

November 2, 1984

Dear Ted:

Your last letter of Oct. 29 had great interest for me and I was especially impressed with how brilliantly you at once put your finger on the Russian discussions from Kol'man to Bukharin, who were reducing "process" and "development" to the vulgar question of these concepts "conforming to certain laws" and "economic requirements of production" (labor discipline).

I need hardly tell you that the same applies even more to the way those Stalinists speak of "masses", "practice," as if it were the equivalent of Marx's praxis and self-activity as well as methodology, as if all Marx meant was techniques and ordering the masses ~~to~~ to produce more and more and more. As you know, I am proposing a special bulletin to be issued on Ron's contribution to the convention and some of the correspondence on it since then. I could turn over your letter of Oct. 29, deleting the last paragraph -- and, of course, if the Mathematical Manuscripts excite you, you could develop your ideas further. Did you know that the Publishers' Guide is ~~so~~ so stupid and money-wise that they don't have Marx's Mathematical Manuscripts listed in "Books in Print"? In fact, I don't know if they even have it listing in Britain, where it was published, since it was a small publisher?

Yours,

*Raya*

16987