The title of this presentation intentionally makes reference to Hans-Georg Gadamer’s *Arte y verdad de la palabra*, specifically to an article titled “on the Truth of the Word” in which the philosophers asks: What is the authentic word, that is, not the word in which something true or even the supreme truth is said but the word in its most authentic sense? “(1998, p.20). The question is clear, it does not ask for the problem of truth, but for the possibility that the word has to be so.

The way Gadamer taught us to see the relation between truth and the word allows us to see what is known under a new perspective. That is, thus, the force of art in diverse manifestations: illuminating the world in another way, infinitely enriched. Now, in this specific text, Gadamer problematizes the old question on truth as adequacy to point out that the poem (and the work of art in general) does not imitate like a copy, whose ontological value would only be measured by the adequacy of what imitates; also, the poem does not represent (vorstellung) reality, and the way a subject makes reality an object. Rather, if it represents it, it does so in another meaning (darstellung), not standing before it but playing it. It is as if the poetic statement were an active execution that transforms what it represents, but whose meaning is completed through the myriad of interpretation it sets to play. (Liñan, 2008).

Now, this way in which the being and the Word are linked together, seems inevitable oppose what power and word are submissive, and not because the being is free of power, but because it is not often that the privilege of dialog is seen in the hermeneutical sense. The relationship between power and the word is shown not by the issue of adequacy nor by the uncovering, but for the mystification. However, hermeneutics is not far from the problem, Gadamer’s essay starts out by expressing: “the deception of language, suspicion of ideology or even the suspicion of metaphysics is nowadays such habitual turns that to speak today of truth of the word is equivalent to a provocation” (1998, p. 15).

However, before the inescapable provocation that Gadamer refers to, it is in our time, something that has been considered as the post truth of the word (Orwell, 2017), a conception that launches us into the strategic communication and modeling of the public opinion. As individuals we find ourselves before a difficult situation: as repercussions of a time that seemed to have been
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overcome, comes the need to, once again, talk of an objective truth, a truth that is close to facts, in order to face the scandalous manipulation of events, the everyday issues in freedom of speech: the discredit that official sources support, those that are believed to hold knowledge discredit each other while holding on to improbable versions.

In the prologue of George Orwell’s *the power of language, 10 essays on language, politics and truth* in a recent Debate Edition, Miguel Berga states “Along with Ayer, the author of the influential text *Language, truth and logic* (1936), were both in Paris in 1945, and their relationship was of mutual deep empathy […] the philosopher must have concluded that Orwell´s work and his idea that any writer has the moral obligation to refer to the facts, could a be an example of logical positivism, his school” (Orwell, 2017, p. 14). Before this statement one is tempted to accept and at the same time deny it, for how could one not experience the tension between the unquestionable construction of the facts as a form of expressing human plasticity in history and the less questionable existence of the political intention of creating *alternative facts* (Orwell, 2017, p. 12).

I refer to this reflection of Orwell as a writer and journalist who was interested in exploring the closeness between the political and emotional aspect, and for warning about the importance of establishing the truth based on facts. However, how is the problem to be ignored: referring to facts does not mean calling upon a notion of logical positivism, it is not enough to use the *objective truth* formula. Before this situation, I find it important to remember the reach of the micro-resistance, and of course the academic disclosures that come as part of it, not because the post truth phenomenon does not or cannot take place, but because the post truth can be evidenced.

In this context, the input from the social sciences allows broadening our horizon not only regarding the empirical data that upholds research, but on the face that those who live the construction of truth—the analysis of capitalism, the understanding of institutional imaginaries, the approach to religious comprehension, the acknowledging of victims, the remembrance of social movements, the concern for building family relationships, the reflection upon cultural and commercial logics open the possibility for the dialogue to be carried out from a political dimension in which relationships between power and words is usually established.
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