On Mon, 14 Oct 2019 at 11:38, António Pedro Dores <[antonio.dores@iscte-iul.pt](mailto:antonio.dores@iscte-iul.pt)> wrote:

Dear Nikolov,

I send you this message because I read your full paper, available at the webpage of the [conference](http://home.iscte-iul.pt/~apad/novosite2007/WORLDSSHNET2019.html). Thank you. I would like to develop a collaborative working and thinking method organizing Lisbon WSSHnet Conference. I wait for your authorization to send this email to all participants. This will help them to engage in discussions they feel relevant beyond the copresence in December, in Lisbon.

Thank you for bringing Marcuse to the discussion.

Your paper rises more than a dozen interesting questions around the contribution of the critical theory to the social sciences. It links as a support to Michael's paper criticizing the critique of social sciences (including the critical theory of social theory). It does not link directly to Raina paper because she looks to on the ground alternatives to capital domination, mostly at Zapatista experience.

In my view, your paper reveals the existence of three main fields of mutually interlinked problems: elitism of power and thinking (Foucault like); identity problems around nationalism (we can also add the nationalist methodologies, which are the basis of Michael critique to social sciences critique); caring of people in need, which is everyone (that is also a central question for Zapatista organization of resistance against adopting modern life, against totalitarian control over the need of people).

The post-modern Marcuse approach challenged the materialistic one-sided Marxist approach. That is why, for me, the Marcuse´s technology references on social control are so out of the box. I wonder why you did not highlight it in your paper.

Social sciences divide between sociology and economy. Doing so, they institutionalize the divide of cultural and materialistic social sciences approaches to reality. In my view, this Manichean disciplinary division of social sciences is delivered by university and competitive policy driven by the funding and professional programs (I call it centripetal scientific strategy) under the utilitarian perspective of the states and the military to take advantage of scientific knowledge to their own proposes.

Marcuse bridge between machine technologies and social technologies is a way to develop contra strategies (I call it centrifugal scientific strategy) to produce knowledge. If I am right, it explains the need of some scholars to criticize Marcuse using the mainstream theory neglect regarding his texts.

The neglect of the readers is not Marcuse´s ideas or texts fault or virtue. However, his texts continue to be references of thought and inspiration for thinking. Why did you, Stephan, bring him to this conference? I did not find an answer in your paper.

Com os melhores cumprimentos  
  
António Pedro Dores

**From: Stephan E. Nikolov** [**stephnikolov@gmail.com**](mailto:stephnikolov@gmail.com)

Dear Antonio,

Thank you for your kind message, as well for your time to read and reflect on my contribution!

I'll start from the end of it. The reason to chose this topic was purely by chance: these were last months of my professional-institutional career - my formal retirement occurred only ten days ago. And I am turning now to my initial University study, when I was interested in (ultra)leftist theories and practice, but this was not too prospective engagement during the communist regime - only few privileged academicians were allowed to read and interpret such domain, in narrow access institute, and I had no chance to step in there. I may tell you more details when we meet, if you are interested. Later I never returned to this particular subject, being engaged, not by my own choice, in very distant sociological domains, and actually I had to catch up with the then newly introduced in Bulgaria sociology. That is why my books and notes from close to 50 years ago ate technically inaccessible for me just now.

I had much hesitations, to admit, after I stated the topic, whether I'll be able to prepare a decent presentation. I feel your polite and implicit criticism, and I completely accept is: this is not good quality paper, but I still hope it will improve. Your analysis help me to see shortcomings and to work further. One encouragement in this, together with coming to conviction, that my topic won't stay outside the mainstream of conference discussion, are your statement that my outlines some in concord with the theses of at least two participants - Michael, and party of Ms. Raina Zimmering. I still haven't read their texts, I hope after reading I'll have more insights.

In my paper I tried both to escape from a lecture-type presentation (I have in mind what is delivered to students)q and in the same time, to uncover as much as possible from the multifaceted  legacy of Marcuse. This led me to just marking numerous lines that were left undeveloped. You correctly identified these three main problems, and these need to be further developed - most probably even only one, that which is close to Michael's treatise - " identity problems around nationalism (we can also add the nationalist methodologies"q which is most closer to my main field during last years. In this way, I'll move more closely to the conference topic, otherwise my paragraph on Marcuse's and neo-Marxists positions vis-a-vis the.nation-state issue.

You have, indeed, my authorization to send this email to the rest of participants - I see, they'll come from many countries and with various theoretical backgrounds, which promises a fruitful discussion.

Best regards,

Stephan