

Andrew Gunder Frank  
Holanda 81  
Santiago, Chile  
July 1, 1964

I am writing this letter to you and a few others of my friends keeping in mind our personal friendship, our common concerns, your interest in the social sciences, and your political receptivity. I want by this means to try to reestablish the intimacy of contact we had before I left our professional world and to discuss with you the circumstances and terms of my possible return to it. The latter means in a word a job - but it is complicated by several political and technical problems. I hope you will take me seriously and that I will as a minimum at least evoke a sign of life out of you, but preferably more.

It has been four years since I left the United States, except for three couple-month visits in 1961 and 1962. In June 1960 I went to the Soviet Union on a one-month American research grant. 1960-61 I was on research leave of absence from Michigan State University and spent it in Cuba, West Africa, and Eastern Europe looking into political determinants of economic development. More generally, I was trying to get a better perspective on development problems than I had been able to acquire at home. I then resigned from Michigan State University because I felt that the political basis of the professional climate there and in the U.S. generally oriented me - and others - to pursue directions in my teaching and research on problems of economic development and social change which could never bear fruit in speeding up development in underdeveloped countries and serves, on the contrary, only to retard it. I decided, therefore, to remain for further study in the underdeveloped countries or the socialist ones and to look for a political-intellectual climate which could influence me to at least ask more nearly the right questions of my chosen problem of development.

In the spring of 1962 I went to Latin America to pursue my search and research. I intended to go to Cuba to work. While waiting to arrange something in Cuba, and in case I could not as indeed I have not been able to so far, I wanted to do three things in Latin America: To come to know it in a general way as a preliminary to future research on this area; secondly, to learn how one might go about doing research on the political determinants of development and underdevelopment (as an erstwhile economist I had long since shifted my attention from "economic" to "social" factors in development and thought that it was high time to get to the evidently immediately more important political ones, but I lacked any theoretical guide for doing so though I did know, as I am sure you will agree, that asking the American political scientists is a sure way never to find any); and thirdly, should Cuba prove to be unavailable to me, I wanted to find an alternative institutional working environment whose political orientation would steer me in the right and not drag me back into the wrong direction. Thus, I spent upwards of a month each visiting, doing informal interviews in, reading about, and beginning to write about Mexico, Guatemala, Venezuela, Peru, and Chile. In the latter country, I did not learn much because I spent three months getting married instead - to Marta Fuentes, on December 21, 1962.

In January 1963, Marta and I set off for Brazil and, in case I did not find anything of political-professional interest there, for East Germany where I had been offered a visiting professorship. We ended up staying in Brazil all of 1963 and the beginning of 1964. The first half of the year I taught a postgraduate seminar in sociological theory (functionalism) at the new University of Brasilia, and the second half I did research on the historical sources of underdevelopment in Latin America. My focus had changed from "development" to "underdevelopment", and it was changing from studying the determinants of one or the other of these to examining how historically each of these determined and still continues to produce the other (but more about that below). In Brasilia and Rio de Janeiro also, I came to have close personal contact with a host of left wing Brazilian congressmen and a modest measure of participation in and familiarity with the Brazilian political life that was soon

to be snuffed out by the recent coup. All my friends landed in jail or exile. I didn't because I left shortly beforehand and returned to Chile with my Chilean wife and my Brazilian son, Paulo Rene. I do not expect to stay here very long and am debating where to go next. But this involves consideration of the substantial political and professional transformations I have undergone in the course of all this. It is to these that I want to turn now.

Travelling from one place to another, I had no illusions about being able to pursue careful research leading to articles for professional journals. What I thought I should and could do, and that I have accomplished perhaps beyond expectations, was to get a better perspective on development problems which could serve to orient my selection and handling of research and teaching problems in the future. In the meantime, I was content to write serious journalism which, though maybe more superficial, brought me closer to the real problems of underdeveloped countries and away from some of the imaginary ones we often prefer to treat as social scientists. I wrote articles for magazines from the Nation to the left, eg. Monthly Review, Revolution, and a number of similar magazines and newspapers in Latin America. I came to be a regular contributor to Monthly Review; and it has become increasingly difficult, and on important matters impossible, for me to tone down and/or bend to the right so far as to write for the Nation. At the same time, though still with a strong political strain and in journals of political analysis, I began again to write things which more nearly meet academic standards. I refer particularly to two long articles for publication both in Latin America and in the United States, in the latter of which they will appear combined as a book to be published by Monthly Review Press. In the first, "Capitalism and Underdevelopment," I examine the source and nature of the development of the structure of underdevelopment in the course of history. I reject as contrary to fact the more commonly held supposition that underdevelopment is somehow original or traditional, or that developed countries were once underdeveloped as the underdeveloped ones are now; and I try to suggest how internationally, nationally, and regionally underdevelopment developed no less than "development;" each in a close causative relation with the other, as a result of capitalist development itself. I suggest moreover, that the development of underdevelopment no less than that of development itself is a necessary consequence of capitalism and that under capitalism this process continues today essentially as it did in the past. I suggest, finally, that insofar as this thesis is well taken, a whole set of theses about development that are widely accepted in the social sciences as points of departure and arrival for research and policy formation are very far off the mark of reality. The second article, "Brazilian Agriculture: Capitalism and the Myth of Feudalism," brings this approach to bear on a particular problem of underdevelopment and development. Here, I criticize as factually erroneous and theoretically inadequate the widely accepted "dual society" thesis and its related or sub thesis which attributes the ills of agriculture and often of everything in Latin America (and elsewhere also) to the survival of an isolated, feudal, non-market, or folk society or sector. Examining the same reality that is usually interpreted along the above lines, I seek to derive them and underdevelopment itself from the development, structure, and functioning of the capitalist system and monopolized market of the economy and society as a whole, rather than falling back on the supposed feudalities or folkiness of part of the supposedly "dual" society. Finally, I go on to criticize the very similar policies of the Alliance for Progress and the Communist Parties in Latin America, both of which are associated with very similar but quite erroneous analyses of Latin American reality in terms of dualism and feudalism and both of which demonstrably have the for Latin America disastrous results of retarding overall development and increasing underdevelopment still further.

These and other articles, as well as a couple of books along these lines in the making, which employ a more holistic structural and historical analysis and interpretation of underdevelopment and development and which hopefully will contribute to a more adequate theory of capitalist reality, is the beginning of a more extensive study I hope to undertake in the coming years. Another part of the same study is

the aforementioned research on the historical sources of underdevelopment and development in Latin America which will appear in part as a bibliographical essay on the subject commissioned by UNESCO's Latin American Center for Research in the Social Sciences in Rio de Janeiro. Hopefully, I will be able to undertake a similar study on Asia and/or Africa at a later date. In general, I am pursuing my growing conviction that development policy in underdeveloped countries cannot be that which was adequate for or is now prescribed by the developed countries; that it is factually erroneous, theoretically nonsensical, and politically reactionary to set the developed countries' stages of growth out as a necessary or desirable path of development for the underdeveloped ones; that this is so in part because the developed countries were never like the underdeveloped ones are now - the developed countries were never underdeveloped but at best undeveloped; that development and underdevelopment are not so much relative to one another as they are related to each other; and that, far from having taken off and left the underdeveloped countries where they were, the development of the developed countries and regions produced the underdevelopment of the underdeveloped ones and vice versa - that development and underdevelopment developed simultaneously, each causing the other as the result of the expansion, operation, maintenance, and continuing development of the mercantilist and capitalist system over the course of the centuries as well as still in our times. Without turning into a pure historian but keeping the needs of theory and policy to deal with present and future reality in mind, I want to study this historical process in past and present in order to distill from it the structure and present transformations: if any of the relationships between the underdeveloped peripheries and the developed metropolises, the ones apparently still underdeveloping while the others continue to develop, on the world, national, regional, and sometimes sectoral levels. Beyond its description of present reality and its possible contribution to theory, the purpose of the study is, of course, to ask and to answer what the structural changes are which are necessary to permit the underdeveloped countries to develop and to inquire into what must be done politically, economically, socially and otherwise to bring these structural changes about. So far, the necessary structural change appears to be the underdeveloped countries' liberation from the inexterably intertwined national and world capitalism which produced and still maintains and even deepens their underdevelopment; and the only available means for the abandonment of capitalism seems to be revolution. Thus, the same study raises the further question, of course, of how revolution must be worked for and can be made to succeed or destined to fail under the conditions which here and there exist in reality rather than in some people's theory, imagination or desire. Nothing less than that seems to me scientifically, morally, and politically adequate. This explains my rejection and criticism not only of most of our social science and economic or political policy but also of most of the Communist Parties' status quo maintaining strategies; and it accounts for my siding with Peking against Moscow or for Peking's siding with me and some of my articles.- I am told that Peking's People's Daily and other Chinese papers reprinted an article of mine in which I show part of how American aid and investment in underdeveloped countries, far from helping them, exploits them and deforms their economies into ever more dependent and underdeveloped ones. I should add maybe that the debate between Washington, Moscow, and Peking and the current reality it reflects has necessarily led me to extend my thinking and research on problems of development to those of war and to the intimate connection between the two in the present as in the past.

My thus emerging research, teaching, pamphleteering, and maybe one day fighting orientation has several personal, political, intellectual, and professional implications that I would like to consider with you now. I can no longer distinguish political from professional aspects and maybe also from personal relations in my life and work. I have long thought that the liberal positivist creed or ideology of trying to separate ones politics from ones social science is not only politically and morally but also scientifically objectionable in that the supposed political and moral dispassion, far from permitting objectivity, condemns to scientific failure. But for a

long time also I did not know how to avoid it and led a schizoid existence like many of us in which political and moral ideas and feelings were effectively compartmentalized and separated from work as a social scientist. A major purpose of my work abroad, of course, has been to overcome this weakness; and I think I am now well along the way to a cure. My "unliberal" identification of science with politics, let alone with my politics, would not be very well received in the United States of course. Furthermore, though I would not and do not do so, better Marxists both south and north of the equator now call me one of them. I have not devoted myself to studying the great books - though I am belatedly getting around to reading some of them - but according to these Marxists I think like a Marxist dialectician and perceive and study the world around me like one. Be that Marxism or not, I myself recognize that both as a person and a scientist I view and analyze the social, economic, and political reality around me so differently from my liberal friends and erstwhile colleagues that we hardly seem to be living in the same world. As a person I must support the present Chinese position on major world problems and that of the most militant black nationalists such as Malcom X and Robert Williams on American domestic ones because as a social scientist I see that it is their positions which most nearly reflect the world's realities and necessities.

My present and growing scientific perspective and political concern are of course reflected in my present and future research. I have already referred above to my empirical and theoretical work on development, underdevelopment, and capitalism which, I hope, can in one way or another lead to more adequate theory, policy, and politics of development. Beyond the difference in direction between it and the work of most of my fellow social scientists, this work is producing some articles as a byproduct which are explicit debunking criticisms of several sacred social science cows. Some of these past, current, and future articles I will submit to professional journals in the United States and other developed countries, though my intention and hope is less to convince social scientists there to abandon their erroneous assumptions, theories, and policies than it is to try to warn their colleagues in underdeveloped countries against importing, accepting, and trying to build on them. The theses of some of these articles are already explicit or implicit in the discussion of my work and orientation above; others maybe deserve special mention here.

These debunking articles all revolve around reality as it is in most of the world today and the inadequacy of theory and misdirection of research and policy offered by most of social science which claims to deal and to want to help improve that reality. I might add that my personal feelings are that many of my colleagues failings along these lines are a mark of their irresponsibility. One of my debunking theses, of course, is that the apparently well nigh universally accepted thesis of the existence in underdeveloped countries of a "dual society" and/or "dual economy" is factually quite erroneous, theoretically very weak, and politically pernicious. Another is to argue against the related thesis according to which it is the introduction of feudalism by the Spaniards and others and the supposed survival of feudal relations and social structures today which is the cause of underdevelopment and present obstacle to development in Latin America and elsewhere. A related thesis or counter-thesis extends the work of Eric Wolf and others to show that there is nothing original or traditional about "folk" or "traditional" society and that most of the associated cultural, ethnic, and social characteristics, far from being part of or due to any cultural holism of long standing are the specific responses to and effects of fairly recent, largely economically determined, historical developments. Referring to all too evident reality in Latin America and elsewhere, I also wish to challenge the all too widely accepted view that political power rests with landowners, feudal or otherwise. Another widespread assumption and/or conclusion about development in underdeveloped countries today which is contradicted by the facts and based on erroneous and otherwise inadequate theory is that the middle classes and social mobility play a generally progressive economic and political role and that they should therefore be encouraged. On the contrary, in general the

middle classes and all the more so the bourgeoisies (as Franz Fanon has pointed out in his epochmaking book, Les Damnés de la Terre - now also in Spanish - which I recommend to one and all) are the consequence and expression of the very economic structure of underdevelopment which they also seek and serve to perpetuate. ~~Beyond the articles I have already mentioned,~~ I have briefly dealt with the foregoing topics in my review article of Whither Latin America?, "Capitalism - Not Federalism," in Monthly Review, December 1963.

These same considerations and concerns are also giving rise to articles dealing more specifically with sociological theory. My seminar on functionalism in Brasilia and the lead article in the October 1963 American Sociological Review which purports in outrageously idiotic fashion to synthesize functionalism and dialectics have led me to write an article for submission to that same journal in which I examine several fundamentals of functionalism which seem to have gone entirely unnoticed in the recent lengthy journal debates on the subject and which render functionalist theory very misleading if not entirely unsuitable for research on the real problems of development and indeed on the functioning of our capitalist society. I have also long wanted to write up my classroom analysis, prepared already in Michigan but extended in Brasilia, of Homans and Schneider's attempt to substitute efficient cause for final cause or teleology in their explanation of the incidence of various forms of cross cousin marriage. <sup>Going</sup> Beyond the theoretical and empirical criticism of their work that has already appeared, I want to suggest that by substituting, as has been observed, an uninteresting problem for Levy-Strauss' much more important one, they fall victim to all kinds of logical and theoretical error, render the argument still more teleological, and suggest that functionalism cannot be saved by that or any road. More than anything, given its increasing popularity at home and abroad without apparently any serious criticism, I think it most important to unmask the entire "pattern variable" approach to development problems in terms of socio-psychological characteristics that are supposedly found in but more usually attributed to developed and underdeveloped societies. This neo-Weberian and pseudo-Freudian (or perhaps more accurately pseudo-Weberian and neo-Freudian) approach to development of underdeveloped countries by Parsonians and his fellow travellers like Almond, Coleman, Hagen, Hoselitz, Levy, and worst of all McClelland and their many followers is a theoretical snare and an empirical delusion. I have all ways known and maintained that it is fallacious to claim, as they do, that it is necessary or desirable for development for underdeveloped countries to switch from socio-cultural characteristics of particularism, ascription, and difuseness to those of universalism, achievement, and specificity (or the same under less Parsonian names). But since coming to underdeveloped countries I have learned also that this thesis is based on an ignorance or downright misrepresentation of the facts and reality of underdeveloped and developed countries and on totally ill-conceived theory, both of which should have been obvious all along. In fact, an honest look at reality in underdeveloped countries, and particularly at the organization and use of power which is so determinant of development and underdevelopment but which social scientists like so much to leave out of all consideration, shows - consider military coups and the role they play in economic organization for instance - that underdevelopment is not at all characterized by particularism, ascription, and difuseness while the developed countries are not characterized by the opposite, as even Mr. Eisenhower noted in his reference to the military-industrial complex. So, the characteristics attributed to development and underdevelopment do not reflect the realities of the respective countries. But maybe that is fortunate for the theorizing, since the characteristics selected for emphasis are also far from those which are really significant for the determination of underdevelopment and development. The important determining characteristics of development and underdevelopment are not social, cultural, or psychological attributes at all, and least of all are they any supposedly original or traditional ones; but they are relations, especially economic and power relations, and above - or below - all the historical development and present structure of the relations between developed metropolis and underdeveloped periphery; and it is these relations, rather than any falsely assigned attributes, that must change in order to stem the tide of deepening misery

and underdevelopment for most of the world's people. Since a number of my good friends seem to be deeply committed to this pattern variable sociology, it is therefore a particularly unpleasant duty for me to note that this social science theorizing and policy formulation is little more than the ultra reactionary "anti-communist" Moral Rearmament (MRA) movement in pseudo-scientific guise.

Some sacred or at least all too worshipped economic cows also come in for substantial criticism. I recently read Milton Friedman's Capitalism and Freedom; and its disingenuous mixture of fallaciously muddled logic with unscientific selection of some and crass disregard for other facts makes me marvel at how I could ever have been led, as others still are, to think that the guiding spirit of the economics department in which I received my PhD deserves his reputation of exceptionally able theoretician and empiricist. Of course hardly anybody in the world any more accepts, as I never did either, the ultra reactionary conclusions and policy recommendations which he claims to derive from neo-classical economic analysis. But most of my economist colleagues happily continue to operate from essentially the same basic assumptions and with largely the same analytic tools, introducing only a Keynesian modification here and an "adaptation to local conditions" there before going on to give underdeveloped countries (and their own) disasterous advice on how they are supposed to develop in the developed capitalist countries' image. The entire neo-classical marginal micro analysis of course, but the Keynesian macro analysis no less so, necessarily accepts the existing economic structure as given, though equally necessarily both of them fail entirely to try much less to succeed to show just what that structure is and what developmental and underdevelopmental effects it produces. For this reason among various others, as I mean to show in an article, the entire now famous debate about inflation and development between neo-classical monetarists and essentially Keynesian structuralists is largely Thomistic in that there is hardly any difference between them on the fundamentals of theory while both of them studiously avoid the facts of the real structure of underdevelopment and development (it occurs to me that this debate about underdeveloped countries is roughly equivalent to that between conservatives and liberals in the United States about the problem of poverty or of Negroes). My study has also lead me to plan an article on the theory of comparative advantage which subjects it to far greater criticism than it has to my knowledge so far received. It can and should be shown that the theory of comparative advantage and the policies supposedly derived from it rest on about twenty assumptions each and every one of which totally misrepresent reality and did so as well during and long before the time of Ricardo; that several of its assumptions are so inconsistent with each other as to make the theory theoretically quite untenable as well; that its theoretically static axioms do not provide a theoretically legitimate basis for the derivation of any development policy at all; that its principal tenets and the policies that have supposedly been derived from it consistently - and that is about the only consistent thing about the whole business - favor the stronger more developed countries and discriminate against the weaker or less industrialized and developed ones; that this is why the theory and its associated free trade doctrine were invented and applied and why they are still maintained by the metropolis, while very responsible economist and statesman throughout the history of the peripheral countries has rejected them for that reason unless he was or is directly or indirectly paid for or fooled into accepting this theory and associated though not even legitimately derived policy which evidently permit the exploitation of the at least in part therefore underdeveloping countries by the therefore developing ones. Looking beyond the trade relations between the metropolitan and peripheral countries to those established between and within them by foreign investment and aid, an honest look and even more so some careful research show that both in the past and the present the capitalist metropolitan countries' so called investment and aid for their economic colonies or partners among the also capitalist peripheral ones sucks capital out of the latter, increasingly deforms the structure of their economies, exerts conservative political pressure on them in less obvious as well as the more evident ways, and serves to maintain and deepen underdevelopment there today as it helped to create it in the past. There is room here for plenty of research on what really

goes on (vide an article of mine in the Nation, November 16, 1963 and a forthcoming one in Monthly Review) to counterweigh some of the stars and stripes and red flag waving on the subject. Lest you think that I am working over only the neo-classical right side of the ECLA structuralist center of the road, I should note that I am also working on a criticism of Leninist theory of imperialism. Erre, am not planning still another right wing apologist whitewashing of worldwide capitalism, but rather a reexamination of the theory in the light of the reality of net capital flows from the underdeveloped periphery to the developed metropolis today as well as during most, if not all, of the past. In general, all this of course implies the rejection on empirical and theoretical grounds of the entire basis, conception, exposition, and application of the Kostowian stages of growth approach to the problems of development. Similarly, it involves the criticism and rejection of the diffusionist thesis, be it in economic or in anthropological clothing, according to which economic development will and can only occur in the periphery thanks to the diffusion out or down to it from the metropolis of capital, technology, economic, political and social institutions, and a whole variety and pattern of cultural and other attributes. This view, explicit in some and implicit in so much other social science, is unfortunately belied by reality. Finally as an afterthought, I might mention that the neo-evolutionist technological determinism which is finding so much belated vogue among some of my friends and colleagues is also rendered unacceptable by any serious and honest examination of reality.

This same intellectual, professional, and political transformation I have undergone inevitably affects my teaching profoundly. Evidently, I can no longer teach the courses I once did in anything like the way I did before; and most of them I cannot teach anymore at all. This goes especially for introductory and standard theory courses in economics, sociology, and the social sciences generally, and in anthropology to a lesser degree. I cannot obviously teach, preach, suggest or fail to challenge error, to say nothing of pernicious falsehood, as I see it. Insofar as my teaching is to be directed at an American or similar audience, the resulting problem is however not so much one of disagreement as one of perspective. It is not so much that I may disagree with the conventional answers to the conventional questions, for that problem should exist for any serious teacher any time; it is that the world I see leads me to reject most of the conventional questions as irrelevant or worse yet as prone or even calculated to evade the real questions and to obscure or hide the real answers. If I teach courses on development - that is on underdevelopment - or on sociology or economics - that is on the nature of the society and economy which produces among other things development, underdevelopment, race problems, and the threat of nuclear destruction - I have to pose the questions, to say nothing of any possible answers, quite differently than do colleagues and books at home and to a large extent abroad. I could not devote my teaching and research to leading students, professional colleagues, and in general the public whose problems cry out for solutions down the garden path.

My teaching and research involve the further consideration of the audience they are directed to and communication with the same. With respect to teaching American students for instance, I fear that the difference in political-intellectual framework between me and even the most liberal of them, to say nothing of ordinary students, would result in a talking past each other that would make what I say seem like Chinese to them. I imagine the problem little different with potential American colleagues. One of the things, precisely, that I would ask of you is to tell me if my fears in this respect are well founded or whether I am exaggerating the peculiarity of my position and the difficulty of communication. In my research, the problem of audience and communication takes another form. I believe that within my present political-intellectual-scientific framework and with my present research-theory-policy purposes I cannot hope to influence metropolitan, and least of all American, mainstream research, theory, policy, or opinion except perhaps with a theoretical or empirical criticism now and then of the sort outlined above. The structure of American society and the country's position in the world, and to a lesser extent that

of the metropolis as a whole, renders it very unlikely if not impossible that in the foreseeable future its academic or scientific community, its public policy makers, or its public opinion come to think in anything approaching the lines I propose. There I could hope to speak only to a very few others who also are in or are moving out to far left field. As far as my possible positive contributions to theory, if any, are concerned, in the United States they could be useful only to a very limited number of people in the Afro-American's national liberation movement and to a possible few of those who are willing to look beyond the surface of the arms economy and nuclear politics. But more important than any difficulties I may encounter in communicating my research to people in capitalism's metropolis is the need to direct it to those people in capitalism's underdeveloped periphery and in the socialist world who in the scientific, intellectual, and political battlefronts may be or get to be in a position to use whatever contribution I might be able to make to the understanding of reality in their own revolutionary efforts to change it. It is in their scientific, intellectual, and political enterprise that I must seek to participate and cooperate because all available evidence suggests that only from their efforts can and will the economics, sociology, and politics of development emerge that will be necessary to liberate the underdeveloped countries and the world as a whole from the present sources of misery and war. The metropolis, and least of all its mainstream, will never produce the ideology, the social science, the policy, or the politics to aid the underdeveloped world to develop. In the future as in the past, the export of these metropolitan aids can only help the underdeveloped world become still more underdeveloped. I cannot in good conscience associate myself with this enterprise in the future as I did at one time in the past and must instead do whatever small part I can in stemming the import by the underdeveloped world of science and policy which prejudices their interests and contribute however I might be able to their development of the science, policy, and politics necessary for their liberation. This may involve, of course, fighting with more than a pen as weapon.



Having summarized my geographical, intellectual, and political wanderings of the past few years, I would like now to consider with you their implications for any possible return of mine to the American or some similar academic and professional world. Some reasons for my physical absence from and some obstacles to my return to that world have fallen away, while other reasons for and obstacles to my return have arisen. The main **purpose** of my trip abroad, orienting myself better in and improving my scientific perspective on the world around me, has for the time being been accomplished. My search for an institutional environment and people in Latin America who would guide me in the right direction has taught me that outside Cuba no such institution **does** or can exist in this continent and that there are few such people. The University of Brasilia was a partial exception to this rule - that is why I went there - but its material facilities prohibited research; and anyway the military coup proved how exceptional it was by throwing all of my immediate ex colleagues in jail without exception and after releasing those it did again, kicking them all out of the University. At the same time, the independent personal political - intellectual development that I had to undertake in the absence of institutional support and guidance has, I fear, already led me to the scientific frontier at least of the direction I am working in and therefore deprives me of the opportunity of ideological or scientific guidance of any but very few people within sight. But my same independent development and the extent to which it seems now to be ingrained in my perception, thinking, and work also mean that I probably do not have to continue to refuse jobs in Latin America, as I did several times in the past, or to **resist** returning to the United States for fear that their institutional environment would suck me back into the old rut (the institutions here that had money to offer me jobs imported it and along with it their entire scientific bag and baggage from the United States). <sup>4</sup>This political-scientific obstacle to my return to the old conservative environment, be it at home or abroad, seems to have disappeared.

But my same political-intellectual-professional development has created a whole set of other problems. <sup>4</sup>The kind of historical-theoretical research on underdevelopment that I want to do is difficult to do in the underdeveloped countries themselves **since** they lack the necessary resources to support it because of their very underdevelopment. <sup>4</sup>They do not have the financial resources to acquire the necessary bibliographical materials, and their immediate needs make it appear that they cannot well afford this kind of basic or longrange research. The books and the money for that are largely available/<sup>only</sup> in the developed countries, which of course carried many of the research materials and other resources away from the underdeveloped countries in the first place. The same political reasons and American pressure here are also making me increasingly unemployable in Latin American academic and research institutions. Even if they employ homegrown leftists, it is more risky for them to have foreign ones around; and a dean who is a personal friend of mine and who had offered me a job before the more recent changes in my political orientation and reputation withdrew the offer now that he has more money because he has two American projects supporting his enterprise. Brazil, of course, is now entirely closed to me; and I fear that after a few more such coups, several other countries hereabouts will be too. All this of course contributes substantially to my financial difficulties, and these in turn render full time devotion to serious research that much more difficult. Moreover, as you must know, in many ways access to the underdeveloped periphery, and certainly to another part of it than that in which I one is at any one time, is more available through the institutions of the developed metropolis - if they do not corrupt one - than it is through the underdeveloped institutions themselves. All these considerations lead me to want to inquire with you into the possibilities of my returning to the United States or going to some other metropolitan country for a while.

My present political, intellectual, and professional position poses several problems for my possible return to the United States and our professional world. The ones that arise in connection with my research and teaching probably do not require further discussion here. I fear that in my research I could not advance in any of the principal directions current in our profession and that in my teaching I would lack the agreement on fundamentals that is probably necessary to fruitful communication. These difficulties would, I fear, manifest themselves even in such technicalities as inability to publish the right sort of things in the right journals and conflict with my colleagues and students about selection of courses and their content. These and other matters, as well as advance statement of my political position, necessarily would cause difficulties in my getting a "first" job, keeping it afterwards, being promoted, transferring to another place, getting foundation or other research support, etc. Beyond that, there are difficulties with the government. The latter might try to interfere with or to prevent my work along the aforementioned lines, particularly inasmuch as I am a foreigner. In fact, my relations with the government already render difficult and maybe even impossible my reentry into the United States. For various technical reasons and my refusal to be drafted, I already had serious difficulties in traveling and returning from abroad while I was a permanent resident of the U.S. without citizenship. But now I am not even a resident anymore, since I lost my residency by staying out too long. I have applied for a new immigration (resident) visa but have received no answer in 5 months although I was initially told by the American embassy in Brazil that I could easily get such a visa in one month. I do not know if the refusal of the visa so far is for technical reasons or if, given my past relations with the Immigration service plus my recent political publications and other activities, the reasons are political. In any event, before I am finally granted any American visa other than a tourist one, like any other foreigner I now need a previous written job offer, in duplicate.

At long last, then, I come to the end of my progress report, if that is what it is. And now I want to ask for an early written response from you and, insofar as you are able and willing to give it, for your advice and help. The response I am asking for is that you write me what you have been doing and how things are going with you and where you are. The advice I would like is your evaluation of the desirability and possibility of my return to our professional world, be it in the United States or in Canada or Europe for instance, in view of the political, intellectual, and professional conditions that I would set and insist on with respect to what I would and would refuse to teach and do research on. The help that I presume to ask for in view of our former and I hope still current friendship is to have you investigate, and where possible pave or even create the way for my return should that become desirable. In this connection, it would perhaps be wise to give special consideration to the possibilities of beginning with a research job or one outside the United States which might circumvent at least some of the abovementioned problems. Though I realize that the summer is a late and particularly bad time to start looking, I would consider a job for as early as fall 1964; and in fact without one I am likely to end up quite underemployed if not altogether unemployed. Finally, let me say that if the foregoing problems render my return to our professional world from where I am now difficult, then they render it totally impossible without inside help. I would not know where or how to begin other than by writing you and a few other friends as I do. herewith.

As ever,

Andrew Gunder Frank