My name is Arturo Morales Carrion. First, I want to express my thanks to this Committee and to its distinguished Chairman for this opportunity to present a statement at this hearing. I represent no government, no party or group, but simply the views of a concerned citizen. I have had long experience in government, on both the federal and Commonwealth levels, but my expressions today are those of a longtime student of the U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship. I shall be frank, as we should be among friends.

The dialogue between Puerto Rico and the Congress has been difficult at times. Too many crucial matters absorb your attention and, as is the case in a truly representative democracy, there is frequent turnover in your ranks. Not many are able to devote time and effort to study the intricacies of Puerto Rican issues. And yet a meeting of the minds between Congress and Puerto Rico is of significance not only to us Puerto Ricans, but to the U.S. position and interests in the Caribbean area. A convergence of views may be a laborious but not an impossible task.

In my brief remarks, I would like to underscore some facts. We Puerto Ricans may appear to some of you as deeply divided political tribes. But if you look behind our ideological quarrels, you will find a people, forged in nearly five centuries of history, with a distinctive ethnic and cultural profile. No matter how powerful the American influence may have been, we remain a West Indian cultural society, in our ethos, language and folk traditions. The U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship becomes, thus, a test of U.S. ability to deal with human and social diversity.

However different we may look, we have a core of shared values with you. We are strongly committed to government by ballots, not bullets; we deeply believe in human rights; we abhor authoritarian statism and are profoundly devoted to the essential freedoms proclaimed by the U.S. and Commonwealth Constitutions. And we seek access to opportunity, to education, to self-fulfillment and self-respect.

In the past, it has not been easy for the Congress to understand our distinctiveness or to realize how many common values we share. For almost half a century, there was great reluctance in these halls to grant us the right to self-government. It was easier to find help for our economic plight, to understand, for instance, that a tax system, designed for a rich continental republic could not be imposed on a densely populated island with limited natural resources, and that flexibility was needed if Puerto Rico was to move forward. It was much more difficult to acknowledge that the principle of government by consent of the governed, also applied to us. Even the extension of citizenship in 1917 failed to equate it with this U.S. time-honored principle.

For nearly half a century, we were ruled by presidential appointees, many of whom did not know Spanish nor had any kind of background to deal with a diverse cultural group.

In spite of several advances in many fields --in health, education, transportation-- the relationship was eminently colonial. The men who sat at our Governor's House --La Fortaleza-- were responsible to the President, not to our people.

Between 1948 and 1952, this situation changed dramatically. We must remember that history or else we may repeat the mistakes of the past. Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress was enacted fully recognizing the principle of government by consent; furthermore, it was adopted "in the nature of a compact so that the people of Puerto Rico may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption." When the people of Puerto Rico did that, and after further
negotiations, Public Law 447 enacted by the 82nd Congress again reiterated that Law 600 "was adopted by the Congress as a compact with the people of Puerto Rico, to become operative upon its approval by the people of Puerto Rico."

Those of us who voted for the law firmly believed that we had entered into a new era in our relations with the United States. Several areas were ill-defined in the arrangement but an effective step had been taken to recognize Puerto Rico's right to self-determination and to a government by consent of the governed. We believed we were on the road to a new experiment in U.S. federalism that provided an evolving political framework for the great momentum that started in the socioeconomic field. This was also the belief that inspired the United Nations Resolution on Puerto Rico in 1953. This was the core of President Kennedy's Executive Memorandum of July 25, 1961, which stated, among other things: "The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution... All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President."

The acknowledgment of Puerto Rico's rights helped most effectively Puerto Rican contributions during the '50s and '60s to inter-American technical and cultural cooperation.

Are we to forget that past? Is Puerto Rico, through lack of a collective memory, to be sent back to square one and considered again as one more territory?

May I sharply disagree with the GAO Report on its chapter on political development. It is amazing that no reference is made to Laws 600 and 447. It is regrettable that the thrust and meaning of Kennedy's memorandum, published in the Federal Register, is totally ignored, not to mention the very significant cases in the Boston Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

I have emphasized the political framework of contemporary Puerto Rico because, in my view, it cannot be isolated from the conditions which create economic development. The United States-Puerto Rico relationship is unique -- both politically and economically. What was known as Operation Bootstrap in the '50s and '60s, was made possible by our access to the U.S. mainland market, to U.S. sources of capital and the capability of designing a tax-exempt incentives program. But it was also greatly aided by a psychological élan created by the conviction that we are moving into a new, fruitful era in our evolving relationship with the United States. Two of the ingredients of a successful economic climate are faith and self-reliance: faith in the institutional pattern, and a feeling of self-help. We had both in the '50s and '60s and so it was appreciated by the Congress.

In the '70s, we sailed stormy seas. As Teodoro Moscoso, who ran our economic development program, has asserted, "the 1973 energy crisis was not a mere blow; it was a knockout punch." And yet we survived. Section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code helped us greatly in navigating the rapids, by attracting long-term capital investment and making possible, to a large measure, our pharmaceutical and electronics industries. But it must be stressed that Section 936 and its effects are possible because of the unique relationship under Commonwealth. This section could not exist under statehood. It is my firm conviction that, in spite of whatever shortcomings we may point out, it was the Commonwealth relationship that enabled Puerto Rico to survive the strain of the 1973 recession.

In the fiscal and economic field, this relationship is delicate, born of realistic considerations. It should not be tampered with, without an awareness of its history or a realization of its uniqueness.

The times call for a new encounter between Puerto Rico and the Congress. The realities of the United States-Puerto Rico relations must be placed afresh in the U.S. public mind. But we must build on the foundations that have been laid, on the experience that has been gained. If the past is prologue, it is a prologue that should be carefully read and remembered.

U.S. interests are deeply involved in Puerto Rico. They are represented, economically, by over $5 billion a year in trade and more than $10 billion in investments. But they are also concerned with the U.S. role in the Caribbean and Latin America and, in no small measure, by the strategic considerations, which may be in the background of these discussions, but are crucial to an understanding of why the United States is in Puerto Rico. Unfortunately, I am unable to enter now into this critical area. If your Committee is planning to study it—as it should—I would be most interested in submitting my views.

Again, my profound thanks for this opportunity to present some of my concerns before you today.

1. Reiterate principles
   - Liberty
   - Prosperity
   - Federal

2. Strengthen P.R. economic structure
3. Section 936 in essential part
4. Eliminate federal transfer payments

###
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STATEMENT BY DR. ARTURO MORALES-CARRION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
May 22, 1986

My name is Arturo Morales Carrion. First, I want to express my thanks to this Committee and to its distinguished Chairman for this opportunity to present a statement at this hearing. I represent no government, no party or group, but simply the views of a concerned citizen. I have had long experience in government, on both the federal and Commonwealth levels, but my expressions today are those of a longtime student of the U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship. I shall be frank, as we should be among friends.

The dialogue between Puerto Rico and the Congress has been difficult at times. Too many crucial matters absorb your attention and, as is the case in a truly representative democracy, there is frequent turnover in your ranks. Not many are able to devote time and effort to study the intricacies of Puerto Rican issues. And yet a meeting of the minds between Congress and Puerto Rico is of significance not only to us Puerto Ricans, but to the U.S. position and interests in the Caribbean area. A convergence of views may be a laborious but not an impossible task.

In my brief remarks, I would like to underscore some facts. We Puerto Ricans may appear to some of you as deeply divided political tribes. But if you look behind our ideological quarrels, you will find a people, forged in nearly five centuries of history, with a distinctive ethnic and cultural profile. No matter how powerful the American influence may have been, we remain a West Indian cultural society, in our ethos, language and folk traditions. The U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship becomes, thus, a test of U.S. ability to deal with human and social diversity.

However different we may look, we have a core of shared values with you. We are strongly committed to government by ballots, not bullets; we deeply believe in human rights; we abhor authoritarian statism and are profoundly devoted to the essential freedoms proclaimed by the U.S. and Commonwealth Constitutions. And we seek access to opportunity, to education, to self-fulfillment and self-respect.

In the past, it has not been easy for the Congress to understand our distinctiveness or to realize how many common values we share. For almost half a century, there was great reluctance in these halls to grant us the right to self-government. It was easier to find help for our economic plight, to understand, for instance, that a tax system, designed for a rich continental republic could not be imposed on a densely populated island with limited natural resources, and that flexibility was needed if Puerto Rico was to move forward. It was much more difficult to acknowledge that the principle of government by consent of the governed, also applied to us. Even the extension of citizenship in 1917 failed to equate it with this U.S. time-honored principle.

For nearly half a century, we were ruled by presidential appointees, many of whom did not know Spanish nor had any kind of background to deal with a diverse cultural group.

In spite of several advances in many fields -- in health, education, transportation -- the relationship was eminently colonial. The men who sat at our Governor's House -- La Fortaleza -- were responsible to the President, not to our people.

Between 1948 and 1952, this situation changed dramatically. We must remember that history or else we may repeat the mistakes of the past. Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress was enacted fully recognizing the principle of government by consent; furthermore, it was adopted "in the nature of a compact so that the people of Puerto Rico may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption." When the people of Puerto Rico did that, and after further
negotiations, Public Law 447 enacted by the 82nd Congress again reiterated that Law 600 "was adopted by the Congress as a compact with the people of Puerto Rico, to become operative upon its approval by the people of Puerto Rico."

Those of us who voted for the law firmly believed that we had entered into a new era in our relations with the United States. Several areas were ill-defined in the arrangement but an effective step had been taken to recognize Puerto Rico's right to self-determination and to a government by consent of the governed. We believed we were on the road to a new experiment in U.S. federalism that provided an evolving political framework for the great momentum that started in the socio-economic field. This was also the belief that inspired the United Nations Resolution on Puerto Rico in 1953. This was the core of President Kennedy's Executive Memorandum of July 25, 1961, which stated, among other things: "The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution. All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President."

The acknowledgment of Puerto Rico's rights helped most effectively Puerto Rican contributions during the '50s and '60s to inter-American technical and cultural cooperation.

Are we to forget that past? Is Puerto Rico, through lack of a collective memory, to be sent back to square one and considered again as one more territory?

May I sharply disagree with the GAO Report on its chapter on political development. It is amazing that no reference is made to Laws 600 and 447. It is regrettable that the thrust and meaning of Kennedy's memorandum, published in the Federal Register, is totally ignored, not to mention the very significant cases in the Boston Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. I have emphasized the political framework of contemporary Puerto Rico because, in my view, it cannot be isolated from the conditions which create economic development. The United States-Puerto Rico relationship is unique—both politically and economically. What was known as Operation Bootstrap in the '50s and '60s, was made possible by our access to the U.S. mainland market, to U.S. sources of capital and the capability of designing a tax-exempt incentives program. But it was also greatly aided by a psychological élan created by the conviction that we are moving into a new, fruitful era in our evolving relationship with the United States. Two of the ingredients of a successful economic climate are faith and self-reliance: faith in the institutional pattern, and a feeling of self-help. We had both in the '50s and '60s and so it was appreciated by the Congress.

In the '70s, we sailed stormy seas. As Teodoro Moscoso, who ran our economic development program, has asserted, "the 1973 energy crisis was not a mere blow; it was a knockout punch." And yet we survived. Section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code helped us greatly in navigating the rapids, by attracting long-term capital investment and making possible, to a large measure, our pharmaceutical and electronics industries. But it must be stressed that Section 936 and its effects are possible because of the unique relationship under Commonwealth. This section could not exist under statehood. It is my firm conviction that, in spite of whatever shortcomings we may point out, it was the Commonwealth relationship that enabled Puerto Rico to survive the strain of the 1973 recession.

In the fiscal and economic field, this relationship is delicate, born of realistic considerations. It should not be tampered with, without an awareness of its history or a realization of its uniqueness.

The times call for a new encounter between Puerto Rico and the Congress. The realities of the United States-Puerto Rico relations must be placed afresh in the U.S. public mind. But we must build on the foundations that have been laid, on the experience that has been gained. If the past is prologue, it is a prologue that should be carefully read and remembered.

U.S. interests are deeply involved in Puerto Rico. They are represented, economically, by over $5 billion a year in trade and more than $10 billion in investments. But they are also concerned with the U.S. role in the Caribbean and Latin America and, in no small measure, by the strategic considerations, which may be in the background of these discussions, but are crucial to an understanding of why the United States is in Puerto Rico. Unfortunately, I am unable to enter now into this critical area. If your Committee is planning to study it—as it should—I would be most interested in submitting my views.

Again, my profound thanks for this opportunity to present some of my concerns before you today.

###

1. Re-enact these principles
2. Strengthen P.R. economic structure
3. Section 936 as coordinated part of compact
4. Take back funds it receivers
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My name is Arturo Morales Carrión. First, I want to express my thanks to this Committee and to its distinguished Chairman for this opportunity to present a statement at this hearing. I represent no government, no party or group, but simply the views of a concerned citizen. I have had long experience in government, on both the federal and Commonwealth levels, but my expressions today are those of a longtime student of the U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship. I shall be frank, as we should be among friends.

The dialogue between Puerto Rico and the Congress has been difficult at times. Too many crucial matters absorb your attention and, as is the case in a truly representative democracy, there is frequent turnover in your ranks. Not many are able to devote time and effort to study the intricacies of Puerto Rican issues. And yet a meeting of the minds between Congress and Puerto Rico is of significance not only to us Puerto Ricans, but to the U.S. position and interests in the Caribbean area. A convergence of views may be a laborious but not an impossible task.

In my brief remarks, I would like to underscore some facts. We Puerto Ricans may appear to some of you as deeply divided political tribes. But if you look behind our ideological quarrels, you will find a people, forged in nearly five centuries of history, with a distinctive ethnic and cultural profile. No matter how powerful the American influence may have been, we remain a West Indian cultural society, in our ethos, language and folk traditions. The U.S.-Puerto Rico relationship becomes, thus, a test of U.S. ability to deal with human and social diversity.

However different we may look, we have a core of shared values with you. We are strongly committed to government by ballots, not bullets; we deeply believe in human rights; we abhor authoritarian statism and are profoundly devoted to the essential freedoms proclaimed by the U.S. and Commonwealth Constitutions. And we seek access to opportunity, to education, to self-fulfillment and self-respect.

In the past, it has not been easy for the Congress to understand our distinctiveness or to realize how many common values we share. For almost half a century, there was great reluctance in these halls to grant us the right to self-government. It was easier to find help for our economic plight, to understand, for instance, that a tax system, designed for a rich continental republic could not be imposed on a densely populated island with limited natural resources, and that flexibility was needed if Puerto Rico was to move forward. It was much more difficult to acknowledge that the principle of government by consent of the governed, also applied to us. Even the extension of citizenship in 1917 failed to equate it with this U.S. time-honored principle.

For nearly half a century, we were ruled by presidential appointees, many of whom did not know Spanish nor had any kind of background to deal with a diverse cultural group.

In spite of several advances in many fields--in health, education, transportation--the relationship was eminently colonial. The men who sat at our Governor's House--La Fortaleza--were responsible to the President, not to our people.

Between 1948 and 1952, this situation changed dramatically. We must remember that history or else we may repeat the mistakes of the past. Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress was enacted fully recognizing the principle of government by consent; furthermore, it was adopted "in the nature of a compact so that the people of Puerto Rico may organize a government pursuant to a constitution of their own adoption." When the people of Puerto Rico did that, and after further
negotiations, Public Law 447 enacted by the 82nd Congress again reiterated that Law 600 "was adopted by the Congress as a compact with the people of Puerto Rico, to become operative upon its approval by the people of Puerto Rico."

Those of us who voted for the law firmly believed that we had entered into a new era in our relations with the United States. Several areas were ill-defined in the arrangement but an effective step had been taken to recognize Puerto Rico's right to self-determination and to a government by consent of the governed. We believed we were on the road to a new experiment in U.S. federalism that provided an evolving political framework for the great momentum that started in the socio-economic field. This was also the belief that inspired the United Nations Resolution on Puerto Rico in 1953. This was the core of President Kennedy's Executive Memorandum of July 25, 1961, which stated, among other things: "The Commonwealth structure, and its relationship to the United States which is in the nature of a compact, provide for self-government in respect of internal affairs and administration, subject only to the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and the acts of Congress authorizing and approving the constitution... All departments, agencies, and officials of the executive branch of the Government should faithfully and carefully observe and respect this arrangement in relation to all matters affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If any matters arise involving the fundamentals of this arrangement, they should be referred to the Office of the President."

The acknowledgment of Puerto Rico's rights helped most effectively Puerto Rican contributions during the '50s and '60s to inter-American technical and cultural cooperation.

Are we to forget that past? Is Puerto Rico, through lack of a collective memory, to be sent back to square one and considered again as one more territory?

May I sharply disagree with the GAO Report* on its chapter on political development. It is amazing that no reference is made to Laws 600 and 447. It is regrettable that the thrust and meaning of Kennedy's memorandum, published in the Federal Register, is totally ignored, not to mention the very significant cases in the Boston Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

I have emphasized the political framework of contemporary Puerto Rico because, in my view, it cannot be isolated from the conditions which create economic development. The United States-Puerto Rico relationship is unique --both politically and economically. What was known as Operation Bootstrap in the '50s and '60s, was made possible by our access to the U.S. mainland market, to U.S. sources of capital and the capability of designing a tax-exempt incentives program. But it was also greatly aided by a psychological élan created by the conviction that we are moving into a new, fruitful era in our evolving relationship with the United States. Two of the ingredients of a successful economic climate are faith and self-reliance: faith in the institutional pattern, and a feeling of self-help. We had both in the '50s and '60s and so it was appreciated by the Congress.

In the '70s, we sailed stormy seas. As Teodoro Moscoso, who ran our economic development program, has asserted, "the 1973 energy crisis was not a mere blow; it was a knockout punch." And yet we survived. Section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code helped us greatly in navigating the rapids, by attracting long-term capital investment and making possible, to a large measure, our pharmaceutical and electronics industries. But it must be stressed that Section 936 and its effects are possible because of the unique relationship under Commonwealth. This section could not exist under statehood. It is my firm conviction that, in spite of whatever shortcomings we may point out, it was the Commonwealth relationship that enabled Puerto Rico to survive the strain of the 1973 recession.

In the fiscal and economic field, this relationship is delicate, born of realistic considerations. It should not be tampered with, without an awareness of its history or a realization of its uniqueness.

The times call for a new encounter between Puerto Rico and the Congress. The realities of the United States-Puerto Rico relations must be placed afresh in the U.S. public mind. But we must build on the foundations that have been laid, on the experience that has been gained. If the past is prologue, it is a prologue that should be carefully read and remembered.

U.S. interests are deeply involved in Puerto Rico. They are represented, economically, by over $5 billion a year in trade and more than $10 billion in investments. But they are also concerned with the U.S. role in the Caribbean and Latin America and, in no small measure, by the strategic considerations, which may be in the background of these discussions, but are crucial to an understanding of why the United States is in Puerto Rico. Unfortunately, I am unable to enter now into this critical area. If your Committee is planning to study it -- as it should -- I would be most interested in submitting my views.

Again, my profound thanks for this opportunity to present some of my concerns before you today.

---

1. Reunite principles of liberty, labor
   as a pragmatic friendship
2. Strengthen P.R. manufacturing
3. Section 936 as a territorial part of U.S.
4. Take hard look at reduction of Federal transfer payments (practically all of)

Federal transfer payments (practically all of)