Tells the Facts and Names the Names

CounterPunch

June 16-30, 2007

Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

VOL. 14, NO. 12

The Making of Hillary Clinton

By Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

his is the summer for show-and-tell books about two icons of the Nineties, one of whom survived into the twenty-first century. We'll leave Tina Brown's bio of Princess Di and focus our gaze on Jeff Gerth and Don Van Natta Jr.'s Her Way: The Hopes and Ambitions of Hillary Rodham Clinton. This is not the only account of HRC's life now on sale. We also have Carl Bernstein's vast A Woman in Charge and, from the far right, Bay Buchanan's The Extreme Makeover of Hillary (Rodham) Clinton.

But in terms of newly excavated facts from this oft-mined topic, Gerth and Van Natta offer the most. It was of course the New York Times' Gerth who brought us the Whitewater scandal during Bill Clinton's 1992 campaign. Fortunately for the Clintons, his prose was so impenetrable that whatever scandal might have occurred during that real estate transaction was entirely obscured in a verbal thicket. Van Natta at least seems capable of writing clearly. The only chapter that is impossible to decipher is clearly written by Gerth, revisiting the Whitewater scandal and the relationship of this real estate investment by the Clintons to Madison Guaranty, a topic on which many millions of dollars of public money were squandered by special prosecutor Kenneth Starr.

HRC, one can surmise from Gerth and Van Natta's interesting and well-researched account, has always been an old-style Midwestern Republican in the Illinois style; one severely infected with Methodism, unlike the more populist variants from Indiana, Wisconsin and Iowa.

Hillary's first known political enter-

(Editors continued on page 5)

André Gunder Frank, the FBI and the Bureaucratic Exile of a Critical Mind

By David Price

ndré Gunder Frank's life work examined how the poverty of underdeveloped nations was not the product of haphazard misfortune, but was the inevitable outcome of capitalist economic systems. His studies of the "development of underdevelopment" described the process of capital accumulation as part of a larger world system, first in southern regions of the New World, then later in the Old World. During the 1960s and 70s, Frank's writings critically transformed the understanding of global inequality.

The recent release of 190 out of an acknowledged 298 pages of Frank's FBI file under the Freedom of Information Act illuminates not only the extent of the FBI's surveillance of him and his work, but of the U.S. government's interests in seeing to it that he could not teach in U.S. universities. For much of his life, he worked as a peripatetic scholar traveling under a German passport; this itinerant status was the combined result of his love of travel, a deep distrust of authority, a reluctance to compromise, and a concerted effort by the INS, FBI and other U.S. agencies to not allow Frank to renew his Resident Alien status.

Frank's FBI file contains records from a 1962 U.S. Army investigation of his father, a famous pacifist and German novelist, Leonhard Frank. His father's file details his involvement in the failed 1919 Berlin communist revolt, political affiliations, writings, and how he and his family fled Berlin for the United States in 1933. The file records that at the age of four, André (born Andreas; Gunder was a high school nickname) came to the U.S.A. with his parents, received his schooling

in California and Michigan, eventually writing his doctoral dissertation on Soviet Ukrainian agricultural production at the University of Chicago under the tutelage of Milton Friedman in 1957.

The FBI's first file entry on André Gunder Frank was a 1957 memo from an Omaha FBI agent requesting permission from J. Edgar Hoover to open an investigation on Frank's activities at Iowa State University, where Frank was an economics professor. This request was spawned by Frank's analysis at a campus Social Science Seminar of the "Soviet governmental process", where he "rudely" remarked "that the Politburo is no different than the Security Council we have as an adviser to the President... [Frank] advised that the general tenor of democratic action in Russia as in the United States. [Frank] argued that the Russians have a legislative branch in the Presidium which fulfills the same place as our legislative assemblies". (The agent's report did not include a comparison of KGB and FBI methods of monitoring dissident scholars.) The identity of the FBI informer remains censored but appears to have been one of Frank's ISU colleagues. The FBI made further inquiries among ISU faculty concerning Frank's lovalties, and the FBI assembled a dossier on Frank's educational background and political affiliations – noting with concern that he had been published in the American Socialist. Hoover advised the Omaha agent not to open an investigation because Headquarters did not believe Frank warranted investigation for illegal communist activities.

Frank's early writings didn't have the sparks of his later radical analysis, and the FBI's interest in his politics was sated

by this brief campus investigation. That spring, Frank resigned from Iowa State and took a position at Michigan State University, where he taught for five years before resigning to travel for several years in Europe and South America. During the 1960s, he held university positions in Brazil, Canada, Chile, and Mexico.

The FBI next investigated Frank in 1961, when his and his mother's names appeared in FBI and CIA investigations related to the espionage arrest of Soviet U.N. delegate, Igor Melekh. As part of this investigation, J. Edgar Hoover sent CIA Director Allen Dulles a summary of FBI intelligence relating to André Gunder Frank's contacts with Melekh. Frank's mother, Edena Frank, had befriended Melekh in her capacity as a translator at the U.N.; she had introduced André to Melekh, and the FBI believed that Melekh and Gunder corresponded for some time.

In 1961, an FBI agent interviewed Frank at his home and concluded that "apart from Frank's comment that Melekh's character did not lend itself to espionage, he made no statements which would give any insight into his sympathies. He was noticeably cautious in his selection of words and volunteered no information on which his sympathies might be evaluated". Frank told the FBI that Melekh had been generous to his mother and had made kind inquiries after her health during

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Assistant Editor
ALEVTINA REA

Business
BECKY GRANT
DEVA WHEELER

Counselor Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except one in July & one in August, 22 issues a year

CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org

a period of illness, "a gesture for which Dr. Frank was very grateful". Frank had asked Melekh for introductions to Soviet scholars who might help him during a research visit to the Soviet Union in July 1960, but Melekh had not provided any contacts. Charges against Melekh were later dropped, and he returned to the USSR with his family.

In March 1962, the FBI's Bern legal attaché sent Hoover (with copies sent to the CIA and FBI liaisons in Bonn, Paris and Rio de Janeiro) a memo (still heavily censored) reporting that "the American Consulate General, Geneva, Switzerland,

One 1995 FBI report concluded, "there is no doubt that Frank is thoroughly anti-American and pro-Communist and would represent a danger to this country were he present".

is being contacted for any information it might have with respect to the allegation that Frank was responsible for the poisoning of _______." The half page that follows is still censored, and there's no mention of this "poisoning" in the remainder of his file; it is unclear what this report means, but it is likely that the FBI was fishing for or cultivating rumors to be used to discredit Frank. If there was any evidence supporting this claim, the FBI would have hunted for it, but this is the only reference to any poisoning in his released file.

In August 1962, the FBI intercepted a letter Frank wrote his mother from Guatemala. In the letter, Frank responded to her motherly concerns about him not marrying and settling in one place. Frank wrote:

"That no one is forcing me not to stay in one place is true. I am trying to stay in one place for a while – Cuba – but I haven't even been able to get there, much less stay there. I think of course my reasons for not working in the U.S. are good ones... I have tried by mail to get a job at the new university of Europe in Florence. But I never heard from them, and it's not the kind of place for me. I am beginning to suspect – much too rightwing, but then most places are including all places in the

U.S. I have a job offer from Leipzig East Germany, but as you know I can't stand the Germans. ... I am getting ready to retire also – from the world. I don't think I like it. I don't know why my father put up with it so long".

FBI reactions to this letter are partially censored, but one later FBI commentary noted "that the subject's father was a suicide". Four months later Frank married Chilean Marta Fuentes, whose radical political views helped push Frank's critique further.

Frank's intellectual interests increasingly focused on how American and European policies extracted wealth from South American nations. In 1963, a Rio de Janeiro FBI agent reported to Hoover that Frank had written a letter to the U.S. Embassy criticizing American policy in Brazil. The agent reported that Frank wrote, "Americans in Brazil are engage in 'spoilage.' He has further made the remarks, according to the Political Section, that he does not feel that the help that has been given to Brazil has done any good". A more extensive FBI investigation of Gunder was then undertaken - mostly rehashing old information with new efforts to trace his movements, but this time the FBI noted his developing critique of how the U.S.A. manipulated South American political and economic developments.

In 1996, Gunder told me he believed that a letter he had written, mimeographed and sent to about a dozen U.S. friends in 1964, had been turned over to U.S. authorities by one of the recipients. He wrote me that "the INS people cited that letter as 'grounds' for my exclusion from the U.S. because of what I said in that private letter, and in an article published in the Monthly Review about my 'ideology"". Frank noted the possibility (suggested by a third party) that one of the letter's recipients who had been critically mentioned in this letter had been a "conduit of the letter to the U.S. government". However, nothing in Frank's FBI file referenced this letter - though other intercepted letters are reproduced or summarized.

This July 1, 1964, letter was a typed, 10-page single-spaced impassioned dispatch combining detailed explanations of Frank's ideological transformations with a notice of his desire to return to the U.S.A. to rejoin an academic world he had abandoned. He chronicled four years of travels, teachings, writings, and the transformations of his understanding of