

S.M. 8/4/68

*Prof. Frank
document*

PSA moves to hire own prof

New recommendations stalled in committee

A statement circulated on campus Monday called for the launching of a project to hire a faculty member for SFU at faculty-student expense.

The project was initiated by a majority of faculty of the PSA Dept. following charges of obstruction of a new appointment "overwhelmingly approved" by PSA.

The approved appointment is for Prof. Andrew Gunder Frank, presently on the staff of Sir George Williams University, Montreal, who is a renowned social scientist and underdevelopment economist.

The faculty members said that the excellence of Frank's academic work is beyond question, but that the President's committee on appointments is withholding its approval due to present enquiries concerning his personality and political convictions.

The statement said that "four appointments, all made with the overwhelming support of members of the Department have been obstructed for non-academic reasons. The personal histories and political background of candidates are being investigated. Heads and other administrative officials are writing or phoning a range of people other than the applicant's referees and asking them -- in effect -- if they know anything bad about them, most often without even informing the candidate that they have done so."

The statement, which was primarily directed to the launching of a campaign for a student-faculty supported appointment, concentrated on a discussion of Prof. Frank:

"One of the four appointments being blocked is that of Prof. A.G. Frank. Prof. Frank did not apply for a position but was invited by the Department for an interview last October. Because of budgetary difficulties the Department voted in January to offer him a one-year visiting appointment to replace Prof. John Leggett who is on leave next year. The vote was overwhelmingly in Frank's favour, with two abstentions and no opposing votes."

(According to some members of the department the recommendation, which then went to the University Committee for approval, was held up because the Committee felt that Frank's "abrasive personality" would "stimulate" an already politi-

cally oriented department.)

The statement continued: "Prof. Frank's major book, Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America (Monthly Review Press, 1967) examines historically the economic relations of Chile and Brazil with the industrial nations of Europe and North America, and concludes that such countries cannot develop their socio-economies without undergoing revolutions.

The book, now translated into four languages, has aroused theoretical controversies among both orthodox economists and traditional Marxists throughout the hemisphere. Frank has also produced a large number of other works on economic underdevelopment, including a notable essay, "Sociology of Underdevelopment and Underdevelopment of Sociology" (Catalyst, Buffalo, N.Y., 1967), which effectively challenges most of the orthodox theories of underdevelopment currently in the United States over the past two decades. This essay, too, has aroused the ire of a number of North American social scientists.

"In addition to his scholarly writings, Frank has taken stands on current political and moral issues. At Sir George Williams University he and Prof. A.M. Shah recently wrote an article in The Georgian advocating a sit-in against Dow Chemical, the manufacturers of napalm. (Dow ceased its interviews and left the campus before a confrontation could occur.)"

The statement goes on to propose "to all student and faculty who are interested in free enquiry and who want vital and incisive minds on this campus -- that we bring Prof. Frank to this campus. We must have departments staffed by the most qualified persons. Let us bring Prof. Frank to Simon Fraser to teach us. Let us, the students and faculty of Simon Fraser, pay his salary . . .

"We would normally have waited for the University Committee's final verdict before launching this project. Prof. Frank's appointment, however, has been delayed for the past five months and by the time the verdict is reached this term may be over and the university community dispersed. Prof. Frank himself must also make his own plans for next year with-

in the next few weeks. This is a case upon which we can and must act immediately."

The statement concludes that "We solicit the support of all who are still willing to work for a vital university".

Yesterday morning following a PSA departmental meeting the following statement was issued in summary of the issues raised in Monday's document:

"A document has been circulated within the university regarding faculty appointments. We, the undersigned, wish to state here that the essential principles of this document are as follows:

"We fear that the university is taking political considerations into account in making academic appointments. We are deeply perturbed by this and also at some of the procedures which have been adopted by the relevant university committees in regard to the appointment of Prof. Frank and other candidates who have been recommended for appointment in the PSA Department.

"In particular we think that when a candidate applies for a position at SFU, if the University wishes to make inquiries about him from other people other than his referees, his prior permission should be obtained. The fact that such inquiries are frequently made in university circles does not, in our view, make them legitimate. Candidates would then be in a position to evaluate the kinds of questions which are being asked about them and in the light of these can then arrive at an assessment of SFU as an institution.

"We consider that Prof. Frank's contribution to the intellectual life of SFU would be so substantial that we would strongly support any efforts to make his talents and advice available to faculty and students."

The statement bore the signatures: Kathleen G. Aberle, Mordecai Briemberg, F.B. Collinge, Jerry Katz, Martin A. Nicolaus, N.S. Popkin, David C. Potter, G. B. Rush, Gerald B. Sperling, and P. Wheeldon.

It concluded with the note: "The following, although not available for signature, are known to be in sympathy with this statement: Martin Robin, John Leggett, Louis Feldhammer, J. Alldritt."

S.M. 8/4/68

THE PEAK, Wednesday, April 3rd, 1968

*PSA Dept.
Prog conduct.*

TA's support Frank hiring

At a meeting of PSA Teaching Assistants yesterday the following statement was issued in support of the faculty:

Faculty members in the PSA Dept. have signed a statement insisting that academic appointment procedures should not be influenced by non-academic criteria, including the political views held by those under consideration. We, as Teaching Assistants and/or graduate students in the PSA Dept., wholeheartedly support their position.

Unlike faculty, we have not taken part in departmental decisions concerning matters of appointment. However, as members of the same department we are affected by those decisions. There is every reason to view the current problem as being of the utmost importance. The department is not being faced with an isolated occurrence, but rather by what appears to be a concerted policy of appointment procedure which considers reasons other than academic.

Many of us will give of our time, effort and money in the campaign ahead to bring Professor Frank to SFU. Our department is on record as having overwhelmingly supported his appointment. None of us would deny him the right to take up that invitation on the grounds of his political convictions.

This endorsement was drafted early Tuesday morning and by Peak press time 23 TAs and grad students had approved it. These were:

D. Adair, A. Baronas, N. Bou-tillier, B. Charnock, D. Driscoll, W. Eliot-Hurst, H. Geisler, J. Hanley, J. Harding, D. Hawkes, W. Hoffer, C. Huxley, D. Katz, K. Lind, M. Loney, A. McDougall, P. Morley, L. Obertowich, H. Rosenthal, N. Smith, P. Stanworth, L. Sperling, and E. Zurick.

PSA meeting

A special meeting of all PSA graduate students, PSA honors and majors undergrads, and all students enrolled in PSA courses takes place today, 12:30, in Room AQ C9001.

The meeting was called to discuss the question of political considerations in PSA faculty appointments raised yesterday by 14 members of the PSA Dept.

Included in discussion at the meeting will be the dissemination of information on the issues raised by faculty and on the campaign to bring Andrew Gun-der Frank to the PSA faculty at student-faculty expense, and the question of student participation in the hiring of new faculty.

Time will be set aside for open discussion of the issues.

S.M. 8/4/68

10 430 /
*St. Albans
Prof. Conduct*

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

With regard to the paper circulated in the university on Monday, 1st April, 1968, and sent out over the names of 14 P.S.A. faculty members, I feel obliged to state at this stage that in my opinion the reporting specifically attributed to me in the document does not convey accurately what I reported or what I had in mind to report.

D. G. Bettison

D. G. Bettison
4th April, 1968.



SM 8/4/68

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

*Prof. Conduct.
PSA Dept.*

IMMEDIATE

MEMORANDUM

To The Secretary of Senate
cc-Chairman of Senate
Dean Funt, Dean Mackinnon
Subject

From John Matthews, Dean
Faculty of Arts
Date April 5, 1968

I wish to inform Senate that I dissociate myself from the second paragraph in the statement of reasons for calling the meeting of Senate on Monday, April 8.

Since subscribing to this request, I have learned that this second part of the statement, which refers to the "Quality of the academic environment of certain courses in the PSA Department" is interpreted as calling into question the academic competence of a member or members of Faculty. Such a matter should not be brought before Senate unless and until a complaint has been laid before the Dean of Faculty and has been investigated by him. This has not been done.

I shall be obliged if you will distribute copies of this statement to the members of Senate at the commencement of the meeting on Monday.

John Matthews

JWM:slc

SM 8/4/68

Prof Conduct
P.S.A. Dept

We the undersigned were requested on Friday afternoon to make ourselves available for possible interviews during a Special Closed Senate Meeting on Monday, April 8, 1968 at 8 p.m. in the Board and Senate Room.

The purpose of the Senate Meeting is: "To consider the implications of documents recently circulated in which allegations are made of non-professional conduct by University Committees in considering faculty appointments."

Only seventy-two hours notice of this investigation was given. It is extremely difficult to conduct any kind of fair examination of the serious issues involved without the following conditions being present:

1. That members of the University who have been involved in consideration of the appointments and procedures about which we are concerned not be in a position to rule on the propriety of their own actions or ours.
2. That the meeting be open and a verbatim record of the proceedings be made.
3. That legal representation be present.
4. That a duly-appointed representative from the C.A.U.T. central office be present.

In view of the fact that these conditions do not obtain under the proposed Senate procedures, we are unwilling to make ourselves available as requested.

We wish to emphasize our readiness to provide full information regarding our statement under the proper conditions as outlined above.

If the Senate acts without providing the conditions we have outlined, we shall feel free to present our information to the wider University Community.

Also on the agenda is the following item: "To examine the quality of the academic environment in certain courses in the P.S.A. Department."

We are appalled. We wonder why this question should be raised in the present context. We can only regard this as an attempt at retaliation.

J. Aldrett
 P. Wheeler
 F.B. Collins
 Martin A. Nichol
 David I. Pitt
 David B. Appleby
 Mordecai Shenberg
 M. S. Popkin
 Larry Katz
 Martin Cohen

M. Bush

Handwritten initials and date: 4/15/68

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Prof. Leggett
1/30/68

MEMORANDUM

SM 8/4/68

To Mr. Meyers

From

Subject Telegram from Dr. J.C. Leggett
(Received by telephone April 8, 1968)

Date April 8, 1968

I wish to associate myself with the April 5th statement of my colleagues re: Faculty Appointments. In doing so I protest any inquiry into the academic quality of P.S.A. courses as retaliation against the protest of my colleagues, charging the intrusion of politics on appointments.

The record of the P.S.A. Department in attracting students as well as the distinguished record of P.S.A. students receiving Woodrow Wilson and Commonwealth Scholarships objectively indicates the quality of instruction in our department. Please Communicate this message to Senate on Monday night.

Dr. J.C. Leggett,
Associate Professor,
P.S.A. Department.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

*try contact
Life dept.*

MEMORANDUM S.M. 8/4/68

To.....The Secretary of Senate
The Chairman of Senate
Members of Senate

From.....John Matthews, Dean
Faculty of Arts

Subject.....

Date.....April 8, 1968

I have sought, in the brief time allowed me, information concerning the matter for which the meeting for Monday, April 8, was called.

The attached statement is, in my opinion, the most useful contribution I can make to Senate's discussion, at this time, of the documents referred to in Item 1 in the notice of meeting.

I wish it to be understood that information given to me was given in informal conversation. I have had no time, nor have I attempted to verify any of the information so obtained.

Those faculty members who signed the document in question have decided they should not provide information except to a properly instituted committee or court of inquiry. I agree with this view and I have tried to avoid including in the attached statement any information which, in my opinion, should be reserved for such an inquiry. In this connection, it should be noted that the request for a meeting of Senate did not specify a closed meeting. It is for Senate to decide whether the meeting at this time should be closed or open.

John Matthews

S.M. 8/4/68

*J. H. Dept.
Prof. Conduct.*

Chairman and members of Senate,

I address myself to item 1 only of the matter specified in the notice calling the meeting.

The present faculty strength of the PSA department is 22 members of whom 15 are engaged in departmental duties at the present time.

On Monday afternoon, April 1, I received a copy of the first of the two documents to which was appended a typed list of 14 names, faculty members of the PSA Department, 4 of whom are presently off campus.

Later in the week, I received a copy of the second document, signed by 10 faculty members, with the names of 4 absent members appended. The same 14 names are on both documents. The second document appears to be a summary of the first, couched, Senate may consider, in more cautious terms, expressing concern instead of making allegations.

Procedure for making appointments in the PSA Department is as follows:

1. Applicants are considered in an "area" committee, and
2. A recommendation is submitted to, discussed and voted upon by the whole department.

Four appointments are referred to in the first of the two documents. Dr. Bettison has provided me with factual information on the cases to which he believes the statement refers.

There appears to be no dispute that the University Committee in the case of Professor Frank, and in at least one other case, has been concerned, or suspicious, as to the possibility that a majority in the department are influencing appointments for political reasons. It must therefore follow that the University Committee did, in a literal sense, take political considerations into account.

The protesting faculty members do not consider that a "cabal" is trying to control appointments in this way. They believe that the suspicion, or concern, of a University Committee is improper and that requests for further information have arisen from this suspicion or concern, and are therefore obstructive.

It is not to be expected that members of the department will always be informed of details about such requests for further information, and it is to be expected that their suspicion, or concern, will lead to inferences which may not be justified.

The decision to propose a visiting appointment for Professor Frank was supported, with no dissenting voice, by the Department; by some for budgetary reasons, by others because a full-time appointment in sociology, it was thought,

S.M. 8/14/68

PSA Dept.
Prof. Conduct.

should be reserved for a person who would satisfactorily fill Professor Bottomore's position as Head or Chairman in the area of Sociology.

Dr. Bettison has denied that he told the Department that the University Committee is seeking further information "about Frank's political activities". His actual communication, it would follow, was either distorted or recollected incorrectly. Dr. Bettison has also denied that he reported the University Committee as delaying approval "because they object to Frank's politics".

It is an acknowledged fact that the University Committee was concerned at, or suspicious of, the possible enlargement of a "left wing cabal". A statement to this effect, if Dr. Bettison in fact made it, could be legitimately rephrased as "objecting to his politics".

On the question of "behind the back" enquiries, Dr. Bettison, will, of course, speak for himself. Opinions I obtained from Departmental members condemned the practice. The mildest statement was that this "old type" administrative practice was not acceptable today.

None of the departmental members I have spoken to expressed any doubt as to the academic qualifications or intellectual capacity of Professor Frank.

Before proceeding to detailed enquiry, should this be decided upon, Senate may wish to consider at the present time the following:

1. Whether in general a political bias in a Department is a matter for academic concern (members will know that the London School of Economics first achieved renown when Harold Laski was professor; since then the political tone at the School has veered towards the right. Perhaps Senate would not wish any department of this University to emulate that institution).
2. Should Senate decide that political bias in a Department is a matter of academic concern, whether inquiry is called for as to the presence of such bias in the PSA Department.
3. Whether prospective personal relations with an applicant are the concern of faculty outside the department in which the appointment is being made.
4. Whether Senate finds acceptable, "behind the back" enquiries

SM 8/4/68 Prof. conduct
of PSA acct.

- a) by a head who is negotiating personally with an applicant, or
 - b) by the President or a Dean, who is not negotiating directly with the applicant, or
 - c) informally by any person.
5. Whether an informal opinion casually obtained can properly be given, in Committee, the status of a considered appraisal.
 6. Whether an acknowledged bias, openly and perhaps vehemently avowed, is academically unacceptable, that is, whether it does or does not further the "education" of a student (Professor Karl Popper is notoriously intolerant).
 7. In what way doubts expressed, by persons outside the discipline as to a department's judgement on academic competence, should be tested before being given weight.

Finally, Senate may wish to express its opinion on the propriety or impropriety in all the circumstances of the publication of these documents; but this question, I submit, concerns primarily the administration and the Faculty Association.

S. M. 8/4/68

7 April, 1968

PSA Dept
Prof Conduct

We have been called to an emergency closed Senate meeting by R.L. Hunt, A.R. MacKinnon, J.W. Matthews, R.J.C. Harper, D.G. Tuck and W. Vidaver to deal with the following questions:

1. To consider the implications of documents recently circulated in which allegations are made of nonprofessional conduct by University Committees in considering faculty appointments
2. To examine the quality of the academic environment in certain courses in the PSA Department.

I think we will all agree that if the allegations made in the two statements, if the fourteen PSA members are true, then the implications of these documents are quite serious. Senate, under these conditions, will have the grave responsibility of suggesting some means of correcting the situation. And, if there is no truth in these statements, we may want to raise serious questions about the propriety of these statements.

The inclusion of Item Two on the call for the meeting raises many additional questions. For one, Senate will want to ask why we have been asked to examine "the quality of the academic environment in certain PSA courses" at a meeting which has as its first item the consideration of charges by PSA members. The presumption on the part of many that this item is meant by the six signatories to punish members of the PSA Dept. will be strong indeed. (Conceivably, one might construct a scenario in which the PSA members are first rebuked for having raised questions about the nature of the University Committee's actions and, with this rebuke delivered, are then investigated in relation to the nature of their courses.)

In order to justify the inclusion of Item Two on the agenda of this emergency meeting, the six signatories will have to show that there is more reason to question the academic environment in the PSA Department than in other departments and faculties, and also that there is sufficient reason to consider this at an emergency meeting.

There are several reasons why Item Two should be dealt with first at this meeting:

- (1) There is considerable question as to whether all of the six signatories to the call understood the nature of this item. There is further some indication that one or more of the signatories to this call would like to remove their names from Item Two. Clearly, if they do so, they will remove their names from Item One also. If two signatories remove their names, we will no longer have the necessary five signatures for our meeting and will have to adjourn.

For these reasons alone, Item Two should be discussed first.

- (2) An examination of the extent and nature of the "evidence" offered by the six signatories in defence of Item Two may very well be germane to a discussion of the validity of the allegations made by the fourteen PSA members. Since several of the six signatories are themselves members of the University Committee which has been criticized, their inability to defend adequately their reasons for placing the item on the agenda may put into question their actions on the University Committee. If it can be shown that the examples they introduce under this item can be cited for other courses, departments and faculties, then it will appear that the six signatories have discriminated in placing only PSA courses on the agenda for the emergency meeting.

It will also be informative to see the extent to which the signatories base themselves upon gossip, hearsay or complaints of unrepresentative discontented students. Furthermore, it will be instructive to learn why the six signatories have called an emergency meeting to discuss these points.

Finally, if it is found that the six signatories have not provided a sufficient justification for their isolation of PSA courses, if it is found that they have taken these questions to Senate without first bringing them to the attention of the instructors concerned, the Head of the Department, the Dean of the Faculty and the Faculty, respectively, then Senate may wish to censure or rebuke the six signatories for discriminating and improper procedures in bringing this item to the Senate in this manner.

Since these considerations are grave and unprecedented in the history of the Simon Fraser University Senate, and since several of the six signatories are members of the University Committee which is under criticism, Item Two should be discussed before we begin to consider the validity of the allegations made in the statement by the PSA faculty members.

To fail to discuss Item Two (an item which may reveal much about the University Committee) first may suggest that Senate is more concerned with the propriety of making charges of nonprofessional conduct than with the validity of such charges and with taking action to correct these conditions. Senate should be chary of appearing to follow a pattern (familiar in other institutions) in which those who bring charges of misconduct are themselves censured (for making the charges) by ~~the~~ people they have charged.

It is entirely possible and perhaps even probable that, upon considering

S.M. 8/4/68

PSA Dept
Prof. Conduct

the implications of having placed Item Two on the agenda for this emergency meeting and upon considering the weakness of any points which may be brought up under this item, Senate may be asked not only to keep Item Two from being discussed first but in fact to strike it from the agenda entirely.

If this occurs, it will appear to substantiate the suggestions made above:

- (1) that the six signatories acted in a discriminating and improper manner in bringing the item to the Senate in this manner;
- (2) that the nature of the evidence which would be introduced in support of Item Two might raise serious questions about the basis of University Committee decisions -- and might lend support to the "allegations" of the fourteen PSA members; and
- (3) that the Senate will appear to be more concerned with the propriety of making charges than with the validity of the charges and with taking actions to correct these conditions.

M. A. Lebowitz

S. M. 8/4/68

*RS Dept
Proposed.*

Proposed Senate procedures for examining the validity of the allegations recently made by fourteen members of the F.S.A. Department

1. Each witness invited to speak before Senate shall be permitted to make a general statement about the documents which have been circulated.
2. Each witness shall remain to answer questions of Senate members.
3. Witnesses, once they have answered the questions of Senate members, shall remain in the Senate Room until all other witnesses have been questioned.
4. All witnesses shall be given the option of refusing to appear unless legal counsel is present, a duly-accredited representative of the C.A.U.P. (or the A.U.C.C.) is present, or the meeting is open. Exercise of this option shall not in any way reflect upon the prospective witnesses.
5. Senate shall begin by hearing the members of the University Committee who are also members of Senate.

M. A. Lebowitz
6 April, 1968

SM 8/4/68

*Prof. Conduci
PSA Dept.*

The undersigned request a Special Meeting of Senate

1. To consider the implications of documents recently circulated, in which allegations are made of nonprofessional conduct by University Committees in considering faculty appointments
2. To examine the quality of the academic environment in certain courses in the PSA Department.

*W. M. G. G. G.
J. Matthews
R. J. H. H.
W. J. H. H.*

April 4, 1968

5. M. 8/4/68

Prof. Conduct
PSA Dept.

It has become apparent that discrimination on political grounds is being applied to faculty recommendations for new appointments in the PSA Dept. Four appointments all made with the overwhelming support of members of the Department have been obstructed for non-academic reasons. The personal histories and political background of candidates are being investigated. Heads and other administrative officials are writing or phoning a range of people other than the applicants' referees and asking them -- in effect -- if they know anything bad about them, most often without even informing the candidate that they have done so.

This obstruction of appointments and investigation of candidates is immoral, damaging to the careers of those concerned and makes it impossible for us presently on the staff to teach an adequate program. Therefore it is imperative that we bring this matter to the attention of the entire university community.

One of the four appointments being blocked is that of Professor A.G. Frank. Professor Frank did not apply for a position but was invited by the Department for an interview last October. Because of budgetary difficulties the Department voted in January to offer him a one-year visiting appointment to replace Professor John Leggett who is on leave next year. The vote was overwhelmingly in Frank's favour, with two abstentions and no opposing votes. According to Professor D.G. Bettison, Head of the PSA Department, however, the University Committee is not satisfied and is seeking further information about Frank's political activities.

According to Professor Bettison's report, the University Committee is delaying approval because they object to Frank's politics; because they feel that the PSA Department is being run by a "left-wing cabal" which must be halted, and because they feel it is advantageous for them to reject a temporary appointment now before Frank comes here rather than to fight later against a permanent appointment should Frank be proposed for one.

Professor Frank's major book, Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America (Monthly Review Press, 1967), examines historically the economic relations of Chile and Brazil with the industrial nations of Europe and North America, and concludes that such countries cannot develop their socio-economies without undergoing revolutions. The book, now translated into four languages, has aroused theoretical controversies among both orthodox economists and traditional Marxists throughout the hemisphere. Frank has also produced a large number of other works on economic underdevelopment, including a notable essay, "Sociology of Underdevelopment and Underdevelopment of Sociology" (Catalyst, Buffalo, N.Y. 1967), which effectively challenges most of the orthodox theories of underdevelopment current in the United States over the past two decades. This essay, too, has aroused the ire of a number of North American social scientists. In addition to his scholarly writings, Frank has taken stands on current political and moral issues. At Sir George Williams University, he and Professor A.M. Shah recently wrote an article in The Georgian advocating a sit-in against Dow Chemical, the manufacturers of napalm. (Dow ceased its interviews and left the campus before a confrontation could occur.)

SM 8/4/68

Prof. Conduat.
PSA Dept.

2.

Considering Frank's scholarly accomplishments on the one hand and the reactions of the University Committee on the other hand, we feel that this raises the question of political repression in faculty appointments. It is clear that with the implementation of such a repressive policy, questions of scholarship, intellectual liveliness and controversy, democratic procedures, and the particular interests of PSA faculty and students are being sacrificed.

We therefore propose -- to all students and faculty who are interested in free enquiry and who want vital and incisive minds on this campus -- that we bring Professor Frank to this campus. We must have departments staffed by the most qualified persons. Let us bring Professor Frank to Simon Fraser to teach us. Let us, the students and faculty of Simon Fraser, pay his salary. Let us be his audience. In this way we would avail ourselves of his knowledge and company, which we greatly value, and we also would be able to work with him on research problems that interest us all.

We would normally have waited for the University Committee's final verdict before launching this project. Professor Frank's appointment, however, has been delayed for the past five months and by the time the verdict is reached this term may be over and the university community dispersed. Professor Frank himself must also make his own plans for next year within the next few weeks. This is a case upon which we can and must act immediately. If we bring Professor Frank here those administrators and faculty who fear and oppose his presence will then be obliged to read his works and debate his ideas, not his politics. These debates will take place publicly where Frank can reply and where we can participate and register our own judgments.

We solicit the support of all who still are willing to work for a vital university.

Appended is a curriculum vita of Frank. We will make available copies of his article, "Sociology of Underdevelopment and Underdevelopment of Sociology". Other works may be obtained from the library.

Kathleen Aberle
J. Alldritt
M. Briemberg
F. Collinge
Louis Feldhammer
J. Katz
John Leggett
Martin Nicolaus

Nathan Popkin
David Potter
Martin Robin
G. B. Rush
G. Sperling
P. Wheeldon