out the noise, quiet down the noise. And rather than consuming more information, consume information more strategically, and with kind of more deliberation and intention behind it.

Hisham Allam

How can we encourage social media platforms like TikTok, X, Facebook, Instagram to take a more proactive role in competing climate disinformation?

Jennie King

Think it has to be a combination of some sort of public pressure. So reputational risk, and then also regulation that creates financial and political risk. So that's both a top down and a bottom-up approach. Fundamentally, social media platforms are reliant on users. We are their business model. If we stop browsing, then they stop making profit. And so, we do have some leverage and some power in influencing the bigger decisions and the direction of travel that companies are making if we say we are not willing to tolerate, for example, hate speech or, you know, terrorist content or climate, mis and disinformation at the same time I think that regulation is absolutely essential to create the enabling environment for better scrutiny and accountability of the private sector and one of the things that regulation is doing at the moment, for example, that the Digital Services Act in the EU is saying we need an assessment from every company, you know, the biggest companies in the world about what kind of risks exist on your services and products.

And we also want to see credible plans for how you are going to mitigate those risks. And at the moment, we have really lacked that kind of transparency. A lot of what is taking place in companies has happened behind the scenes. And really feels very opaque to the general public. So, we're trying to open up some of those systems to understand why information flows in the way that it is?

Are we creating the right incentives within these platforms for proper evidence? You know, good faith debate, genuine dialogue, or as is the case right now, are we creating perverse incentives that are built around outrage and division and controversy? And I think one of the kinds of easiest or quickest wins that we could achieve, one of the policy levers that we really need to press on is around demonetizing mis and disinformation.

So, making it so that it is very, very difficult and much harder than right now to make money off of spreading that kind of false and misleading content in the online space. So, remove advertising revenue, stop people from merchandising that kind of content. And once you take away that profit motive, I think you will see that a lot of actors drop away from this space and, and decide to pursue other types of activity.



DevelopmentAid Dialogues



Hisham Allam

Thank you, Jennie! As we conclude our discussion, what final thoughts or advise would you offer to our listeners who are passionate about competing climate disinformation and promoting environmental awareness?

Jennie King

I would encourage you to look at the work of ISD at www.isdglobal.org, and also of the coalition at <https://caad.info/>

But equally, the final point I would like to leave is that this is a solvable issue, it is very easy to feel like all is lost and the information space has just become too toxic and too divided. But when I started working on this issue five years ago, it was barely being discussed. And now it is a real agenda item in governments in multilateral bodies among climate organizations, among policy makers and regulators. So we have achieved an enormous amount of momentum and forward progress even in that very small window and that does feel me with hope that we are going to move forward and implement some really meaningful responses that help us to create the kind of environment for climate action going forward.

Hisham Allam

Jennie King a dedicated advocate in the fight against climate disinformation. Stay tuned for another enlightening conversation on DevelopmentAid Dialogues next time. This is your host Hisham Allam signing off.