

RD

April 1, 1985

Dear Ted:

This letter has nothing to do with Olga's trip, which she and Peter will be working out with you. Instead, this concerns the correspondence with Paul M. Sweezy. It is a great deal more than ever I got as an acknowledgment from him, whom I have been fighting ever since the early 1930s. All this goes to show what a University of Utah letter-head, and youth, achieved. So I wish to be sure that you try to keep the correspondence up.

Here is what I suggest -- that you write to thank him for his letter of March 6, and say that you were very glad to see that he would understand the seriousness of getting reviews of book MRP publishes. You wondered whether he saw that N&L reviewed the work of Shanin, and make sure you enclose Mike's review, (cut out from the paper and sent by itself). Tell him that this ~~wasn't~~ the only place Shanin's work was referred to in N&L publications, as witness Marx and the Third World by Peter Hudis. And ask if he saw that.

You can't, however, quite understand how he can say that for Brokmeyer to have concluded from Marx's Mathematical Manuscripts so supposedly far-fetched a relationships between them and dialectics meant that "one has to want very much to do so." It is, after all, clear in Marx's own expression on the very first page of "On the Concept of the Derived Function" where Marx says: "The whole difficulty in understanding the differential operation (as in the negation of the negation generally) lies precisely in seeing how it differs from such a simply procedure and therefore leads to real results." Then say you'd be glad to hear his comments and that you will tell him of any other reviews of Shanin's books you find.

Now, Ted, put it in your own King's English, and mail it with page 4 of the June 1984 issue (Mike's review).

I'm sure I'll be sending all sorts of messages with Olga for you.

Yours,

*Copies to Peter, Karin  
& office*

*PS included ref to  
ref. to RD in  
Hist. of Am. Soc.*

*Sweezy's  
Princeton Unit*

16989