

# UNIVERSA

## International Journal of Socio-legal, Economics, Science and Educational Technology

Volume 1, Issue 1, January 2026



### Rethinking Scientific Authority in the Post-Truth Era: A Gadamerian Perspective

*Menimbang Ulang Otoritas Keilmuan di Era Post-Truth: Perspektif  
Gadamerian*

Muhamad Barqi Asila\*<sup>1</sup>

Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta, Indonesia <sup>1</sup>

\*Corresponding Author: [23105010027@student.uin-suka.ac.id](mailto:23105010027@student.uin-suka.ac.id)

Submitted : 21 April 2026

Revision : 28 April 2026

Accepted : 5 May 2026

#### Abstract

This article reexamines the crisis of scientific authority in the post-truth era through Hans-Georg Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics. It argues that the erosion of trust in science is not merely driven by misinformation, but by a deeper hermeneutical gap between scientific rationality and historically situated public understanding. Drawing on Gadamer's concepts of prejudice (*Vorurteil*), tradition, and the fusion of horizons, the study employs a historical-critical library approach to analyze how Enlightenment objectivism contributed to the marginalization of tradition in knowledge formation. The findings suggest that scientific authority cannot rely solely on methodological objectivity, but must be grounded in dialogical recognition (*Anerkennung*) and interpretive engagement with societal contexts. By integrating insights from critical theory and contemporary post-truth discourse, this paper proposes a reconfiguration of scientific authority as reflexive, dialogical, and historically aware, offering a conceptual foundation for more inclusive science communication and hermeneutic-based education.

**Keywords:** Hermeneutics; Gadamer; Post-Truth; Scientific Authority; Tradition

#### Abstrak

Artikel ini meninjau kembali krisis otoritas keilmuan di era post-truth melalui hermeneutika filosofis Hans-Georg Gadamer. Studi ini berargumen bahwa erosi kepercayaan terhadap ilmu pengetahuan tidak semata disebabkan oleh misinformasi, tetapi oleh kesenjangan hermeneutik antara rasionalitas ilmiah dan pemahaman publik yang bersifat historis. Dengan menggunakan konsep prasangka (*Vorurteil*), tradisi, dan peleburan cakrawala, penelitian ini menerapkan metode studi kepustakaan dengan pendekatan historis-kritis untuk menganalisis bagaimana objektivisme Pencerahan memarginalkan peran tradisi dalam pembentukan pengetahuan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa otoritas keilmuan tidak dapat hanya bergantung pada objektivitas metodologis, tetapi perlu didasarkan pada pengakuan dialogis (*Anerkennung*) dan keterlibatan interpretatif dengan konteks sosial. Dengan mengintegrasikan perspektif teori kritis dan diskursus post-truth, artikel ini menawarkan rekonfigurasi otoritas keilmuan yang reflektif, dialogis, dan sadar historis.

**Kata Kunci:** Hermeneutika; Gadamer; Post-Truth; Otoritas Keilmuan; Tradisi



Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike (CC BY-SA): This work is licensed under a Contemporary Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>). If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must contribute under the same license as the original.

### INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Western philosophy has witnessed a significant paradigm shift in how truth is understood. While the Enlightenment (Aufklärung) elevated reason as the highest authority capable of liberating humanity from dogma and tradition, the twenty-first century is instead marked by what Oxford Dictionaries named in 2016 as the post-truth condition.<sup>1</sup> This term refers to a situation in which objective facts have less influence in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief. In this context, the authority of science, long grounded in scientific method and objectivity, is facing an unprecedented crisis of legitimacy.

This crisis is not confined to the political sphere but has also permeated academic and scientific domains. Scientific consensus on issues such as climate change, vaccination, and even historical interpretation is increasingly contested, often not based on empirical data, but through alternative narratives circulating in digital media.<sup>2</sup> This phenomenon reveals a fundamental rupture in the relationship between the knowing subject and the object of knowledge. Modern science, rooted in positivist methodology, frequently fails to engage with the historical and traditional dimensions that shape human consciousness itself.<sup>3</sup>

It is in this context that the thought of Hans-Georg Gadamer becomes highly relevant. In his major work *Truth and Method*, first published in 1960, Gadamer offers a profound critique of the dominance of scientific method in the pursuit of truth.<sup>4</sup> For Gadamer, truth in the human sciences cannot be attained through objective methods that separate the knower from the object of inquiry. Rather, understanding is an ontological event in which the interpreter is always already involved through prejudice and tradition.

The central problem lies in the Enlightenment legacy, which discredited prejudice and tradition as irrational obstacles that must be eliminated in the pursuit of pure objectivity. Gadamer challenges this assumption by arguing that prejudice is in fact the very condition that makes understanding possible. Without prejudice, there is no starting point for interpretation. In the post-truth era, the rejection of scientific authority by the public is often not a rejection of facts themselves, but a rejection of how science positions itself as an authority detached from tradition and lived human contexts.<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, this study is essential for addressing a fundamental problem in the post-truth era that is not merely epistemological but also hermeneutical. It examines how Gadamer's hermeneutics can rehabilitate the concepts of authority and tradition so that they become relevant again within a contemporary intellectual landscape marked by distrust toward scientific authority. Furthermore, this study explores the assumption that acknowledging the historical limitations of human beings, often seen as weakening objectivity, can instead serve as a new foundation for a more reflective, dialogical, and open form of scientific authority that is capable of bridging the tension between scientific rationality and lived historical experience.

- 
- 1 Palmer, R. E. (1999). *The Relevance of Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics to Thirty-Six Topics or Fields of Human Activity*. *Philosophy Today*, 44(1), 11. <http://www.Mac.edu/faculty/richardpalmer/relevance.html>
  - 2 Anisa Yurmanita. 2026. "Semiotic Analysis of Qur'anic Environmental Ethics: A Julia Kristeva Approach to Ecological Responsibility". *Dirasat Qur'aniyyah Wa Hadithiyyah* 1 (1): 21-34. <https://darulilmijournal.com/index.php/daqiyah/article/view/102>
  - 3 Abdalla Ali Morshed Mohammad Thah, and Yousef Mohammed Abdo Mohammed Al-Awadhy. 2026. "مراجعة منهجية تراثية للشبهات حول الإعجاز العلمي في القرآن الكريم". *Dirasat Qur'aniyyah Wa Hadithiyyah* 1 (1): 74-88. <https://darulilmijournal.com/index.php/daqiyah/article/view/63>
  - 4 Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*. New York: Continuum, xxv.
  - 5 Ardhes Blandhivay Leuanan. 2026. "Distorted Devotion: Cult of Personality in Indonesia: (Devosi Yang Terdistorsi: Kultus Individu Di Indonesia)". *Theosynesis: Journal of Integrative Understanding and Ethical Praxis* 2 (1): 62-71. <https://darulilmijournal.com/index.php/theosyn/article/view/137>

## Method

This study employs a qualitative approach using a library research method, focusing on the analysis of philosophical texts.<sup>6</sup> It centers on Hans-Georg Gadamer's *Truth and Method* as the main reference for examining key concepts such as prejudice, tradition, and understanding. In addition, works by scholars such as Jean Grondin, Nicholas Davey, and Jürgen Habermas are used to enrich interpretation and provide critical perspectives within contemporary philosophical discourse.

The study adopts a historical-critical approach by situating Gadamer's ideas within the broader development of modern philosophy and the context of the post-truth era. The analysis is conducted through hermeneutic interpretation, particularly by examining the relationship between parts and the whole (the hermeneutic circle) to uncover meanings relevant to current issues. Thus, this research is not merely descriptive but also analytical-critical in linking philosophical concepts to the contemporary crisis of scientific authority.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Prejudice and Tradition in Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics

To understand the relevance of Gadamer in the context of the crisis of authority, it is necessary to first clarify what is meant by philosophical hermeneutics. Unlike traditional hermeneutics, which is methodological in nature, such as biblical or legal hermeneutics aimed at correctly interpreting texts, Gadamer's hermeneutics is ontological. This means that hermeneutics is not merely a tool or method for understanding texts, but a description of how human beings exist in the world.<sup>7</sup> According to Gadamer, understanding (*verstehen*) is not a subjective activity performed by a subject upon an object. Rather, understanding is a mode of being of Dasein, that is, human existence itself. We do not perform understanding as a separate act; instead, we are always already situated within it. Every interaction with the world, with others, or with texts is inherently part of a hermeneutic process.

Jean Grondin, in his introduction to Gadamer's hermeneutics, explains that this shift from epistemology to ontology is crucial for liberating the human sciences from the dominance of natural scientific methods.<sup>8</sup> The natural sciences aim to explain phenomena through universal causal laws, whereas the human sciences aim to understand meaning embedded in human action. If the human sciences are forced to adopt the methods of the natural sciences in the name of pure objectivity, the very meaning of human experience risks being lost. In relation to scientific authority, this ontological perspective is essential. It reminds us that scientists are not detached observers, but participants within the very world they study. Claims of absolute objectivity often overlook the fact that scientists themselves are shaped by language, history, and tradition. Gadamer asserts that being that can be understood is language, implying that reality as accessed through science is always mediated by linguistic and historical conditions. There is no direct access to things in themselves without the mediation of language.

Neo Kantian legacy in Gadamer's thought argues that although Gadamer critiques method, he does not reject rationality.<sup>9</sup> Instead, Gadamer seeks to rescue rationality from being reduced to mere technical instrumentalism. Hermeneutic rationality is a form of rationality that recognizes

---

6 Mestika Zed, *Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan* (Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2008).

7 Grondin, J. (1994). *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 112.

8 Grondin, J. (1994). *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*, 125.

9 Steven Galt Crowell, "Neo-Kantianism," in *A Companion to Continental Philosophy* (Wiley, 2017), 185–97, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405164542.ch14>.

its own limitations. This becomes a crucial theoretical foundation before addressing the concept of prejudice. If understanding is ontological, then the structures that make understanding possible must also be ontological rather than merely psychological. One such structure is prejudice. The concept of prejudice (*Vorurteil*) is one of Gadamer's most radical contributions to modern philosophy. Etymologically, the German term refers to a pre-judgment. Since the Enlightenment, however, the term has taken on a negative meaning, referring to unfounded or biased judgment. The Enlightenment motto *Sapere Aude* implies a call to free oneself from the prejudices of tradition and authority.

Gadamer challenges this assumption in *Truth and Method* by arguing that the complete elimination of prejudice is both impossible and itself a form of prejudice.<sup>10</sup> Human beings are historical beings who are always situated within specific linguistic, cultural, and historical contexts. These contexts provide the initial horizon through which the world is understood. Without such a horizon, understanding would not be possible. Prejudice is not the enemy of understanding, but its very starting point. It represents the initial projection of meaning that precedes full comprehension. When reading a text, one inevitably approaches it with certain expectations, and these expectations constitute prejudice. Through the process of interpretation, these prejudices are tested and, if necessary, revised. This dynamic process is what Gadamer refers to as the hermeneutic circle.

It is important to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate prejudices. Legitimate prejudices arise from traditions that enable understanding, such as linguistic competence or foundational knowledge within a discipline.<sup>11</sup> Illegitimate prejudices, by contrast, stem from hasty judgment or imposed authority lacking rational justification. The task of hermeneutics is not to eliminate prejudice, but to become aware of it and critically examine it. In the context of scientific authority in the post-truth era, this concept is particularly significant. Public rejection of scientific findings is often framed as resistance to elite prejudice. However, from a Gadamerian perspective, scientists themselves also operate within prejudices, including theoretical assumptions and scientific paradigms.<sup>12</sup> Acknowledging this does not weaken scientific authority but rather strengthens it through epistemic honesty. The crisis emerges when science claims to be free from prejudice, leading to a collapse of trust when biases are revealed. Thus, objectivity should not be understood as the absence of perspective, but as critical awareness of one's own standpoint.

The third fundamental concept is tradition. For Enlightenment thinkers, tradition was often seen as opposed to reason and freedom, regarded as a constraint on progress. Gadamer reverses this view by presenting tradition not as a static inheritance, but as a living process within which individuals are always situated.<sup>13</sup> One cannot step outside of tradition, but only move within it. Gadamer introduces the concept of *Wirkungsgeschichte*, or history of effect, to describe the way in which understanding is always shaped by historical influences.<sup>14</sup> When interpreting a figure such as Plato, one does not encounter a pure original, but rather a historically mediated figure shaped by centuries of interpretation. Tradition thus becomes the medium through which truth is transmitted across generations.

---

10 Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, 277.

11 Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, 270.

12 Marie Vigouroux and Richard B. Hovey, "Gadamerian Hermeneutics and Feminist Thought: Exploring Preunderstandings to Uncover Experiences of Prejudice," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 23 (January 24, 2024), <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241278954>.

13 Wijaya, B. (2019). *Dialog Antarbudaya dalam Perspektif Hermeneutika Filosofis*. *Kontemplasi*, 18(3), 205.

14 Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, 300.

Closely related to tradition is the concept of authority. Gadamer distinguishes between authority based on coercion and authority based on recognition (*Anerkennung*).<sup>15</sup> Legitimate authority arises not from force, but from the acknowledgment of expertise and wisdom. One listens to a teacher not because of compulsion, but because of a rational recognition of their greater understanding. Warnke emphasizes that such authority does not contradict freedom.<sup>16</sup> On the contrary, recognizing authority is itself an act of rational freedom that acknowledges one's own limitations. Individuals choose to follow tradition because it has been tested over time and continues to hold relevance.

In the context of scientific knowledge, this implies that authority should not rely solely on institutional status or formal credentials, but on public recognition of intellectual integrity and contribution. The crisis of post-truth intensifies when scientific authority depends exclusively on formal legitimacy without engaging in dialogical recognition with societal traditions and values. Gadamer's framework suggests that tradition can function as a rationally acknowledged authority, provided that it remains open to dialogue and reinterpretation rather than becoming a closed dogma.

### **The Crisis of Scientific Authority in the Post-Truth Era**

The post truth era is characterized by the blurring of boundaries between fact and opinion. Within the ecosystem of social media, algorithms tend to display information that confirms users' existing beliefs, reinforcing confirmation bias and creating echo chambers in which alternative truths can flourish.<sup>17</sup> In such a context, traditional scientific authority, grounded in expert consensus and peer review, is increasingly challenged. Why does this occur? From a Gadamerian perspective, it reflects a tension between two forms of consciousness, namely scientific methodological consciousness and the historical consciousness of society. Scientists operate within a methodological framework that seeks to separate facts from values. In contrast, society exists within a historical consciousness in which facts are inseparable from values, identity, and tradition.<sup>18</sup> When scientists present claims such as the safety of vaccines without acknowledging the historical and cultural concerns of the public, these claims are often rejected not because they are empirically incorrect, but because their meaning fails to resonate within the lived experience of society.

Tobi and Hendrik highlights that the dominance of scientific methodology often alienates individuals from their own lived experiences. Modern science tends to reduce reality to measurable data, while human experiences of truth are frequently qualitative and narrative.<sup>19</sup> In the post truth context, personal narratives, such as individual accounts of adverse experiences, can appear more convincing on an emotional level than statistical evidence. This phenomenon should not be dismissed simply as public irrationality, but rather understood as a failure of science to communicate within the language of human experience.

The challenge to authority is further intensified by the democratization of information. Access to knowledge, once limited to institutions such as universities and libraries, is now widely available to the public. However, this accessibility includes both reliable information and

---

15 Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*, 281.

16 Warnke, G. (1987). *Gadamer: Hermeneutics, Tradition and Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 45.

17 Urbano Reviglio and Claudio Agosti, "Thinking Outside the Black-Box: The Case for 'Algorithmic Sovereignty' in Social Media," *Social Media + Society* 6, no. 2 (April 28, 2020), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120915613>.

18 Habermas, J. (1970). *On Systematically Distorted Communication*. *Inquiry*, 13(1-4), 210.

19 Boli Tobi, Hendrik. 2021. "Revitalisasi Humanisme Dan Kritik Gadamer Atas Metodologi ". *Dekonstruksi* 5 (01):5-35. <https://doi.org/10.54154/dekonstruksi.v5i01.73>.

misinformation, thereby weakening traditional hierarchies of authority.<sup>20</sup> The ability to search for information online often leads to the assumption that access equals understanding. From a Gadamerian standpoint, however, understanding requires dialogue and the critical examination of one's own prejudices, not merely the accumulation of information. To deepen this analysis, it is useful to consider Jürgen Habermas's critique. Habermas expresses concern that an emphasis on tradition, as in Gadamer's thought, may perpetuate ideological domination.<sup>21</sup> He introduces the concept of systematically distorted communication, arguing that traditions are not always neutral but may reflect unequal power relations.

In the post truth era, this critique becomes particularly relevant, as many narratives are shaped or funded by political and corporate interests.<sup>22</sup> Public beliefs and traditions can be strategically manipulated, for instance in campaigns that deny climate change. Habermas therefore emphasizes the importance of an ideal speech situation, in which communication is free from external coercion. When the insights of Gadamer and Habermas are considered together, a deeper issue emerges. The crisis of authority is not only a matter of misinformation, but also a failure of scientific communication to meet both hermeneutic and critical standards. Scientists often speak to the public in a monological manner, rather than engaging in genuine dialogue. The public is positioned as an object to be educated, rather than as a dialogical partner whose perspectives and prejudices deserve recognition.

Habermas further reminds us that authority must be accountable within a free public sphere.<sup>23</sup> If scientific authority cannot sustain itself in open dialogue and instead relies solely on institutional credentials, it becomes fragile. In the post truth era, the public sphere itself has become fragmented into multiple, often polarized spaces, making the formation of shared consensus increasingly difficult. Modern science places strong emphasis on methodological rigor, often equating validity with adherence to method.<sup>24</sup> However, Gadamer reminds us that truth can also emerge outside strict methodological frameworks, for example in art, philosophy, and historical experience. In the post truth condition, many people perceive scientific truth as abstract and disconnected from their lives, leading them to seek existential forms of truth that provide meaning. When science fails to offer such meaning, individuals may turn to alternative sources such as conspiracy theories or spiritual movements, even if these lack methodological rigor.

This analysis suggests that the crisis of scientific authority is not merely a problem of scientific literacy, but fundamentally a hermeneutic problem rooted in the absence of shared understanding. Scientists often fail to translate methodological truth into meaningful narratives that resonate within the traditions of public life. In Gadamer's terms, they fail to achieve a fusion of horizons between the scientific perspective and the lived world of society. For instance, in debates on climate change, scientists present temperature data and statistical models, while environmental activists frame the issue in moral terms, and skeptics emphasize economic freedom. Each group operates within its own horizon, without genuine engagement with the others. As Gadamer would argue, dialogue becomes impossible as long as each side refuses to acknowledge that the other holds a legitimate claim to truth. Scientists, in particular, often

---

20 Mussarat Sultan and Muhammad Rafiq, "Open Access Information Resources and University Libraries: Analysis of Perceived Awareness, Challenges, and Opportunities," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 47, no. 4 (July 2021): 102367, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102367>.

21 Habermas, J. (1970). *On Systematically Distorted Communication*, 215.

22 Habermas, J. (1970). *On Systematically Distorted Communication*, 218.

23 Habermas, J. (1970). *On Systematically Distorted Communication*, 205.

24 Saul Newman, "Post-Truth, Postmodernism and the Public Sphere," in *Europe in the Age of Post-Truth Politics. Palgrave Studies in European Political Sociology*, 2023, 13–30, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13694-8\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13694-8_2).

dismiss skeptics as simply incorrect, rather than recognizing them as participants whose concerns may still warrant understanding.

### Reconfiguring the Authority of Tradition and Rationality

The preceding analysis indicates that the crisis of scientific authority cannot be adequately addressed within a framework that maintains a strict separation between scientific rationality and the historical consciousness of society. Rather than resolving the crisis through reinforcement of institutional authority or accommodation to public opinion, the findings suggest a structural reconfiguration of how authority is constituted. In this respect, Gadamer’s rehabilitation of tradition implies that authority emerges not from detachment, but from its embeddedness within historically mediated forms of understanding.<sup>25</sup> Tradition functions not as an obstacle to critique, but as its enabling condition, insofar as it provides the conceptual and linguistic resources through which critique becomes possible.

This reconfiguration entails a shift in the basis of authority from formal legitimacy toward recognition (*Anerkennung*), where authority is sustained through its capacity to engage meaningfully with the interpretive frameworks of the public.<sup>26</sup> Scientific knowledge, therefore, operates not merely as a set of validated propositions, but as a form of meaning that requires mediation within shared horizons of understanding. This implies that the validity of scientific claims is not only methodologically grounded but also hermeneutically situated, insofar as their acceptance depends on their intelligibility within lived contexts. The implications of this shift can be outlined as follows in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Reconfiguration of Scientific Authority in a Gadamerian Framework

Dimension	Conventional Model	Hermeneutic Reconfiguration	Implication
Basis of Authority	Institutional legitimacy	Recognition ( <i>Anerkennung</i> )	Authority depends on relational validation
Nature of Knowledge	Objective and detached	Historically mediated	Knowledge requires contextual interpretation
Communication	One directional transmission	Dialogical engagement	Meaning emerges through interaction
Rationality	Instrumental	Reflexive	Rationality includes awareness of limits
Education	Method oriented	Hermeneutic awareness	Understanding includes interpretive capacity

*Source: the Author analysis*

Furthermore, the analysis suggests that the absence of dialogue constitutes a central factor in the erosion of authority. Within a hermeneutic framework, understanding is not achieved through transmission but through interaction, where each participant remains open to the possibility of revision. This does not imply a relativization of scientific knowledge, but rather a transformation in how it is communicated and situated. The role of scientific actors thus shifts from providers of authoritative claims to participants in a process of meaning formation, in

25 David Vessey, “Gadamer on Tradition,” in *The Gadamerian Mind* (Routledge, 2021), 117–26.

26 Renate Fischer et al., “What Constitutes a Local Public Sphere? Building a Monitoring Framework for Comparative Analysis,” *Media and Communication* 9, no. 3 (July 23, 2021): 85–96, <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v9i3.3984>.

which public concerns, local knowledge, and historical contexts become integral to the articulation of knowledge itself.<sup>27</sup>

Finally, the implications extend to the domain of education, where the development of hermeneutic awareness becomes a necessary complement to scientific literacy. The findings indicate that the capacity to interpret, contextualize, and critically reflect on knowledge claims is central to navigating the epistemic conditions of the post truth era. In this sense, the reconstruction of authority is not achieved through the elimination of prejudice, but through its critical recognition, allowing for a form of rationality that remains both situated and self reflective.

### CONCLUSION

This study finds that the crisis of scientific authority in the post-truth era is fundamentally hermeneutical rather than merely epistemic or informational. Drawing on Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, the analysis demonstrates that the erosion of trust in science stems from a disconnection between methodological rationality and the historically situated horizons of public understanding. The concepts of prejudice (Vorurteil), tradition, and the fusion of horizons reveal that knowledge is always mediated by historical and linguistic conditions, and thus cannot claim absolute objectivity detached from context. The study further shows that the Enlightenment's strict dichotomy between reason and tradition has contributed to the marginalization of interpretive dimensions of knowledge, thereby weakening the communicative capacity of science. As a result, scientific authority becomes fragile when it relies solely on institutional legitimacy and methodological claims without engaging in dialogical processes that acknowledge the lived experiences and interpretive frameworks of society.

The primary contribution of this research lies in its theoretical reconfiguration of scientific authority through a Gadamerian lens. It advances the argument that authority should be grounded not in hierarchical imposition, but in rational recognition (Anerkennung) achieved through dialogical engagement. By integrating Gadamer's hermeneutics with insights from critical theory, particularly Habermas, the study offers an interdisciplinary framework that bridges philosophy, social theory, and science communication. This framework shifts the understanding of scientific authority from a static, objectivist model toward a reflexive, historically aware, and participatory paradigm. In doing so, it provides a conceptual foundation for rethinking science communication as a process of meaning-making rather than mere information transmission, and highlights the importance of hermeneutic awareness in education as a means to navigate the complexities of the post-truth condition.

However, this study is not without limitations. As a library-based and primarily theoretical inquiry, it does not incorporate empirical data to substantiate its claims regarding public perception or communication practices. The analysis also remains largely conceptual, which may limit its immediate applicability in policy or institutional contexts. Future research is therefore recommended to empirically investigate how hermeneutic dialogue can be operationalized in science communication across different cultural and media environments. Comparative studies integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches could further examine how trust in scientific authority is constructed and negotiated in diverse contexts. Additionally, interdisciplinary research involving media studies, sociology, and cognitive science would enrich the framework proposed in this study, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of the post-truth phenomenon and the practical reconstruction of scientific authority.

---

27 Daniel A. Menchik, "Authority beyond Institutions: The Expert's Multivocal Process of Gaining and Sustaining Authoritativeness," *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 9, no. 4 (December 10, 2021): 490–517, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41290-020-00100-3>.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boli Tobi, Hendrik. 2021. "Revitalisasi Humanisme dan Kritik Gadamer atas Metodologi." *Dekonstruksi* 5(1): 5–35. <https://doi.org/10.54154/dekonstruksi.v5i01.73>
- Crowell, Steven Galt. 2017. "Neo Kantianism." In *A Companion to Continental Philosophy*, 185–197. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405164542.ch14>
- Fischer, Renate, Alexa Keinert, Otfried Jarren, and Ulrike Klinger. 2021. "What Constitutes a Local Public Sphere? Building a Monitoring Framework for Comparative Analysis." *Media and Communication* 9(3): 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v9i3.3984>
- Gadamer, H. G. 2004. *Truth and Method*. 2nd rev. ed. Translated by J. Weinsheimer and D. G. Marshall. Continuum.
- Grondin, Jean. 1994. *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Yale University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1970. "On Systematically Distorted Communication." *Inquiry* 13(1–4): 205–218.
- Leuanan, Ardhes Blandhivay. 2026. "Distorted Devotion: Cult of Personality in Indonesia: (Devosi Yang Terdistorsi: Kultus Individu Di Indonesia)". *Theosinesis: Journal of Integrative Understanding and Ethical Praxis* 2 (1): 62-71. <https://darulilmijournal.com/index.php/theosyn/article/view/137>
- Menchik, Daniel A. 2021. "Authority beyond Institutions: The Expert's Multivocal Process of Gaining and Sustaining Authoritativeness." *American Journal of Cultural Sociology* 9(4): 490–517. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41290-020-00100-3>
- Newman, Saul. 2023. "Post Truth, Postmodernism and the Public Sphere." In *Europe in the Age of Post Truth Politics*, 13–30. Palgrave. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13694-8\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-13694-8_2)
- Palmer, Richard E. 1999. "The Relevance of Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics." *Philosophy Today* 44(1): 11–25.
- Reviglio, Urbano, and Claudio Agosti. 2020. "Thinking Outside the Black Box: The Case for Algorithmic Sovereignty in Social Media." *Social Media + Society* 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120915613>
- Sultan, Mussarat, and Muhammad Rafiq. 2021. "Open Access Information Resources and University Libraries." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 47(4): 102367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102367>
- Thah, Abdalla Ali Morshed Mohammad, and Yousef Mohammed Abdo Mohammed Al-Awadhy. 2026. "مراجعة منهجية تراثية للشبهات حول الإعجاز العلمي في القرآن الكريم". *Dirasat Qur'aniyyah Wa Hadithiyyah* 1 (1): 74-88. <https://darulilmijournal.com/index.php/daqiyah/article/view/63>
- Vessey, David. 2021. "Gadamer on Tradition." In *The Gadamerian Mind*, 117–126. Routledge.
- Vigouroux, Marie, and Richard B. Hovey. 2024. "Gadamerian Hermeneutics and Feminist Thought." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241278954>
- Warnke, Georgia. 1987. *Gadamer: Hermeneutics, Tradition and Reason*. Stanford University Press.
- Wijaya, B. 2019. "Dialog Antarbudaya dalam Perspektif Hermeneutika Filosofis." *Kontemplasi* 18(3): 201–215.
- Yurmanita, Anisa. 2026. "Semiotic Analysis of Qur'anic Environmental Ethics: A Julia Kristevan Approach to Ecological Responsibility". *Dirasat Qur'aniyyah Wa Hadithiyyah* 1 (1): 21-34. <https://darulilmijournal.com/index.php/daqiyah/article/view/102>
- Zed, Mestika. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.