

Parra, A. y Fajardo, C. (2016). *The language against consensus. Speech beyond liberalism*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

To show that a critique of liberalism must not pass by denouncing the falsity of consensus, but by questioning the meaning of the opposition consensus vs. violence, that is, to question the conceptual framework that allows us to think that life in human community runs in a zero-sum game between consensus and violence.

It proposes a reading from Gadamer on politics as conversation, from Ranciere on a policy of talking animals and dialogue in relation to the overflowing consensus.

Politics exists not because men overcome their violent relationships through language, but because in language there is a destabilizing power, which goes beyond any consensus and agreement.

The language in the Gadamerian perspective is the condition that allows to have a world of sense and meaning. The meaning that is made manifest in the speech takes place under the logic of the conversation, that is to say, of a meaningful event in which a network of significant relations is unfolded and gives consistency to reality. Giving meaning to the world moves in two logics of understanding: On the one hand, tradition moves in frameworks of interpretation of practical life realization and, on the other hand, otherness opens a type of understanding where interpretation is an unfinished process.

Likewise, it is an encounter between heterogeneous worlds, two ways of conceiving understanding that creates dissensual speech that escapes inter-subjective exchanges, which sets in motion an encounter between tradition and otherness. Then, the dialogue is not a bet for the mutual understanding between subjects, but the acts of the speech that underlie in the gadamerian approach, do not suppose a movement between understanding and comprehension, but perhaps they interrupt the practical and daily relation that we have with the language because a clash between two forms of conceiving the comprehension takes place.

In the Rancierian approach the logic of this process does not change. For Ranciere, politics, which underlies the encounter between two heterogeneous forms of understanding, cannot be settled by mutual agreement between the parties, since the arguments that make it possible for two forms of understanding to come together, presuppose a situation of paradoxical speech: there is disagreement and therefore a policy when two ways of conceiving what is said come into collision, when an approach that has as its presupposition the inequality in the order of speech and the world of the language of equals establishes a scenario of interlocution.

The acts of the subjects do not seek agreement or to be included in the realm of the tongue-bearing animals, but rather act as if they were using a language in common use by anyone to highlight the very contingency upon which the orders and hierarchies of discourse rest. The consequences of the clash of worlds, supposes a redistribution between the modes of perception or between the distribution of the sensible that fixes if a sound is or not a part of the national speech. That is why politics is not an interruption in the order of understanding, but a transformation between what is possible and what is not and also between what is reasonable and what is not.