

PROJECT OUTLINE

I. The Status of Commonwealth.

- a. Brief Historical Background.
- b. Present economic, industrial, educational, political, constitutional realities.
- c. Nature of Puerto Rico's relationships and attitudes vis a vis U. S.; the Caribbean; Latin America, Spain. The rest of the world.
- d. Centripetal forces, e.g.
economic factors; labor mobility; cultural (e.g. contacts with US educational/scientific structures and funding); historical cultural value of Puerto Rico to the United States);
- e. Centrifugal forces, e.g.
language; religion; position and attitudes of Puerto Rican emigrants to the mainland; Latin American attitudes toward the US, and the problem of "double identity" (cultural) of Puerto Rican intelligentsia.

II. Pluralism in Other Parts of the World.

In a second phase, the study would examine pluralistic experiences in other parts of the world - e.g. check out the existence of similar centrifugal/centripetal forces, and the institutional arrangements which have emerged. This could be done by a combination of literature surveys, interviews and (possibly) written contributions from leading personalities in the areas concerned.

- a. I would suggest that emphasis be placed on three successful experiences:
 - Switzerland (also the Romansh group, which has cultural but not political identity);
 - Yugoslavia;
 - Italy (development of "autonomous regions" - South Tyrol; Aosta; Sardinia; Sicily).
- b. Then I would look at some current conflict areas and at least survey trends, claims and current situation in:

- Canada (Quebec);
 - Spain (Catalan and Basque movements);
 - Belgium (Wallon/Flemish).
- c. I would also briefly survey the France/North Africa development, with the major problems brought about by political independence combined with economic dependence.
- d. The study could also, briefly, cover the position of mini-states in Europe (illusion of sovereignty?) Monaco, Andorra, Liechtenstein, San Marino.
- e. Lastly, I would look at some of the recent trans-national conglomerates or integration models, and their guarantees of local autonomy:
- European Economic Community;
 - British Commonwealth (especially contemplating UK membership in the EEC);
 - Council of Europe (cultural links).

III. A Puerto Rico/US Model.

In its concluding part, the study would bring to bear current and projected Puerto Rico/US trends, as well as foreign pluralistic experience, on the specific features of a model (or models) of future Puerto Rico relations; e.g.

- a. political participation;
- b. law, legislative and judicial processes;
- c. education;
- d. cultural identity;
- e. foreign relations (regional/international; general/special, e.g. cultural);
- f. economics.

IV. The Potentials of Federalism.

Flexibility - In the US and elsewhere.

At this point I wish to quote from two unrelated and preliminary memoranda already submitted: the first by an American political scientist; the second by an Spanish philosopher.

1. Page 3 from memorando.--

"Despite increasing awareness of the social factors modifying formal federalism, there has been little attention paid to an even more significant flexible aspect in federal processes. There are also a number of instances where some new form has been devised which is in essence federal but which does not conform to the historic nation-state division of identical sovereignties on an identical basis. Practice has run ahead of theory in this line; the argument for federalism clearly is that some aspects of sovereignty are better handled locally, some nationally. But the early writers on federalism were so influenced by the eighteenth century notion of the unvarying state that they failed to take account of another point: Once we grant locality and community, as significant qualifiers to the authority of the central structure, we ought to raise the next question: Should the central, focal authority divide its authority and legitimacy with the province, in the same way even formally, in regard to each province and each area? As Grodzins and the Canadians above referred to have shown, in reality, the lines of division may well have been different, even tho the form is the same:

"The founders and theorists of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth idea, for the most part perhaps without realizing what they were doing, are willing to answer the question just posed: 'The formal nature of the relationship between the focal or federal government and its several parts may vary where there is a significant difference in social structure between one of the provinces and most of the others'. Now, of course, as with most political inventions, practical considerations played a part in creating this point of view; nevertheless the basic statute and its various corollaries does indeed create a portion of the United States which in fact exercises in some respects more sovereignty than the fifty states (while at the same time in certain respects its citizens exercise less sovereignty).

"Some students of Puerto Rican affairs describe the Commonwealth as a way for Puerto Ricans to 'eat their cake' (have autonomy and, for instance, exemption from the U.S. tax) 'and have it too...' (the advantages of being part of the U.S. market, social security system, etc.) I prefer to say that while the 50 states

have baked one sort of cake, or had it baked for them, we have baked a slightly different sort of cake!; and our cake may be better for us, theirs for them."

"...It is, of course, equally important for us in Puerto Rico that our friends in the United States, in official and non-official positions, come to see that we are not merely dealing here with a pragmatic expedient but with the general possibility of flexibility in federalism. (Incidentally, it would be interesting and valuable to get scholars familiar with the situation of Newfoundland, which in some respects bears a relationship to Canada, somewhat similar to that of Puerto Rico to the U.S.A., but which chose full membership in the Canadian Confederation in 1947, to help us contrast the two provinces)."

2. Page 3 from memorando.-

"The main difficulty today is that the 'units' are not comparable to those of other times. They usually were 'homogeneous' units: the American states, the Greek cities, the medieval kingdoms. The trouble is that now we have to unite enormous and tiny units, countries with different degrees of economic or technical development, with independent historical backgrounds, with totally different religions, customs or traditions.

"In other words, the present problem is to unite heterogeneous units. And they will have to share their sovereignty - without losing it - at different levels, in a more complicated structure, no longer 'flat', but tridimensional. This is the condition for world balance, progress and freedom, but this requires to have more adequate sociological and political concepts. With a 19th century mentality one cannot expect to face the most burning questions of our time. This is why we are now witnessing a strange phenomenon: the association of 'nationalism' with its old enemy, 'Marxist internationalism': most new 'countries' are now striking and self-destructive examples of Marxist nationalism.

"...Now, the fact is that this badly needed social theory has been to a large extent elaborated twenty years ago; what's more, it is successfully working for two decades. Where? In Puerto Rico."