Economic science came to be – too late to celebrate or to complain. The question now is no longer ‘Which economic science?’ but ‘When does it disappear?’

Scientific practices in economics are phenomenologically unbearable. To claim scientific authority makes one forget the motives for doing so in the first place. That is to say economists ‘forget the life-world’.

The economic suspicion is the source of meaning in economic talk. Economic science came to be as that discourse which avoids this suspicion.

Since the formalist revolution, it has been increasingly difficult to renew scientific optimism in economics. In this sense, economics has passed the peak of its life cycle.

The economic scientist is made by a discreet attitude – so discreet that they cannot even refer to anything in particular. Science is thus an obstacle for economists’ expressive life, which leads to a cynical attitude about their own discipline.

Liberals and socialists both have an interest in the structuralism of economics. For liberals, it is because it lets the market appear beyond corrupted politics, and for socialists it is because it lets the economy appear to be subject to non-corrupted politics. Both associations are contingent.

Liberals and socialists are driven by the same dream that has never come true: that capitalism will finally pass away. The difference is that, until today, liberals did not admit that dream. Get on with it!

Referential truth is an invention of modern science. From Plato to the Scientific Revolution, epistemic life was a matter of a virtuous life. We have had enough of modern science to remember that.

The gap between analytic and continental thought – or, for that matter, between science and philosophy – is at least as great as their ideas. The sooner we acknowledge that, the sooner we can at least be interested in each other.
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