Dear Antonio,

… what a beautiful example of how social sciences criticism embraces what the critique:

Firstly they critique the „neoliberalism“, a mystified big evil, misleading the world from ist originally good intentions,  namely the good mission of academics in particular are - refusing to name any reasons of what they complain about, the neoliberalism, this bad deviation of an originally good capitalism, who is this wicked evil, the neoliberalism is and why is it so powerful to seduce the whole world, including the real powerful? All victims of the bad boy ned-liberalism, nobody seemingly wants.

Secondly, they find a even worse evil, they also do not want to know any why about, "the *social and ecological emergency that the whole world currently faces“*. To then embrace the first evil as they compangneiro angst the second bigger  evil: *"The social and ecological emergency that the whole world currently faces represents a common general interest that should push us to unite if we want to meet all these challenges.“*

… thus facing this bigger evil, again not wanting to think about any reasons, any subjects creating and making this monstrous emergencies, a dubious, mystified  anything to quickly make their piece with the first evil and to presuppose that the first evil, the neoliberalism can never be the reason for what now the whole world faces, thus to embrace this neo-liebarlism as a part of their united mankind.

This is how to make criticism affirmative. What a stupid and dangerous logic. It is, by the way, precisely the logic we were presented by our greek colleague in Palmela and a perfect example how social sciencees make the critiqued a companeiro of whatever their criticism is about.

Best

Michael