

## My Journal of Fieldwork in Puerto Rico

*These “Journal Notes” were written in 1974. In 2011, I found the manuscript buried under papers in a cabinet, forgotten. This Journal was written for myself as the basis for a book that I never finished. A student typed the old manuscript and found some pages missing. The manuscript is not edited for publication but students may find this Journal useful as a guide to fieldwork in participant observation. The notes were part of my thinking at the country level. It was a time when I began to conceptualize “societal development.”*

## Self-Governance in Puerto Rico

Journal Notes

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

*These topical headings can be found in the pages below: “copy and find.”*

#### CHAPTER ONE: Sociology and History

##### Introduction

A Case in Point  
The Larger Picture

##### Part I: Field Methods: The Process of Getting to a Theory

On Writing Societal History  
On Keeping a Journal

##### Part II: On Making a Theoretical Interpretation

In Summary

##### Part III: Historical Notes

###### A. The Political Order: Self-Governance and the State

The U.S. Invasion and Occupation  
The First Laws of Autonomy: U.S. Controls Remain  
The Struggle for Independence Deepens  
The Era of Luis Munoz Marín: The Concept of Commonwealth  
The Shift Towards Statehood and Annexation  
The Political Economy: A Theoretical Note

###### B. The Economic Order: Self-Governance and the Economy

Bootstrap and Industrial Development  
TABLE A: Industrial Areas and American Corporations  
Close Encounters: A Hypothesis About Corporations and Governments  
Industry vs. Agriculture: Absentee Ownership

###### C. The Religious Order: Self-Governance and the Church

The Process of Church Development

#### CONCLUSIONS\*

---

\* This note was written at the end of my studies on the island in June 1974. It followed my notes on the island’s history and my completion of the journal. These conclusions have not changed in my mind even with subsequent visits to the island.

## FOOTNOTES

### **CHAPTER TWO Journal Notes: My Experiences as a North American**

February 27, 1974: Campus Unrest

The Evening of February 27 Comparative Revolution

#### **I The Political Order**

Talks with Government Officials: Copper Mining and Community

March 7, 1974 The Limits of Bureaucratic Government: Cruz Matos\*

Open Bidding Versus Government Controlled Bidding

The Alternative to Traditional Business: Cooperative Development

Government Oligarchy versus Decentralized Authority

Afterthoughts

April 24, 1974 Fomento and Final Attitudes on Copper

#### **II. The Economic Order: Self-Governance in the Business System**

Pollution and Absentee Ownership

March 15: The Effects of Pollution on the Local Community

The Strings on Public Corporations

Afterthoughts

March 22, 1974 Private Detectives of Environmental Pollution

Following Sewage and Factory Smoke

Investigating Government Promises

Fertile Land Lying Fallow

Distillery Sewage Empties On the Beach

Imperialism and Education

Political Roots of Pollution

March 25, 1974. Paperwork for the Environmental Quality Board (Morning)

March 26, 1974 The Gallant Effort of a Small E.P.A

Worker Self-Management and Copper Mining

February 28: Unions and the Socialist Movement

February 29 Questions of Revolutionary Reform Toward Self-

Management

#### **III The Religious Order: Self-Governance in the Church**

##### **1, Catholics**

April 11, 1974 Socialist Practice and Independent Clergy

April 18, 1974 *Concientizaciòn* in a slum called La Perla

May 16, 1974 Bridging the Chasm Between Capitalism and Socialism

##### **2. Christian Scientists**

##### **3. The Episcopal Church**

---

\* Since I took no notes during this meeting, I decided to write a letter to Cruz Matos to confirm the essence of our conversation. I also sent him my notes covering visits with other islanders on the topic of copper mining. His reply to me confirmed my notes to be accurate. My action here refers to Rule #4 on capturing the essence of events. His letter responding to me is found in Appendix B.

## Part Three A Social Interpretation

### I. Charting the Basis for Social Theory and Research: Abstracting and Generalizing

1. **What is the course of societal development?** (What did I learn sociologically about the history of Puerto Rico?)
2. **What is the meaning of self-governance?** (What happened in my personal experiences?)
3. **What does self-governance mean in general?** (How is self-governance a social theory?)
4. **What is the meaning of self-governance as a root metaphor?** (How does self-governance become a theory of society?)
5. **How can the concept of self-governance be studied as a “positivistic” theory and applied to Puerto Rico?** (How can hypotheses be developed and tested?)

#### Hypotheses for Empirical Investigation

##### *Corporate Decentralization*

6. **How is the concept of self-governance a part of dialectical theory?** (What does the “self” mean in the Hegel-Marx tradition?)

## CHAPTER THREE Toward Social Economy: Theory, Research, and Policy

- A. Social Development in Business
- B. Practical Steps Toward Social Research and Planning
- C. Social Economy
- D. Social Planning

### Indexes of U.S. Controls Over the Puerto Rican Society (Examples)

1. Import Substitution: Planning for Self-governing Enterprises
2. Institutional Development
  - a. Steps from Private to Socially Oriented Corporations
  - b. Steps From Welfare Payments to Community Development Corporations
  - c. Steps from Rent-Free Land to Payments for Agricultural Development
  - d. Steps from Old to New Beliefs in Looking Ahead

## Chapter Four The Cultural Order

### Concluding Notes

### Epilogue

- The Method of Participant Observation
- The Self in Society
- The Theory of Self-Governance
- The Direction of Governance in Modern Organization
- Research on Societal Governance
- The Direction of Development
- Key Issues of Social Planning

Planning for a Post-Bureaucratic Society  
A Final Word

**Appendix**

**CHAPTER ONE: Sociology and History**

**Introduction**

I read a fascinating essay by Robert Merton about the history of scientific ideas and decided to keep a diary of my research in Puerto Rico. Professor Merton, a Columbia University sociologist, argues that there is a tendency for scientists to ignore the way in which basic theories are developed. They fail to tell about the history of a scientific idea and are reluctant to reveal the personal experiences that led to their conclusions. In fact, they tend to consider their own experiences to be unimportant to the logical process of scientific discovery. His idea it is relevant to the method of participant observation.

Merton traces his interest in the history of scientific discoveries back to the work of Francis Bacon and then forward through a number of distinguished scholars. He first quotes Bacon's observation that the public obtains only the end-product of scientific investigations: that "never any knowledge was delivered in the same order it was invented...". Merton says since Bacon's observation about scientific reporting, other scholars have come to similar conclusions. Leibniz, for example, complained about Descartes' pretensions to have avoided reading anything and then pleads, "I wish that authors would give us the history of their discoveries and the steps by which they have arrived at them." Merton continues with Ernst Mach's argument that the publications of Euclid led followers "into actually concealing their methods of investigation to the great detriment of science." Merton develops his point still further by referring to A.A. Moles, who said that scientists are "professionally trained to conceal from themselves their deepest thoughts" and to "exaggerate unconsciously the rational aspect" of their work. Finally, he quotes the botanist Agnes Arber who argues: "the mode of presentation of scientific work is molded by the thought-prejudices of its period." Merton then says, "What must be emphasized here is that this practice of glossing over the actual course of inquiry results largely from the mores of scientific publication which call for a passive idiom and format of reporting which imply that ideas develop without benefit of human brain and that investigations are conducted without benefit of human hand." <sup>1\*</sup>

When I read Merton's case about this problem some years ago, it seemed interesting but not of particular importance. In the meantime, I completed a book called The Social Economy that contained the theory of self-governance that had developed in Puerto Rico. The book was based on experiences in several countries, but it told virtually nothing about the actual fieldwork which led to the theory. I had kept voluminous field notes upon which I relied heavily as the background data for drawing conclusions to my work, but I did not publish them. I kept them only for use in teaching courses on participant observation and fieldwork methodology.

In 1971 the Puerto Rico Industrial Mission asked me to review the proposals made by American copper companies to begin mining on the island. A council of churches created the Mission to monitor the effect of the business system on the environment. Islanders were especially worried at that time that the excavations of the copper companies would spoil the beautiful vegetation and ecology of the island. They were also worried that the companies might try to exploit local workers and destroy the cultural life of the island's interior.

I spent a month talking with people in San Juan and in the hills where the mining was to take place. I wanted to learn how they felt about the problems that could arise from the mining venture. I then returned home to prepare a report on my findings. My report suggested that there could be trouble if the companies did business in the traditional manner. I therefore recommended an alternative whereby the mining could take place without the danger of exploitation and dominance. I called the alternative "self-management" which simply meant teaching the islanders how to mine the copper and run the business cooperatively by themselves.

In 1974 I was invited to teach for a semester at the University of Puerto Rico. This period broadened the scope of my work and represented the critical stages of learning for me. I kept a diary (labeled Journal Notes) of key experiences including my personal opinions about political events and my feelings about the people I met there. I also took notes on the history of Puerto Rico for my own use in research. These field notes are now the subject of this book and represent the path that led me to a theory about self-governance.

I discovered that Puerto Rico has a history and a culture that literally shouts self-governance. The Puerto Rican environment inspired me to learn something about the larger meaning of this basic idea. Indeed, I came to see how self-governance could be one of the most important concepts of our time. I can offer an illustration of what this concept means to a few islanders by telling you a short story. My intent is to entice you into looking further into the elaboration of its meaning for a theory of post-modern development.

### A Case in Point

There is a little island called Culebra off the coast of Puerto Rico where the people make a living by farming and fishing. The island belongs to Puerto Rico but the United States claims certain rights to it. Some years ago the United States Navy decided to use Culebra for target practice; it began bombarding the island and its beaches with millions of shells. This went on for years, against the wishes of local residents. It soon became impossible for islanders to farm and to fish in peace because of the constant bombardment. Angry Culebrans asked the North Americans: “Suppose we had a big navy and used your Central Park, on the island of Manhattan, for our target range. How would you feel?” The United States Navy and government, of course, ignored their protests.

Nevertheless in Puerto Rico there developed widespread protests against the bombardment. In the spirit of the civil rights movement of Martin Luther King, nonviolent activists decided to build a chapel within range of the bombardment, as a symbol of their protest. The Navy in its target practice soon destroyed the chapel. The activists then rebuilt the chapel. Again, it was destroyed and then, rebuilt again. Public pressure in Puerto Rico became intense. Finally Governor Ferré and the Senate President, Hernandez Colón, obtained promises from Washington that the naval bombardment would be stopped. The Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, personally assured the Governor by letter, in August, 1971, that the use of Culebra as a naval “practice range” would cease by the end of 1972. The Pact of Culebra was signed.

With this pact behind him, Governor Ferré ran for election. He lost the election, however, to Hernandez Colón and the Defense Department changed its mind. At the end of 1972, Marvin Laird announced that the United States Navy would continue to use the

island until 1985. Public pressure mounted again. Finally, in 1975, the new Governor Hernandez Colón was able to achieve an agreement for a cease-fire.\*

This instance of struggle for self-governance is one among hundreds that Puerto Ricans have experienced since the United States conquered the island in 1898. The United States has, at times, acceded to Puerto Rico's interests in self-governance over these years but it has not sought systematically to encourage it or to lay the foundations for independence. It has more often resisted island movements toward independence and has made overtures to island officials to help convert the island into a state.

### The Larger Picture: Societal History

I think Puerto Rico symbolizes the problems of self-governance in Third World development. Its future could foreshadow what historians L.S. Stavrianos describes as The Promise of the Coming Dark Age. Stavrianos is a scholar of medieval European institutions and is very familiar with what occurred in the so-called Dark Age that followed the collapse of the Holy Roman Empire. He knows that the period was anything but a "dark age" when compared to the age that had preceded it. The Dark Age was in fact a "liberating decentralization" and "an age of epochal creativity" relative to the decadent Roman Empire. In a world apart from the bureaucratic dominance and economic imperialism of Rome, people became more important; small-scale technology began to flourish; the plow and harness developed; three-field rotation began to restore fertility to the land; serfs became freer than the slaves had been and were full members of the community with a real stake in its welfare. A new form of "autonomy and self-management blossomed..."<sup>1</sup>

Stavrianos believes that we are now entering a new age that parallels that medieval period. We are witnessing the breakup of modern empires based on centralized technology and are heading for an historic period based on alternatives to the hegemony of big capitalist and socialist states. Stavrianos envisions a decentralized technology for the Third World serving basic human needs rather than profit-making corporations and bureaucratic elites in the big nations. He foresees a new age that will increase the potential for self-management – a new age that will not be a return to the primitive life of the feudal life but will be

---

\* The whole question of control has been raised again on another island called Vieques. The Navy transferred its target practice from Culebra to Vieques.

based instead on a liberal use of scientific concepts supplied to a new technology that will make very small demands on capital and their physical environment.

While doing research in Puerto Rico I learned about a struggle for self-governance that was not inconsistent with this epochal vision, although not so grand in scope. I began to see the struggle of small nations in the context of big nations and small towns in the context of metropolitan centers. I could see that the struggle toward self-governance for the smaller political units could be eased and simplified by major innovations in transportation, energy, communications, and agriculture. This would also involve a whole new social outlook on the relationship between the traditional organizations of modern society. This was the issue that pursued me through my experiences on the island of Puerto Rico.

I should say that the concept of self-governance is no respecter of ideology – capitalist or socialist. It speaks directly to the problems of the Soviet Union or China as well as to those of the United States. It clarifies the issues of “periphery” nations like Poland or Taiwan much as it does Puerto Rico. It also offers the basis for examining alternatives to internal imperialism as well as to external imperialism as the ease of Puerto Rico demonstrated to me.

In short, the concept of self-governance is a protean idea. In fact, it is a root metaphor underlying a theory of field methods and societal development. This may seem to be a big assignment for a single concept. But it will not be so difficult to understand later when we see that it also connects with the very logic of being human. It is interwoven with everything we do in daily life.

### **Part I Field Methods: The Process of Getting to a Theory**

The method of participant observation begins by getting to know people personally in the field. It means at the same time getting to know the history and culture of those same people. What follows here is an explanation of the principles behind my work in Puerto Rico. It is a discussion of the social philosophy behind my field methods.

#### On Writing Societal History

The writing of history is a critical issue in social scientific circles. The way we record past events and our reason for taking a certain viewpoint in history is the subject of

much academic debate. My own viewpoint is therefore important to explain here how I took notes in Puerto Rico.

I believed at the outset of my trip to Puerto Rico that knowledge about the history of the island could help me to better understand how to guide my work. The formal history that I read in Puerto Rico itself told me a great many facts but the interpretation did not seem to ring true with the stories I heard from people on the street. My search for the whole story, for the larger picture, then helped me to define better what I expected as a sociologist.

History for me is the story of how a society is created. It is interpreted from within the cultural perspective of various institutions. But it is also understood from the lives of people who work and live in them at all levels. This is the perspective of the people who live at the bottom and middle and the top of the society.

It is said that history is written best as a continuous interplay between a subjective and an objective viewpoint. It is first of a “subjective” record of how people view themselves. The “subject” is thus always the primary concern of the historian. At the same time the historian must look at history objectively by standing outside the society. The historian must find a larger perspective in the international scene on their world history.

The ultimate purpose of history is then to obtain a total picture from the subjective standpoint of people themselves as opposed to societal development in the framework of world history. This is achieved by a proper mix of subjective categories devised by people to explain their lives in a particular time and place with the objective categories of the scientific historian seeking a broader basis to explain societal development itself.

The “subject” of history, then, is the body of people who create a society. It is the story of how people construct associations and values in every order of their cultural life. The general categories include “institutions,” “roles,” “associations,” “governance,” and “development.” History is the record of people learning to govern themselves in associations.

Wilhelm Dilthey, a European historian sympathetic to fieldwork methods saw history as a record of events that have unitary meaning to people. Historians obtain this unitary meaning by re-living the symbols of historical events as people saw them in that

period. Only by this effort to re-live the lives of people at different levels of society could the historian then interpret the viewpoint of people who struggled through their own events.

My own note taking in Puerto Rico took Dilthey's position seriously. My notes carry a bias toward the concept of self-governance simply on the logic of this method. The motive of self-governance seems to me as written into the life of every major event in the history of a society.

Although the significance of this concept of self-governance was not in my mind before going to Puerto Rico, it was essential for interpreting the history of society. History is in part the story of how societies achieve some measure of self-governance. A major historical event has greater meaning in reference to this concept of governance. That is, revolution or a war or a key parliamentary vote can be interpreted fruitfully a sign of progress or retardation in the self-development of society.

The sociological meaning of self-governance begins in the history of associations of society. The governance of major associations is critical to understanding the relation of the personal lives and the society as a whole. This is because associations define personal identities. They shape the development of our ego and determine the concept we have of our "self." They do this by defining the roles we play as individuals in society. Thus when someone asks us, "Who are you?", we answer according to the role we play in associational life. We might say, "I am a citizen," or "teacher," or "priest," or "businessman," or "housewife," or farmer." The concept we have of our "self" is wrapped around the roles we take in major associations. Our personal sense of duty, obligation, privilege, conscience, and our beliefs are formed in society's associations. Therefore the history of such major associations as the family, government, the corporation, and the church, tells us a lot about our identity. The history of associations becomes essential to understand *who we are* in the historical context of society.

History texts written for the public schools have a strong tendency to reflect the viewpoint of leading officials in these associations. The most important association is generally thought to be the state and its affiliated political institutions. The "history" taught in schools tends to select those *political* or *state* events which are deemed important to that period. It shows how certain groups succeeded over others in the light of contemporary mores and prevailing pattern of beliefs, emphasizing political victories that support the

majority opinion and prevailing interests of the times. It often lends honor to the existing customs and is always nation-centered. It thus loses some measure of objectivity that would come otherwise with a broader perspective of history in the world-at-large. By emphasizing the life of the society as found in the association of the state, historians ignore a major part of the cultural development of a people.

Furthermore, historians tend to accent a statist view from the top-down. This is true whether it is a capitalist or socialist state. The post-revolutionary period of Cuba, for example, turned previous written histories upside down. After the revolution, the cottage where Fidel Castro stored weapons to attack the Moncada Barracks became a widely recognized museum. Many places gained prominence that had no significance before the revolution.

A whole new story of Cuba was written. The attitudes of revolutionaries toward the people who fled from the revolution had to be now interpreted from the view of the top down. On the popular record they became the *qusanos* (worms) of the revolution. It is difficult to integrate the subjective view of the “enemy” into a history of the state. In this Cuban case, the class who had been at the middle and the top of the hierarchy before the revolution was now moved toward the bottom. The people who fled the island were looked upon with hostility in the record of this emigration. It is difficult to express humanity in people who leave you when you need them to rebuild the society.

Similarly, the history texts in the schools of Puerto Rico find it difficult to interpret the full significance of the Independence movement or the role of the socialist parties in the record of major events on the island. There is little honor accorded to *independentistas* or socialists in their efforts to find a new direction for island development. Pedro Albizu Campos was a leading member of that party. Island socialists said it would be impossible to record the life history of a patriot like Pedro Albizu Campos as important without a revolution to show his place in it.<sup>2</sup>

Socialists find that the standard history texts do not interpret the oppressive exploitative aspects of government. They tend to ignore the interests of minorities and the values of the people who have been pressed in past events. They fail to describe the “oppositional forces,” and the underlying dynamics at work in the creation of a society.

I believe that the real historical record is an interpretation of the whole movement of society. It gives dignity of the lives of political prisoners, street delinquents, vagrants, and the oppressed peasants as much as it depicts the lives of the leaders, the kings and elected presidents of a ruling government. The real history of society begins with the premise that all people are equally important. It assumes that oppressed groups are as important to development as the oppressors. Indeed, the oppressed could be more important in signaling the future of society.

In sociological terms, then, the real historical record is a cross-sectional view of human development, not just a record of a government or state. It is not just top officials, but rather a record of people as a whole. It is also a record of interdependent associations, a record of what people have lost and gained in learning how to govern themselves. Without this larger picture, we cannot comprehend the meaning of deep dissent; we cannot anticipate the direction of rebellion and revolution. We can only interpret the prevailing policies; we project them into the future as an extension of the status quo. We cannot foresee the fundamental changes taking place at the root of the society.

The key to writing history, I think, is by keeping in mind the epochs of history and the total constitution of the culture. The movement of a society can thus be comprehended better in both its past and its future dimensions. History then begins to express what Leo Tolstoy once suggested in the Second Epilogue to *War and Peace* as the “movement of humanity.”

With this view of history, I found myself talking to people at all levels: the bottom, the middle, and the top of the societal order. I discovered that self-governance was built-in at all levels of the society. Self-governing associations became a motif in my taking notes. The struggle of some islanders to become autonomous and other islanders to become independent became an important focus of my fieldwork.

The impact of Spain was critical to explain the island's struggle for autonomy in the western hemisphere. The impact of the United States was key to explaining the struggle for self-governance. The full story of how these two nations had an impact on the development of the island, however, is not the purpose of Part One. The real story would require volumes of historical data and interpretation.

My own notes on Puerto Rican history, therefore, must be understood with this in mind. They were a brief attempt to capture the essence of this history as a basis for guiding my research. They were written for personal use in thinking about how Puerto Ricans governed themselves in major associations. My original motive was to learn how the economy might deal with social problems developing on the island.

#### On Keeping a Journal

The journal notes begin in February 1974 in Rio Piedras. I had gone to Puerto Rico to teach in the Department of Sociology at the main university situated in Rio Piedras, just outside San Juan. I wanted to learn something about the business system and I hoped to learn more about the cultural life. I had gone to Mexico the previous summer and fall to develop a speaking ability in Spanish. I now felt ready to begin talking in Spanish with people.

I found a room with a family living near the campus where I hoped to become a part of local life. I had not defined any specific research purposes at the outset but I wanted to learn about the problems of multinational business. I did not know fully at first what direction my study of business would take. I took heart in recalling that it took William Foote Whyte 18 months before he knew where he was going in his study of *Street Corner Society*. My first interest was in the business economy but my intuition kept leading me toward the larger picture of the society. I began to visit church leaders on the island and then government officials. Gradually, the connection between the political, economic, and religious associations became a focal point of my Journal.

I wanted at first to explore the idea of “self-management” with business and labor leaders because it had seemed so important to me in developing economic alternatives in copper mining. I was led gradually through these ... **(The typist notes “page 10b is missing”)**.....with our inner world. It is the basis for coming to terms with the outside society after viewing its effects upon us from within ourselves. It is a method for increasing the level of our self-direction rather than being determined by outside forces. We find our real direction primarily from within ourselves rather than primarily from outside associations.

Put another way, the journal helps us stand outside the forces of history and society. By understanding more about our place in associational life, we can become more self-

directing and more self-governing in our own lives. We learn to alter social structures so that they no longer easily control us. We then learn that the secret of self-governance is found not only within ourselves but also in shaping our relationships to higher associations outside ourselves.

My own guidelines on Keeping Journal Notes suggest something of this perspective. I tried to follow them in Puerto Rico. They are important guides for participant observers.

1. Honesty: Tell the whole truth about even the worst situations (oppression, exploitation, jealousy, hostility). Report all feelings as facts. The whole story should be revealed. It can be done without demeaning anyone, but it requires searching for the reasons why people act the way they do.
2. Sensitivity: Listen carefully to the “opposition,” hear all the undertones, the deeper currents of life in every event. Look also for contradictions in organizations. In this way, the “deceptions” which people experience in every day life can often be explained.
3. Reality: Retain the real names of people and the places you observe insofar as you can. Send your journal notes to people with whom you have shared an experience. This is especially important when their interpretation is critical to its correct meaning.
4. Essentials: Lean to capture the essence of events. Look for the key themes that are expressed by people in speeches and conversations. Try to go to the heart of the matter in each event.
5. Memory: Write down notes as soon as possible after our experience. Then, later, look them over to reflect on the meaning and their connection with other experiences.
6. Roles: Describe the roles people take in the system – executive, minister, politician, housewife, accountant, etc. See how these roles lead toward the dominance of others, and conversely, note how they offer support, a degree of equity and shared responsibility with others in the system.
7. Ethics: Take part in activities in a way that helps increase the awareness of the interdependence of people in the larger community. Fieldworkers can participate in some activities that may seem questionable (or unethical) when they broaden the basis for intelligent decision-making among companions.
8. Hierarchy: Talk with people at all levels of the “system” from top to bottom. Enjoy learning about their life at every level.

9. Spontaneity: Record the first thing that comes to your mind in an event. There are a thousand things to record. So, begin spontaneously. But see everything as a mystery; know that clues to the true meaning of an experience are generally hidden from view.
10. Strangers: Respond to the human qualities and the humanity of all people you meet even the exploiters and oppressors.

The last rule -- calling for the recognition of human qualities in all people -- is not intended as an ethical principle. It is rather a question of scientific caution in the face of the complex “facts.” These directives emphasize objectivity in a subjective setting. People are not defined in the final analysis simply by the dominant or subservient roles they take in associations. When fieldworkers can see people apart from their roles, they are in a better position to understand the person working from within the whole system.

A basic requirement for me in fieldwork is to think and work “dialectically” where possible. This means, for example, that it is equally important to see the freedom that operates in a system as well as its oppressive features (Rule 6). This rule is first encountered by researching the history of associations in society.

When I talked with people about island history, for example, I saw “oppression” in the early forms of Spanish colonialism. It was most evident in the *hacendado* system and early forced labor. Then I saw how these systems were replaced in history by capitalist forms of wage-labor and farm ownership. This transition freed people to assume greater degrees of self-governance in the new system. The nineteenth century native did not have the freedom that finally emerged with the advent of island capitalism. Capitalism in this stage of development was “liberating.” The new type of capitalist ownership, however, showed its own tendencies to exploit and retard self-development. Exploitation was inherent in a system that Thorstein Veblen once analyzed in detail as “absentee ownership.” Absentee ownership is of course a major problem of Puerto Rico today although it is not the only one.

This is where I entered the scene with my Journal. I found that the new steps toward self-governance beyond the business system were not discovered easily. They were to be discovered in mystery of daily events. It was my job as an observer to begin unraveling the mystery.

A journal, then, is a series of experiences in which you see yourself acting within the structures of history. You see how your feelings and activities flow through the structures formed decades ago, and even in some cases centuries ago. For example, in this case I saw my work on the island become split between the “secular” and the “sacred” order of things, as people defined them. This “split” (secular/sacred) began long ago. Here, I felt its meaning expressed in the institutional life of Puerto Rico. Such notions, of course, had not occurred to me but they were latent in my notes and later became part of my interpretations.

Chapter two, then, is simply a record of what I experienced. It was the basis for me to learn something about what these experiences meant in the context of Puerto Rico at this time in its history.

## **Part II: On Making a Theoretical Interpretation**

I remembered reading about the struggle of Beatrice and Sidney Webb to interpret their data on trade unionism at the turn of the century. They said it was difficult and yet it was a most rewarding part of the process. (3)

(I)t was only by interminably arranging and rearranging our separate sheets of paper that we could ascertain how far piece-work, or the objection to piece-work, was characteristic of a particular kind of industry, or of a particular type of trade union, or of a particular type of district of the United Kingdom, or of a particular stage of development in the organization concerned, or of the trade union movement as a whole. Indeed, it is not too much to say that in all our work we have found this process of reshuffling the sheets, and reassembling them on our work-table according to different categories or in different sequences – a process entirely dependent on the method of arrangement of the notes – by far the most fertile state of our investigations.

After considerable reshuffling of notes in the midst of my fieldwork, I saw that I was focusing on the institutional life of the society. The political, economic, and religious orders were becoming juxtaposed through these experiences. The problems of copper mining were connected to all three institutions. I saw that my interpretation would center on the nature of self-governance not only in copper mining but also in all these institutional orders.

My own fieldwork did not follow methodological traditions. It was not to be a systematic study of neighborhood life like William F. Whyte’s Street Corner Society or Elliot Liebow’s Tally’s Corner. Nor would it involve a careful study of a single

community like Helen and Robert Lynd's study of Middletown or Lloyd Warner's investigation of Yankee City. The institutions which drew my attention in Puerto Rico were based in society and therefore much more complex in nature. Yet, any single problem like copper mining on the island seemed to trace itself back to the problem of self-governance in institutions at the level of society.

This broad fieldwork focus on institutions in society had has its own tradition in anthropology. Anthropologists have traditionally made brief visits to small societies for data. They offer limited interpretations on what they had found and reports on their field forays had still been helpful for later studies. I have always held in highest regard such students of "society" as Robert Redfield, Evans Pritchard, Bronislaw Malinowski, and Hortense Powdermaker. They were observers of whole societies and their culture. An earlier precedent for commentaries based on "brief excursions" into a society was Alexis de Tocqueville's study of the United States; his reflections on Democracy in America were based on a journal he kept during his tour of the states in the 1840s. The work of such investigations provided important insights into the broad institutional problems of (the whole) society.

Feeling certain that there was a tradition to what I was doing, I felt it was now important to focus on a specific theme. My data clearly showed a theme of self-governance. The meaning of self-governance had become a concern to me before I had left the island. But I had not been able to think systematically about all its convolutions and intricacies. It was only after I left the island that I found its greater meaning in my Journal and History Notes.

My purpose was formed in the field. It was to clarify the meaning of self-governance in all these institutions together. My questions became: What are the various types of self-governance according to my experiences? How does self-governance develop in these institutional orders? How is it different and similar in each institution? What factors seem to bear most heavily upon its expression at each level of association?

A book I had read many years ago by Alvin Gouldner called *Industrial Patterns of Bureaucracy* influenced my thinking. This book was a study of a gypsum plant and involved participant observation. Gouldner's purpose was simply to clarify the variables of "bureaucratization." The work was so clearly done that it later became the basis for

guiding labor-management policies. It also helped other empirical studies to become more definitive about the types of bureaucracy to be found in industrial enterprise.

My purpose here was similar: to clarify the variables of self-governance functioning in three institutional orders – the political, economic, and religious. The data on self-governance were evident in my notes on History and in my Journal.

Having developed a purpose, I could now follow the usual procedures of interpretation. First, my field notes provided the basis for “abstracting” classes of phenomena. I expected my data to yield generalizations beyond merely the historical events and my personal experiences on the island. Certain questions became explicit: What classes of data will fit my key concept (self-governance) accurately? To what extent can I generalize from this data? How can I formulate hypotheses about self-governance as a function of social development?

Second, my field notes provided the basis for extensive comparisons between different classes of data. I looked for contrasts and contradictions. I was often forced to look for a higher principle in theory to explain such data. Third, I had to keep in mind the theoretical boundaries or limits of my theoretical framework. I had to keep it from expanding through my comparisons into too broad an area of inquiry.

Part two then expresses how these procedures unfolded for me. The first chapter illustrates the process of abstracting and generalizing from field notes. I asked myself a series of questions about what I had learned. I asked how my experiences could be interpreted in social theory. I had to define self-governance in more precise terms. I began to formulate hypotheses about how self-governance functioned in institutional life. I wanted especially to explain how it connected to social development.

This was an attempt to interpret self-governance as a function of social development. It required a broader frame of reference in theory. The next chapters then describe how I worked this out through interdisciplinary fields. In an interdisciplinary framework, I could then develop a basis for social analysis and policy in the context of the whole society. I was careful to keep in mind the general theme of self-governance.

Keeping in mind this framework of society, I began to compare and contrast beliefs about self-governance in each association – the state, business, and church. I saw that people working in them perceived “governance” quite differently. Each institution

expressed a set of beliefs – sub-culture – that shaped each mode of self-governance. To find the common mode of self-governance for the society as a whole, I looked more carefully at the subjective life of people in each association.

A theory of self-governance for the society had to connect with the beliefs of people in each institutional sector. Fieldwork theory must grow from the subjective facts, that is, the common beliefs of people. Yet the beliefs about governance in each institution varied so much from one to the other that I could not find a common denominator for the society. The concept of “governance” in the state, for example, was based on principles of democracy. The concept of governance in the business system was based on principles of command management. The concept of governance in the church was based on its unique history and varied principles of theology. The theology of each church translated into different types of governance for each denomination.

The governance of the church could not be discussed entirely from a secular standpoint. Instead of continuing with a secular interpretation, I sought the meaning of self-governance from within the beliefs of the church itself. Religious beliefs can be analyzed from a social scientific standpoint but they also needed to be examined from within the perspective of the church members. To do this meant looking for a framework linking the fields of sociology and religious studies. In this way I could maintain the cardinal principle of fieldwork: “Always generalize from subjective data.” This would also not perpetuate an academic myth that the whole truth can be found in only the secular disciplines.

### In Summary

Keeping in mind Robert Merton’s concern for revealing the path taken to develop a theory, I can say that the interpretive process began early in fieldwork. It began while collecting information on the history of Puerto Rico and continued while keeping a diary. These early interpretations become evident in the first two parts of the book where my notes are recorded. My interpretations then continued a much broader scale upon my return to the U.S. mainland. I began to look at all my notes as though they were reports on a weather map showing how different temperatures and atmospheric change in various parts of the country. I wanted to reflect on what had happened overall and especially what

it all meant sociologically in the aftermath. I also wanted to see how these experiences advanced my own understanding of what was occurring in the Third World.

I can now summarize briefly what I did in three steps, adding items I have missed in early comments.

First, I poured over all my notes on the history of Puerto Rico to see the general course of events. My notes showed unexpected connections between the institutions of the state, the economy, and the religious life. I began to bring these notes together quickly into an interpretive essay. I then went over my Journal Notes and saw that my experiences could also be ordered easily within these major institutional orders. I re-arranged the pages of my Journal according to the three institutions rather than according to the sequence of dates in which they happened.

Second, I looked for a basic theme in my notes. The theme stood forth clearly in the concept of self-governance, an issue on the Island itself. I began to “abstract” general principles from my sets of experience to interpret the broader meaning of self-governance in these institutional orders. I started to think of self-governance as an analytical concept.

Third, I sought to connect the idea of self-governance to sociological theory. I wanted to know how this key theme of island life explained the larger social questions of development in a theory of society. The key question that arose in my work at this point concerned the role of the church. It was clearly a part of the political economy (the state and the business system) but it was also separate. My attempt to interpret self-governance within the spiritual life of the church then became the final critical question I faced in developing a theory of self-governance in society.

I should add, finally, that the Appendix contains a brief analysis of the trade and industrial sectors of Puerto Rico. I made this analysis while I was on the island to help identify the degree to which Puerto Rico’s economy was dependent on the United States. The next logical step on this island would be to see how each industry could develop autonomy in its different levels of organization.

In the Epilogue, I discuss the questions of “post-modern development” in this simple concept of self-governance. I began to see how self-governance is central to the issues of development in the Third World. It is also central to the course taken by big nations as they decide on imperialism versus decentralized development. The United States and Puerto Rico are at a crossroads in their relationship today. Puerto Rico has become a crucible in this movement for self-government. The island is a testing ground in the struggle for a new “age of self-governance” in the world today.

1. L.S. Stavrianos, The Promise of the Coming Dark Age, (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman, (1976).
2. John Dewey, Art as Experience (N.Y.: Capricorn Books, 1958) p. 35.

### **Part III: Historical Notes**

The historian represents the organized memory of mankind, and that memory, as written history, is enormously malleable. It changes, often quite drastically, from one generation of historians to another – and

not merely because more detailed research later introduces new facts and documents into the record. It changes also because of changes in the points of interest and the current framework within which the record is built...The historian cannot avoid making a selection of facts, although he may attempt to disclaim it by keeping his interpretations slim and circumspect...All these perils of the historian's enterprise make it one of the most theoretical of the human disciplines, which makes the calm unawareness of many historians all the more impressive.

#### C. Wright Mills

As for the distinguishing social characteristics of the Dark Age, it was an underlying participatory impulse that is distinctive of the present age as well. Medieval serfs engaged in more self-management than did the slaves of the Roman Empire, and this autonomy was to develop and blossom during the following centuries under the Western tendency toward pluralism in government...It also explains the English, American, and French revolutions, which reflected the awakening and activation of the masses. The major result of these revolutions was that the people now not only participated in government but also considered it their inherent right to do so. This participatory impulse, which has been a distinguishing feature of Western civilization from its early medieval origins is today a central feature of the emerging new Dark Age; the idea of popular participation is now worldwide in scope and has grown more pervasive in content, implying self-management in all phases of life and for all segments of society.

#### L. S. Stavrianos

All history is nothing but a continuous transformation of human nature.

#### Karl Marx

### **A. The Political Order: Self-Governance in the State**

The struggle for political self-governance in Puerto Rico began early in the Nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> The first step toward basic reform of the autocratic centralist government in Spain was embodied in the liberal constitution of 1812 which gave the island its first elected delegate to the Junta Suprema in Madrid. This democratic reform was the beginning of a long series of reforms that were granted and then taken away, only to be granted again. The struggles were partly dependent upon events in Spain and Europe as well as a growing interest in autonomy among islanders. The struggles finally culminated in a charter for autonomy in 1897. (fn.1)

Those who still seek independence on the island today remember the charter fondly because it appears to grant them more control over their own affairs than the U.S. was willing to grant after the American invasion of the island. The issue was debatable among historians because the granting of autonomy could have been a belated attempt by Spain to forestall U.S. intervention. It appears that Spain was granting autonomy to both Puerto Rico and Cuba to avoid war; the document is interpreted by some historians as still reserving actual power in the hands of Spain's military governors for those islands. Since

the Spanish-American War followed this concession in 1897, the new charter was never tested in normal times. Therefore, no one really knows just how much self-governing power Puerto Rico would have actually achieved.

In the nineteenth century, three basic political positions developed which set the framework for examining the history of Puerto Rico in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In this period, leaders who were called “unconditionalists” assumed a political position of “annexation” with Spain. They sought to form a union with Spain in a manner comparable to the “statehooders” of today who seek annexation with the United States. A second political position was formed with the “autonomists” who were middle roaders. They sought certain concessions of independence but believed it was important to remain within the same basic political framework of the mother country. In the context of Puerto Rico today, this political position is comparable to Munoz Marín’s idea of a “commonwealth.” The third political position was that of the “separatists,” who wanted complete political independence from Spain, the mother country. Today, this would be recognized as the position of the independents (*independentistas*) that seek political separation from the United States \*

The fight for autonomy and independence continued throughout the nineteenth century. On September 23, 1868, an uprising began in Lares (*Grito de Lares*). The rebels declared a new Republic on the island. It was short-lived, however, because the Spanish had learned from an informer of the plans for revolution and were able to prevent its spread to other towns. Ramon Betances, on a revolutionary ship carrying troops and arms, was halted in Santo Domingo.<sup>2</sup> Without support of arms and men the uprising in Lares was defeated by the superior Spanish forces. Most importantly, the uprising had to be done before it was originally planned (September, 29, 1868).

The beliefs of the “autonomist” in the nineteenth century involved a concept of self-government within a federated union with Spain. According to Gordon Lewis, the idea included a concept of national unity with cultural diversity.<sup>3</sup>

The idea, at the bottom, was one of federal autonomy rooted in the federal principle, although interminable debate raged between those, like Pi y Margall, who thought along the lines of a close federal association on the American model and those, like Rafael Maria de Labra, who advocated a loose federal structure on the models of the then emerging

---

\* This same struggle for autonomy was also evident in the economic and religious orders, as we shall see.

British Commonwealth. There is little doubt, in any case, of the tremendous influence of the British imperial system upon Spanish constitutional thinkers and Puerto Rican liberal politicians alike. The difficulty was, to put it bluntly, that Spain was not England. There was no long tradition of constitutional government, as in London, to guarantee a liberal imperial outlook.<sup>3</sup>

In the viewpoint of Gordon Lewis, the final decades of Spanish sovereignty witnessed a whole range of expressive political movements, which sought degrees of freedom within the dominant system of Spanish colonialism. These movements included: the Partido Liberal Reformista of 1869, the Partido Asimilista of 1883, the Partido Autonomista of 1887.

But on November 25, 1897, the Spanish government finally granted a charter of autonomy, it was the result of a pact between the Spanish Prime Minister, Praxedes Mateo Sagasta, representing the Party in power in Spain, and Luis Munoz Rivera, representing the Liberal Party in Puerto Rico. The new charter guaranteed individual rights and extended the old Election Law to provide for civil rights, free elections, and an insular parliament. It went into effect on February 1898, only months before the American war with Spain began in that same year.<sup>4</sup>

#### The U.S. Invasion and Occupation

When the U.S. Army invaded the island and established a military occupation on July 25, 1898, the colonial rule over Puerto Rico then shifted from Spain to the United States. The series of events that took place during this invasion is important to note from the standpoint *independentistas*.

On July 16, 1898, Spanish forces surrendered in Santiago, Cuba, though the final surrender by Spain did not come until August 13. On July 17 the Spanish government offered to open peace talks with the United States. On that same day the U.S. government ordered its navy to invade Puerto Rico, and on July 25 Puerto Rico was invaded by the armed forces of the United States. These forces placed the island under military occupation, dissolved the Puerto Rican Parliament, and established United States rule by force of arms. Under the terms of the Treaty of Paris, signed in December 1898, Spain “ceded” Puerto Rico to the United States in disregard of Puerto Rico’s constitution, its

autonomous institutions, and the wishes of the Puerto Rican People.\* The statistics on Puerto Rico's trade reflect one aspect of the dependency that resulted from U.S. control. In 1897, the year before the U.S. occupied Puerto Rico, 19% of the island's trade was with the United States. By 1906, the figure had risen to 85%.

The U.S. invasion of Puerto Rico was part of the Spanish-American War that resulted in the acquisition of many Spanish possessions as booty. The islands of Cuba, the Philippines, Guam, and Puerto Rico were all acquired in the Treaty of Paris. After the Treaty officially concluded agreements with Spain, the U.S. flag was raised over all the public buildings in Puerto Rico. The U.S. then began to govern a country of almost a million inhabitants of a different language and culture.†

The "war against Spain" was condemned by many leaders in the U.S. as the most blatantly self-aggrandizing that the country had fought since the war against Mexico. Grover Cleveland, a U.S. ex-President, said he was ashamed of the whole affair. Carl Schurz, former Secretary of Interior in the Cabinet of President Grant believed that the American people were opposed to "a policy of imperialism." He called for a national plebiscite to reject "colonialization" of Puerto Rico. Andrew Carnegie supported him; the leading American industrialist who believed such a plebiscite would demonstrate public sentiment against American imperialism. But the plebiscite was never held.

While the U.S. was demanding the possession of Puerto Rico at the signing of the Treaty of Paris, Senator George Vest of Missouri was introducing a resolution into Congress that said: "Under the Constitution of the United States no power is given the Federal Government to acquire territory to be held and governed permanently as colonies." A half-dozen other resolutions against imperialism were offered in the Senate. Charles Francis Adams, the grandson of John Adams and son of John Quincy Adams, spoke at Lexington, Massachusetts against the new imperialism. He said it was a travesty against America's own principles. The "spirit of liberty" for which his ancestors had fought was passing from the scene.

---

\* The parallel effects on the economy should be noted here.

† My "note taking" on history at these points accents the viewpoint of *independistas*. As an underclass, their view is not fully recorded in the history texts used in the public schools. A balanced account of history would afford proper space to all three political positions.

The forces of anti-imperialism, however, did not win. Senator Thurston of Nebraska had said earlier: “War with Spain would increase the business and earnings of every American railroad, it would increase the output of every American factory, it would stimulate every branch of industry and domestic commerce.” Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., who was to become Governor of Puerto Rico wrote later in Colonial Policies of the United States about the attitudes of the times: “Destiny seemed to point to an entire world ruled by white people... The general attitude of mind of the white people at that period was that no nation with any pretense to importance should be without colonies. We decided that we, too, would be an empire, and shoulder, ‘the white man’s burden...’”<sup>5</sup>

Many Puerto Ricans were perplexed by the events. At the time of the invasion, they did not feel oppressed since just seven months earlier they had achieved home rule from Spain after a century of struggle. Yet Spain had treated them miserably and the U.S. was known to be democratic and wealthy. The American General in charge of the invasion, Nelson A. Miles, sought to speak to this fact and to soothe anxieties on the island in his first public speech<sup>6</sup>:

We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed but on the contrary to bring you protection...to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our government.

General John R. Brooke assumed command as governor of Puerto Rico on October 18, 1898. His first official acts were to bypass the existing institutions and introduce more suitable political arrangements. He abolished the existing Provincial Assembly (*Disputacion Provincial*) which he regarded as “wholly unnecessary and incompatible with the present administration of public affairs.” The duties assigned to it under the Autonomous Constitution of 1897 were reassigned to the Insular Council. The General appointed new members of the Supreme Court, retraining two members of the former court. He stated that the schools would be reopened by mid-November and that English would be required.<sup>\*</sup>

---

\* These historical facts caused me to theorize about a parallel between the psychological and social concepts of the conscious versus the unconscious of a society. The “conscious” of the society becomes the ideology that “wins” the battle to command a government. The

Resentment against the policies of General Brooke grew rapidly and General Guy V. Henry replaced him on December 6, 1898. One of the first acts of the general was to arrange for a meeting of the delegates from the principal towns of the island along with the Cabinet of the Insular Council formed under the Autonomous Constitution. At a meeting with island leaders he said his program would include the introduction of the following: improved sanitation methods; revised election standards (in view of the fact that only 14% of the people were said to be literate); education in English (taught by women school teachers brought from the United States); the United States police system; and a check on the freedom of the press.<sup>7</sup>

The year of 1898 ended with increasing conflict between the military and local inhabitants. It began when the liberal newspaper, *La Democracia*, editorialized on its belief that sometime in the future the military government would be removed. The next day, the military government made it clear that “This General Government does not allow the publication of writings in which reference is made to the Army of the United States or to the Military Government lest the extreme case of such publicity can be justified with conclusive proof.”<sup>8</sup>

General Henry continued to issue orders that sought to “Americanize” local institutions. The police force of the island was taken away from the control of the Puerto Rican State Department and put directly under the governor general. Then, an American, Frank Techter, was placed in charge. Another American, General John Eaton, was appointed superintendent of public instruction and all teachers and school officers in Puerto Rico were ordered to report to him. The friction increased. General Henry then dissolved the Insular Cabinet as “not compatible with American methods and progress.” All posts were placed under direct control of the governor general. In protest, the secretaries, Luis Munoz Rivera, Juan Hernandez Lopez, and Cayetano Colly Toste resigned. They demanded a legislated body that would truly represent the people but General Henry rejected their petition as a matter for the legislation of the U.S. Congress to decide. A new government was organized on February 12, 1899, whereby all “secretaries” were to be

---

“unconscious” of the society then becomes hidden in the dreams of revolutionaries. It is also symbolized in the life of criminals, and the “insane” also hidden from view. The “aberrant” are segregated in “asylums” away from societal consciousness. See the epilogue for more on this notion.

directly under the control of the governor general. They had lost their autonomous powers that had been given the Insular Council by the Constitution of 1897.

The issue of the free press continued. The right to dissent was at stake. *La Democracia* argued for home rule in the spirit of Thomas Jefferson. *El Territorio* published a letter by Dr. Rodriguez Castro of San Juan stating that smallpox vaccinations were expensive and harmful. He ended his letter: “I am not a Tagalo, nor from Hawaii, nor a redskin.” An order from General Henry’s headquarters addressed to the editor of *El Territorio* stated “any similar articles appearing in his newspaper will at once result in the suspension of that paper... The Secretary of State will at once notify Dr. Castro to discontinue his articles criticizing the Government, or to suffer such penalty as the case merits.”<sup>9</sup>

On April 12, 1900, the U.S. Congress approved the Foraker Law that was intended to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico. It stated that legislation formulated in the U.S. Congress would have application to Puerto Rico with the exception of internal revenues. (Congress decided not to tax the island without political representation, recalling its own colonial history.) It also stated that all laws that would be formulated in Puerto Rico could be annulled by the U.S. Congress. A House of Delegates would formulate the laws. But only those who could read and write and pay taxes would be allowed to vote. Under these stipulations, the majority of Puerto Ricans were not given access to the polls. The law further stated that the Puerto Rican governor and all members of a ruling Executive Council were to be named by the President of the United States. The appointed governor would have absolute veto over any legislation passed by the newly formed House of Delegates. The first colonial governor took office on May 1, 1900.

The reaction of Puerto Rican leaders was of shock and disbelief. The strongest political party existing at the time for the Foraker Act was the Union Party. In 1904, the Union Party demanded a plebiscite but the U.S. Congress ignored its demands. Resentment against the Foraker Act was so strong that by 1909 the Puerto Rico House of Delegates refused to approve any legislation, including the next year’s budget and instead sent a memorandum to President Taft stating its opposition to the “unjust law.” President Taft responded by saying that the U.S. had already allowed them too much political power.

The Union Party's paper replied by saying that "One million souls are living in Puerto Rico in an unbearable state of tyranny under the folds of the American flag."<sup>10</sup>

The Union Party was led by two men: Jose De Diego, an *Independentista* who was the President of the Chamber of Deputies, and Munoz Rivera who was an autonomist and Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington. The two men fought for their different political positions of separatism and autonomism. It appeared as though Munoz Rivera would win their battle with the passing of the Jones Act in 1917.

#### The First Laws of Autonomy: U.S. Controls Remain

The Jones Act provided for a Bill of Rights and a popularly elected legislature for Puerto Rico. It took steps toward autonomy while at the same time keeping the island in the category of an American colony. The U.S. Congress still retained full authority over Puerto Rican laws. The U.S. appointed Governor still retained the veto over island legislation and the U.S. President retained the final veto.

The significant new factor in the Jones Act was its "offer" of U.S. citizenship to all Puerto Ricans. The Act provided a choice for Puerto Ricans to reject U.S. citizenship but they had to appear before judges (small in number) to swear affidavits that they had refused it. The refusal then denied them civil rights including the right to vote and to hold public office. In effect, leaders said at the time that the choice of U.S. citizenship made them aliens in their homeland. Munoz Rivera asked for a plebiscite to test public opinion on the question of citizenship. His request was ignored. On May 5, 1906, Munoz Rivera rose in the U.S. House of Representatives and spoke against the Jones Act knowing his cause was lost.<sup>11</sup>

On the 18<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1898, when the flag of this great Republic was unfurled over the fortresses of San Juan, if anyone had said to my countrymen that the United States, the land of liberty, was going to deny their right to form a government of the people, by the people, and for the people of Puerto Rico, for my countrymen would have refused to believe such a prophecy, considering it sheer madness...

A spokesman for President Wilson was reported to have said that the imminence of the First World War made it wise to insure the loyalty of the Puerto Ricans. In any case, the requirement of citizenship for Puerto Ricans meant that 20,000 men were compelled to enter military service.

Jose de Diego spoke passionately on the issue<sup>12</sup>:

Never was anything like this seen before...under the threat and coercion of losing their right as electors and of being eligible for all public offices, in a country where they are obliged to carry all the burdens of the state and to render military tribute to the dominating nation, in the country of their birth and their life, where they long to be buried, Puerto Ricans, who for a crime unknown as yet in universal law – love of their own citizenship – are reduced to the condition of foreigners in their own country, are exiled from their land; and so, through terror, and because of the harshness of the punishment, only a very small number of Puerto Ricans have renounced the imposed citizenship, for almost all of them accept it, to present afterwards to the world with this unheard-of deed the fictitious demonstration that the Puerto Ricans voluntarily and joyfully accepted United States citizenship and with it they abandoned the ideal of constituting their country among the free and sovereign nations of America.

The Foraker and Jones Act thus set a colonial framework for Puerto Rico. Gordon Lewis, in his important study of freedom and power in the Caribbean concluded<sup>13</sup>:

In both cases, the cabinet was in effect an imperial office protecting the American metropolitan interests against the locally elected legislature...the majority of its members, including the Governor, were responsible not to any local will but to an external authority, the President of the United States...Congress ironically, was willing to create in San Juan the sort of Hamiltonian executive it was almost constitutionally incapable of encouraging in Washington.

Six months after U.S. citizenship was granted both houses of the Puerto Rican legislature sent resolutions to President Wilson demanding total self-government for Puerto Rico. Protest telegrams were sent to the mainland. \* Antonio R. Barceló, president of the insular Senate telegraphed the President<sup>14</sup>:

The first Porto Rican Senate greets President Wilson and relies on him and the American Congress for a greater development of the system establishing in Porto Rico a Government of and by the people to its fullest extent and purity.

In 1920, Warren G. Harding campaigned against Porto Rican Independence<sup>15</sup>. After he was elected, anti-American cablegrams began coming from the island to the White House. In March, 1921, Horace M. Towner, Chairman of the U.S. House Committee on Insular Affairs sent a letter to Barceló warning him that there was “not now, and there is

---

\* These facts are no longer “remembered” in the standard histories of Puerto Rico. They could be said to exist in the “social unconscious.” Most Americans are also “unknowing” of the early military repression of the island and the resistance movement against American supremacy.

not likely to be, any considerable sentiment in this country for the independence of Porto Rico.”

The dispute continued to mount on the island when President Harding appointed E. Montgomery Reilly, a Kansas City businessman, as Governor of the island. In his inaugural address he claimed that only “Old Glory” would continue to wave over Puerto Rico. In a letter to Barceló, Reilly said<sup>16</sup>:

While discussing appointments, I want you to fully understand that I shall never appoint any man to office who is an advocate of independence. When you publicly renounce independence, and break loose from your pernicious and un-American associates, then I will be glad to have your recommendations.

The Union Party had always maintained a principle of independence in its platform under the leadership of Rivera and de Diego but these two men had died shortly after the passing of the Jones Act. The successor to the presidency, Antonio R. Barceló, decided to eliminate the principle of independence from Point Five of the Party’s platform. The Party now proposed an autonomous form of government that resembled the recently established Irish Free State. It proposed that the island become an Associated Free State. But the proposal was ignored. The Party’s withdrawal from the independence movement was to have its consequences in narrowing and deepening the resistance. The future was to be written less with formal protests and cablegrams and more with overt physical violence.

#### The Struggle for Independence Deepens

On September 17, 1922, the Nationalist Party was born. A young lawyer from the city of Ponce, Don Pedro Albizu Campos, a graduate of Harvard University, abandoned the Union Party and entered the ranks of the Nationalists. Albizu Campos said later that his decision was based upon the new policy of the Union Party to give up its struggle for independence. Eight years later in 1930, Albizu Campos was elected president of the Nationalist Party.

But the old Union Party could not survive on the island without the principle of independence. By 1932, the Union Party had ceased to exist and a new party was formed called the Puerto Rican Liberal Party. Antonio R. Barceló now presided over the new Liberal Party, favoring independence. The forces of nationalism were now on the rise.

On October 24, 1935, the colonial police and the nationalists outside the University of Puerto Rico clashed in Rio Piedras. Four nationalists and one police officer were killed

forty people were wounded. The event came to be known as the “massacre de Rio Piedras.” In retaliation, on February 23, 1936, two young nationalists Hiram Rosado and Elias Beauchamp killed the U.S. Colonel Francis Riggs, head of the colonial police forces. The youths were beaten and shot after they were taken to police headquarters. Puerto Ricans then saw the North American government begin to repress the activities of the nationalists, and all major efforts to work toward independence. Albizu Campos and many of the nationalists were indicted on charges of sedition by a grand jury in a U.S. Federal Court. Campos was charged with desiring to “overthrow the government of the U.S. established in Puerto Rico.”<sup>17</sup>

The trial brought considerable attention to the role of the U.S. as a colonial power. The members of the first jury for Albizu Campos were both North Americans and Puerto Ricans who could not reach an agreement. The Puerto Rican members were in favor of acquittal while the North Americans were in favor of condemnation. A new trial was then ordered. The new jury, chosen in the palace of the colonial governor, was composed of 10 North Americans and two Puerto Ricans who sought annexation to the U.S. This time the jury condemned Albizu Campos to 10 years in the penitentiary in Atlanta, Georgia.

But the forces for independence continued. On March 21, 1937, Palm Sunday, a large public demonstration was organized in the city of Ponce to demand independence for the island and the liberation of Pedro Albizu Campos. It began as a peaceful demonstration and ended as the “massacre de Ponce.” Leaders had obtained legal permission from town authorities to demonstrate. The demonstration began to gather when suddenly strong police detachments appeared and surrounded the demonstrators. The chief of police notified leaders that the authorization for demonstrating had been withdrawn. The demonstrators did not yield. An unarmed column of marchers started to move forward to the strains of “La Borinquena,” the national anthem. At the same time, the police opened fire. The toll of dead was 20 and the wounded numbered 200. The dead included women, old people, youth and children.

Concerned about the death of Colonel Riggs and the continued island unrest, Senator Millard Tydings presented to the U.S. Congress a plan for granting independence to Puerto Rico. The plan called for a plebiscite of the Puerto Rican people. The people would decide by their votes whether they were for or against independence. Albizu

Campos rejected the plan because they considered a plebiscite held in an occupied country to be incapable of reflecting the authentic feelings of the people. He said that occupation itself was illegal since the U.S. had invaded a territory that had been granted autonomy. But the bill died in Congress and the idea never came to fruition. It was said on the mainland that this was still a time of unrest on the Island. Public sentiments had not yet stabilized.

In the 1940s, four decades after the American occupation of the Island, social and economic conditions were hardly improved for the general population. The elite construction workers were making twenty-two cents an hour. Meat was almost unheard of among the poor. Per capita income was \$118 a year; farm work paid as low as \$.06 an hour. Seven out of ten persons were still illiterate. But the United States was pulling out of a Depression. The time was ripe for a major political turn of events in Puerto Rico.\*

#### The Era of Luis Munoz Marín: The Concept of Commonwealth

Luis Munoz Marín and the Popular Democratic Party (PDP), which rose to power in 1940, led the political turn of events. Munoz Marín was the son of the Munoz Rivera who in turn had led the Island toward independence from Spain and then began the struggle all over again with the United States. Munoz Marín was born in 1898, the year of the U.S. invasion, and then lived his formative years in the United States while his father was Resident Commissioner. Following his father's death, he remained on the mainland and began moving in literary circles. By the end of the 1920s, he had perceived "two major problems" which perplexed Puerto Rico and were "arising out of its enforced relationship with the United States." He said one dealt with the consequences of economic development and the other dealt with the "cultural Americanization" on the Island<sup>18</sup>.

The importance of the economic problem is obvious to all, whatever their views or interests. Americanization is more insidious. The tendency works while you sleep. It

---

\* I should say that I did not see the significance of "municipal development" in the theme of self-governance on the island at the time. These mind "openings" on the nature of social history are one of the side benefits of fieldwork.

changes the expression of your eyes, the form of your paunch, the tone of your voice, your hopes of Heaven, what your neighbors and your women expect of you – all without giving you a chance to fight back, without even presenting to you the dilemma of fighting back or not. Certainly no two things are more important than to have what you want and to live as spontaneously as you can manage. These two hopes are now in process of being shot to hell in my country.

A few years later he returned to Puerto Rico to engage in the fight for independence. He sought and won a seat in the Senate for the Liberal Party. But his views were quite radical and when rifts developed in the Party, Munoz was expelled. In 1938 he formed the Popular Party and began touring the Island to talk to the country folk (*jbaros*) whom he believed had been neglected in the Americanization of the Island. He spoke about voting for a new form of government. He won their hearts and their votes and came to office as a Senator and to power in the Popular Party in the 1940s.

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Rexford Guy Tugwell as governor of Puerto Rico. Tugwell proved to be one of the most effective governors in the history of the Island, indeed, a major force for political change. He recommended early in his period of office that the U.S. Congress “permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own governor.” Tugwell and Munoz were both charismatic figures that were now beginning to work as a team. Gradually, however, Munoz moved closer to U.S. policy and farther from his early beliefs about independence.

In 1944, the Popular Democratic Party won 60% of the votes in the legislature. But many of the Popular Party members were pro-independence. And when Munoz Marín failed to move forcibly on the issue of independence, several members resigned to form the Independence Party under the leadership of Gilberto Concepción de Gracia. It was a battle that would continue interminably with Munoz Marín and the U.S. Government on the winning side in the succeeding decades.

In 1947, the Independence Party petitioned the United Nations for help in resolving the “colonial status” of the Island. Under pressure from the U.S., the United States Congress decided it was important and timely to resolve the issue under the combined leadership of Tugwell and Munoz Marín. It was decided to permit Puerto Rico to elect its own governor. In 1948, then, Senator Munoz became Puerto Rico’s first elected Governor. In the meantime, he had made up his mind about the political status of the Island. He recommended what he called *Estado Libre Asociado* (Free Associated State). It was a concept that approximates the status of a commonwealth. It could still be conceived as a practical step toward independence.

The radical struggle for the independence was continuing outside official circles. Albizu Campos had returned to Puerto Rico in 1947 to reorganize the Nationalist Party. In 1948, the Student Council of the University invited him to give a lecture on the political status of the Island. The Rector of the University refused to permit the lecture to be given. The students protested vigorously and declared a University “strike” which lasted four months. Students lowered the U.S. flag and raised the Puerto Rican flag. The police occupied the campus. Many students were imprisoned and many university faculties were expelled.

Munoz Marín said independence could not be achieved without adequate economic development. He said that the dream of complete jurisdiction over Puerto Rican affairs could only be reached after certain economic goals and first been achieved. Puerto Rico had to achieve an adequate per capita income, volume of industrialization, and minimum

family income, before the people could vote for full independence. The achievement of these goals depended upon favorable relations with the United States.\*

Many people claimed that the consequences of this political decision for “economics first” and “independence second” were unknown to Munoz Marín when he made it. The industrial development of the island would involve the country in a new relationship of dependency with the United States. The new relationship would be with the multinational corporations and U.S. investments for which there would be no retreat in the lifetime of Munoz Marín. The consequences of foreign investment and social bondage to North American corporations were later to force Munoz Marín to give up on his original goals for Puerto Rican independence.

The stage was now set for the organization of the Commonwealth. It was still said to be the “autonomous phase” of what was hoped to be a practical step toward independence. The U.S. Congress passed Public Law 600 that provided for the organization of a constitutional government. Puerto Rico was to have a constitution that was authorized by people on the Island. But the new constitution would also have U.S. “consultation.” It would need to be sent to the President of the United States and be approved by Congress. The United States had cause to encourage a constitutional government. Since 1946 it had been reporting to the United Nations according to Article 73 of the United Nations Charter relative to non-Self Governing Territories. By initiating action on a Puerto Rican constitution and a referendum on the island approving the action,

---

\* This historical period under Munoz Marín is noted for its economic development as much as for its political development. The story of economic development, however, is reported in the next section. It is no less important to the history of the island’s struggle for self-governance.

the U.S. could cease submitting reports to the United Nations. It would no longer have the stigma of maintaining a colony.

The independents, however, saw the move as another legal trick to stop the independence movement. The extremists took action into their own hands. Soon after President Truman signed the Commonwealth Bill (Public Law 600) a group of Nationalists attacked the governor's mansion in Old San Juan. One policeman and four Nationalists were killed. There were also uprisings in Ponce, Jayuya, Utuado, Arecibo, and Jaranjito causing 27 deaths. In November 1950, two Puerto Ricans, Oscar Collazo and Griselio Torresola, went to Washington to attack Blair House where President Truman lived. It was an amateurish attempt in which they sought to draw national attention to the injustices they felt was being perpetrated on the Island.

It was President Truman who had applied his veto to a bill that would have made Spanish the official language in the schools of Puerto Rico. This bill had been passed by a two-third vote of the Puerto Rican legislature. Yet under the political status of dependency, Truman's veto had nullified this action. Such a matter was of vital importance to Puerto Ricans but in a nation where they had no representative and no voice in the U.S. Congress, there was no national attention to the matter.

Under the leadership of Munoz Marín, Puerto Ricans on the Island approved the Commonwealth status in a referendum by a vote of 387,000 to 119,000. Opponents called the vote unfair because it provided only two negative choices: to adopt the new commonwealth status or to remain a colonial territory. There was no choice for independence. Furthermore, opponents claimed the act to be lawful since the drawing up of a constitution meant that it must be done independently of outside powers. In this case,

the “constitution making” had to be approved by the United States. The process had been prejudiced. Furthermore, the U.S. presence had created an atmosphere on the Island that suggested that to move toward independence was tantamount to secession and sedition.

The new Commonwealth Constitution proved to have legal strings attached to it. It was based on the concept of a “pact” which was said by officials to have been made equally between two countries. But it did not free Puerto Rico from “final authority” being constituted in the U.S. Congress. A part of the Puerto Rican Constitution which the U.S. Congress insisted be included was the following <sup>19</sup>:

Any amendment or revision of this constitution shall be consistent with the resolution enacted by the Congress of the United States approving the constitution, with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States, with the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act, and with Public Law 600.

Congress continued to define the Puerto Rican Constitution as extending to “the island of Puerto Rico and to the adjacent islands belonging to the United States.” Public Law 600 had never fully repealed the previous colonial relationship outlined in the 1917 Jones Act. So the Puerto Rican government still did not have political independence.

In 1959, Puerto Rico submitted a bill to Congress to amend the U.S. – Puerto Rico compact. It sought to eliminate the phrase “adjacent islands belonging to the United States” and other parts that made Puerto Rico appear as a legal possession. The bill failed in the U.S. Congress. Luis Munoz Marín and leaders in the Popular Party were deeply disappointed. But many Popular Democrats believed that achievements had been made and the issue passed from popular debate. The U.S. ended its reports on colonial status to the United Nations with many Independents convinced that Puerto Rico still belonged to the U.S.

Opponents argued privately that the new “free associated state” was still more colonial and less autonomous than the charter achieved from Spain in 1897. In 1897, the Puerto Rican Parliament fixed its own tariffs and duties on import and export merchandise whereas now, it was subject to the Tariff Laws of the United States that benefited American manufacturers. In 1898, Puerto Rico could utilize the shipping facilities of all friendly nations but now the Island was limited exclusively to U.S. shipping which charged the highest tariffs in the world. In 1898, Puerto Rico could develop its own agriculture without limitations but it was under a strict system of production quotas. In 1898 Puerto Ricans had their own citizenship whereas now they were required to be American citizens.

Puerto Ricans were not obliged to do military service in the Spanish Army but under the “Free Associated State” they were so obliged to service in the U.S. Army. The laws passed by the Spanish Parliament did not apply to Puerto Rico unless the Puerto Rican Parliament accepted them but U.S. Laws applied to Puerto Rico without Puerto Rico representation in the U.S. Congress. Finally, they said, Puerto Rico controlled its own postal, customs, banking, monetary, and judicial system whereas now these were now to be regulated by the U.S.

Munoz Marín was not for introducing a new outside force into the “political” scene. It was rather the “force” of the American corporation that came to industrialize the island and to end the abysmal poverty. The new movement, called “Operation Bootstrap”, was destined to virtually change the face of the political life. It was destined to promote economic development at an unheard of rate. It would turn the tide of interest on the Island toward consumer goods and raise public opinion toward the concept of statehood within the province of the North American government.

The popular Party won the 1956 and 1960 elections by 60 percent voting margins. But the entire voting pattern was changing at the same time. The Statehood Republicans were on the increase. In 1956 they won 25% of the vote and in 1960, 32% of the vote. The Independence Party lost ground, dropping from 12% to 3% in the same respective years. Many Independents began to abstain from voting on principle and their resistance deepened. At the same time, the Independents began to suffer divisions and disputes in leadership as many members of the Party sought stronger ideological positions leading toward socialism.

#### The Shift Towards Statehood and Annexation

The general climate of opinion moved favorably toward the United States and so “Commonwealtheners” argued that it was now time to consider a plebiscite on the political status of the Island. The U.S.–Puerto Rican Commission (STACOM) was appointed with seven North Americans and six Puerto Ricans. After a two-year study, the Commission decided to hold a plebiscite. By this time, Munoz Marìn had stepped down from his position as head of the Popular Party and had handpicked his successor Roberto Sanchez Vilella, who in 1964 became the second elected governor in the Island’s history. The Popular Party majority then pushed through a bill calling for a plebiscite on July 23, 1967.

The charismatic leadership of Munoz Marìn and the apparent successes in economic development in this period led to an overwhelming victory for the Popular Party. Many Statehooders and Independents claimed abstention from voting but more than 60% of the 702,000 voters chose to maintain the commonwealth status. The Statehooders won nearly 39% while the Independents won less than 0.6%. The plebiscite, which had been denied to

Puerto Ricans so many times in its early development, now seemed to confirm that the Island finally rejected Independence.

The interests of politics continued to shift favorably toward the business community. On November 4, 1968, a successful Puerto Rican businessman, Luis A. Ferrè was elected governor of Puerto Rico. His New Progressive Party, which sought statehood for Puerto Rico, gained 44% of the votes as opposed to 42% for the Popular Democrats. It was a narrow win that would be lost in the next election again to the Popular Party now under the leadership of Hernández Colón. But the dramatic shift toward the interests of the business community was to remain deeply set in the new administration of Hernández Colón.

On April 17, 1974, the Democratic Senator Henry Jackson visited Puerto Rico and claimed that it would require an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to give Puerto Rico its independence. He said that even if the people of Puerto Rico voted to become independent, they could not become so in reality without such an amendment. He said further that Puerto Rico was an “irretrievable” part of the union. “Puerto Rico is an integral part of the United States...and we fought the War Between the States on that issue.” He added: “English must be the dominant language. We don’t want another Quebec problem”.

The next day Governor Hernández Colón said, in response to a query from United Press International that the constitutional problem hinges around the full citizenship granted to Puerto Ricans. “If 51% of the Puerto Rican electorate voted in favor of independence, could the Congress grant it to the other 49% as well and in the process deprive them of their American citizenship?”

The comments by Senator Jackson touched off a debate on the Island that became reminiscent of the discontent and frustration generated at the time of the Foraker Law after the turn of the century. The San Juan Star reported how major leaders in the Puerto Rico legislature responded to the issue. Speaker Luis E. Ramos Yordan said mildly and simply, “He is incorrect.” Vice Speaker Severo E. Colberg said: “They represent the imperialist mentality.” House Majority Leader Josè Ramòn Morales called Jackson’s expressions “those of an eminent troglodyte.” The Resident Commissioner in Washington, Jaime Benitez, said, “If he said what they say he said, then he is legally and ethically wrong.” Representative Olga Cruz de Nigaglonini said, “He obviously knows very little about commonwealth status and how it was established.” Senator Ruben Berrios called the U.S. Senator “an educated, insolent cowpoke who doesn’t know beans about constitutional law...” It appeared as though the issue of independence was still alive in Puerto Rico.\*

#### The Political Economy: A Theoretical Note

The struggle for independence that had been so vital at the turn of the century receded and changed course at mid-century. Beginning in 1898, the struggle for independence was at first blunted through sheer military domination and force; then it was controlled through selective appointments to government office by foreign governors; then deeply set back by the forced deprivation of civil rights, including the power to vote and run for office; then diverted by promises of gradual advancement toward autonomous status; then repressed through the imprisonment of *independistas*; and then finally offered alternatives through commonwealth status and a program of industrialization. The program

---

\* These events were current with my residence on the island and thus gain significance here. But the events are not alien to the on-going attitudes about autonomy and independence among people today.

in industrialization began in the 1940s and could account for the major shift in the politics of the Island toward annexation.

This impact of the United States on the economic life of the Island is important. It requires separate attention because it functions less visibly than political life. Yet the industrial program was connected to Puerto Rican politics in ways that changed the course of life on the Island.

A key proposition here is that the shift in public opinion away from independence and toward statehood in the 1950s and 1960s did not occur primarily through changes and trends in state institutions by themselves, but through the effects of changes in the economic order. Historians argue that the changes occurred through the advancement of the multinational corporation engaged in the private economic development of the country.\*

The influence of changes in the economy on politics is not easily perceived in a capitalist society because the business sector is defined as “private.” Private corporations move much more quietly into the life of society than do new legislative laws and state constitutions. The administration and organization of the corporation is not commonly subject to public debate as would be an alteration in the court system or a change in the number of Congressional representatives. The corporate purchase of land, the practices of hiring and firing employees, the autocratic controls, the interlocking directorates, the executive fee payments, decision-making by absentee landlords, etc. are not normally matters of public examination. Corporate activities are generally relegated to the back

---

\* The power of the economy to affect politics has been a theoretical issue for a long time in social history. In this case, the industrialization of the Island by U.S. multinational firms played a key role in popularizing the statehood party on the island. And this becomes a central issue in the next section on the economic history of Puerto Rico.

pages of the daily newspaper or detailed in trade association journals that the public never reads. Yet corporations have their own governing systems in the economic order. They set a pattern of interests and values of people to follow in society. They set models of behavior and principles of action even though they are not included as issues in a political party platform. It is this quiet entry of corporations that is now examined for the extent to which the corporate system has become a basic part of the impact of the U.S. on the political and cultural life of Puerto Rico.

### **B. The Economic Order: Self-Governance and the Economy**

The economic development of Puerto Rico can be divided into three periods: Spanish Colonialism (1493-1898); American colonialism (1898-1940); and the recent decades of Puerto Rican industrial development.

The first two periods of Spanish and American colonialism can be considered together as the pre-industrial stage. Three types of agricultural products, tobacco, coffee, and sugar, remained the predominant economic activity during these periods even though significant changes took place in the relative importance of the three products. The production of sugar under the American occupation, for example, displaced the production of coffee. Large U.S. business interests bought vast tracts of land and built sugar mills. The production of coffee was essentially lost in the process. In 1895, sugar represented roughly 25% of the commerce, tobacco, 17% and coffee, 60%. By 1931, sugar had become 52%, tobacco was reduced to 4%, and coffee became less than 1%. The country remained essentially agricultural in this stage but the type of ownership moved from small *fincas* to plantations in the American period.

The invasion of Puerto Rico by American troops in 1898 changed the pattern of land ownership as well as island politics. A struggle soon began with the Spanish *hacendados* for control over the political life of the island. The American victory showed certain economic gains for islanders but it was also deceptive with new problems of dependency. Earl Parker Hanson, Consultant to the Department of State of the Puerto Rican Commonwealth, describes this mixed blessing:<sup>21</sup>

The dramatic rise in trade between 1901 and 1921 from \$17 million to \$218 was less healthful to Puerto Rico than statistics alone would indicate. To a large extent it reflected the investments of American corporate capital in the island's economy, which, in an exploitative monopolistic manner, exported a large share of the profits together with the products, controlled much of Puerto Rico's political life, and created sweatshop economic conditions.

The American invasion brought the mixed blessing of business investments and business dominance. This meant economic advances for certain sectors of the population while a new form of foreign control developed through absentee ownership of land and enterprises on the Island. Gordon Lewis notes that by 1930 "the twin developments of economic concentration and of absentee ownership of land and corporations had reached its zenith. In the field of public utilities and banking, the degree of absentee ownership by American corporations was some 60%; in the tobacco industry, 60%; and in the steamship lines operating between the island ports and the mainland ports, almost 100%..." The American corporation was not decentralized in its structure of administrative power and authority. It was not organized democratically so that Puerto Ricans could participate equally in the power and the material benefits of economic enterprise. This business pattern of development meant the beginning of corporate areas of monopoly and small dictatorships within the Island's economic order. It had the cumulative effect on the shape of political order.

When the Popular Democratic Party of Muñoz Marín won a majority in the legislature in 1940, the principal slogan was *Pan, Tierra, Libertad* (Bread, Land, Liberty). Land reform was a main issue. The sugar companies had engaged in vote-buying as well as gained substantial control over the press and Puerto Rican representatives. Muñoz Marín toured the Island imploring the people to ignore past practices and vote for a new pattern of Puerto Rican politics.

One plank in the new politics was a land reform bill (1944) that sought to break up the great estates and redistribute land to the peasants. A program to create family-sized farms was instituted and 83 profit-sharing farms were created. The land law prohibited the monopolization of land and set size-limits for landholding. But the law failed to be implemented. The corporate estate system continued in spite of the law. Earl Parker Hansen again notes the special power of the corporation to shape political life in this period.<sup>22</sup>

Despite a federal law under which no corporation was permitted to own or control more than five hundred acres of Puerto Rican land, four powerful sugar companies acquired estates ranging in size up to nearly 55,000 acres – only half of which were usually planted to sugar while the rest were held in reserve. Those four came to exercise enormous political power, in part because they were “American” interests, in part because they could control the votes in elections. The many thousands of men who worked for them voted as they were told, lest they lose their miserable starvation wages; the thousands of the voting poor who did not depend for their living on the sugar companies were given small bribes – up to two dollars – for voting “correctly.” By such means the companies made sure that the legislature was filled largely by sugar-lawyers who were careful to do nothing as lawmakers which they would later come to regret as lawyers serving the sugar interests.

Muñoz Marín had come to power to overcome this pattern of politics but it could not be done in the field of agriculture and the countryside. To fulfill his promises about building a new society, a new pattern of economic development and planning had to be created in the city and its suburbs.

The popular Party had help initiating its new program through the policies of the New Deal. These politics were expressed in the leadership of Rexford Tugwell, the last of the U.S. appointed governors and often considered the most effective. Tugwell was largely responsible for creating the Puerto Rico Planning Board that assumed a new direction for government capital. The new direction was taken first in the creation and administration of nine public corporations that became central to Island development. They were designed to produce electric power, operate irrigation, control water supply and sewage disposal, construct public housing, operate ports and airports, the San Juan bus system, as well as to conduct certain farming operations and develop banking services and industries. They became financially bonded to private corporations in the United States.\*

#### Bootstrap and Industrial Development

A new pattern of industrialization then began with the team-leadership of Rexford Tugwell and Munoz Marín. The Puerto Rican Development Company was established in 1942. By 1947 it had five large plants operating as subsidiaries: a cement plant, a glass container plant, a paperboard mill, a shoe factory, and plants that made clay products and sanitary ware.

The Company was re-organized in 1950 as the Economic Development Administration and came to be known in Spanish as *Fomento*. An office was opened in New York with the intent of promoting private enterprise. This program was conceived to be a service to subsidiaries of American corporations that were looking for buildings, land, and consultation on Puerto Rico. The Fomento program offered technical services to

---

\* The value of combining data from historical records with field observations is important. The contribution of Tugwell's "public corporations" to island development is widely claimed in the textbooks but the hidden problems of dependency are never explained. They were explained to me in this case by an *independista*.

interested enterprises including the operation of a school for waiters, hotel workers, and supervisors. Fomento continued to develop other services in laboratory research, engineering consultation, and market research. These were considered as techniques to shorten the start-up time for a new firm.

The new program grew rapidly. From 1950 through 1954 net income generated by Fomento plants increased by 50% a year and employment increased from 5,000 to 22,000. Over half the employment in Fomento factories in 1954 was in the apparel and textile industries. Most of the rest of Fomento employment were in such industries as rubber, leather, metal, machinery, and instruments. BY 1959, H.C. Barton, of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University was able to say:<sup>23</sup>

Ever since the number of Fomento firms has been large enough for meaningful comparison with U.S. manufacturing experience, their profits have been about twice as high in relation to equity investment and about three times as high in relation to sales as companies in the same asset size classes in the United States, before taxes. For tax-exempt Fomento plants this means about four times as high in relation to equity and five times as high in relation to sales...

The attraction of U.S. corporations of the Island lay principally in the fact that they did not have to pay taxes. They were freed for a period of 10 to 25 years. This period could even be extended upon request and permission. There were no federal income taxes for resident firms or individuals. The tax freedom extended also to municipal, property, and excise taxes. Furthermore, resident stockholders were exempted from taxes on dividends and capital gains on the sales of stocks received during the period of residency.

The program has been both praised and criticized in political circles – domestic and international. It transformed the Island from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy. Manufacturing is responsible today for almost 25% of net income. Economic progress in certain areas since 1950 has been nothing short of miraculous. The Gross

National Product rose from \$755 million in 1950 to \$4,607 million in 1970, far higher than its larger Caribbean neighbors. Net income rose from \$255 million to \$3,821 million and per capita income increased from \$121 to \$1,427 in the same period.

At the same time, Puerto Rico remains very poor in comparison with the United States. Its per capita income remains about one-third of the U.S. level. Even though a large middle class has been created, there are at least two families in five living in “extreme poverty” at less than \$2,000 per year. The official unemployment rate has remained chronically high at about 12%. It runs unofficially as high as 30% if one counts the so-called “voluntary idle,” that is, people who do not seek work partly because their lack of skills makes job searching hopeless for them in the job market. This “underutilization of human resources” is about six times greater than the U.S. average. This percentage of unemployment is double that of the Great Depression in the United States. Fomento has not touched this problem of unemployment even though it has been an important job-creating agency on the island.

Fomento has contributed enormously to the general economic progress of Puerto Rico while deepening the dependency of the political economy on the United States and American corporations. This dependency is evident in new forms of absentee-ownership which influences and controls major sectors of Puerto Rican life. It has thus contradicted the original struggle for independence.

North American corporations today principally control the field of mass communications. The largest daily newspaper with over 100,000 in circulation, *El Mundo*, is tied to the Knight Newspaper chain. It maintains an archconservative outlook on politics and business. This means generally supporting North American policy on both the

mainland and the Island. Its television subsidiary, WKAQ-TV follows suit. *El Imparcial*, once owned by Antonio Ayuso, a leader in the Nationalist Party, has been sold to American interests.\* The San Juan Star is part of Cowles Communications, which also publishes Look magazine. Editorial policy is oriented to U.S. interests. *El Dia* is owned by the family of former Governor Luis A. Ferrè. The newspaper is only a part of a larger business complex that helped bring the Governor to power. It stands behind the New Progressive Party and the policy of statehood for Puerto Rico. North American newspapers (e.g. the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal) are flown in daily and sold at the San Juan stores and are also delivered to homes. Television channels regularly supply American programs and shows: old Hollywood films like Yankee Doodle Dandy with James Cagney and evening shows like Gunsmoke, Mod Squad and The Dean Martin Show, and the FBI. Radio stations buy their news-briefs from Associated Press and United Press International.

There are a few independent voices remaining like the Socialist newspaper, *Claridad*. They often provide highly important news reports and analyses but they do not represent the general readership or voice popular opinion on the Island today.

It has been estimated that nearly 80 percent of all firms established in Puerto Rico belong to foreign stockholders. This has meant economic progress while at the same time it has meant a loss of native businesses. The great supermarket and department store chains in the U.S. have come to Puerto Rico to entice the consumer but at the same time they have destroyed many of the small businesses on the Island. Behind the glowing economic reports of Sears, Walgreens, J.C. Penny, Grand Union, and Puerto Supermarkets, lies a story of ruination among small Puerto Rican business.

---

\* *El Imparcial* has since ceased its publication. A new newspaper, *El Vocero*, has appeared.

The growth of the American multinational corporation within all major areas of industrial life in Puerto Rico has been phenomenal in the last decades. The following Table indicates that percentage of American subsidiaries in each major field of enterprise today. They have developed especially since

TABLE A: Industrial Areas and American Corporations

INDUSTRIAL AREAS	PERCENT OF AMERICAN CORPORATIONS
1) Petroleum Refining, Petrochemical and Allied Products	80%
2) Drug and Pharmaceutical	87%
3) Apparel and Related Products	52%
4) Knitting Mills	93%
5) Textile Mills Products	84%
6) Plastic Products Misc. (Industrial Products)	37%
7) Plastic Prod. (Bottles, Containers, Boats)	62%
8) Food and Kindred Products	27%
9) Tuna Canning	100%
10) Hosiery	72%
11) Metals	47%
12) Lumber and Wood/Furniture Fixtures	9%
13) Professional, Scientific and Controlling Instruments/Photographic; Optical Goods; Watches Clocks	92%
14) Electrical/Electronics	86%
15) Leather Products	88%
16) Footwear	86%
17) Foundation Garments	99%

Source: See Appendix A

American corporations represent over 90 percent of the total number of firms in the area of Knitting Mills, Tuna Canning, Professional Instruments-Photographic-Optical-Watches, and Foundation Garments. In only seven of the above seventeen industrial areas is the percentage of American corporations less than 80 percent. In terms of actual production and sales, the American percentage is considerably higher.

The petroleum refining, petrochemical and allied products industries in Puerto Rico now constitute the fourth largest group of the manufacturing sector. As of September 1972, this group accounted for 7,700 out of 143,500 jobs in manufacturing or 5.4% of the total. Only the apparel, food, and electrical groups surpass it. Of the 49 Fomento operating plants, 39 (80%) are subsidiaries of U.S. firms, 4 firms are foreign and the balance is composed of locally owned companies. Two U.S. firms, Union Carbide and CORCO, own all or part of 18 plants. The following firms have multi-plant operations: Union Carbide Caribe, Inc., CORCO, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries, Phillips Petroleum Co., Royal Dutch Petroleum Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Occidental Petroleum Corp. (For further analysis of industrial areas, see Appendix A)

Hidden within the reports on economic progress can be seen a basic change in the structure of trade and commerce in Puerto Rico. In its report on Industry in Puerto Rico (July, 1967), the Chase Manhattan Bank admits that industries have become increasingly tied to the U.S. mainland. The Report notes that industries import raw materials and some manufactured products from the United States, generally from their affiliates, and turn these items into manufactured products on the Island and finally ship back to the continent almost all the finished products. In 1967, the Economic Report to the Governor noted that Puerto Rico had become the fifth ranked market of the United States for its entire world market of nations.

#### Close Encounters: A Hypothesis About Corporations and Governments

The model of American business has been reproduced and imitated rather closely in Puerto Rico. The multinational corporation sets the pace and is the model of organization through its pattern of subsidiaries. The model is “autocratic” within the single corporation

and “oligarchic” within the system of corporations. Although such terms are not commonly used in the schools of business administration, they nevertheless apply to the polity of corporate life. Corporate administration is based on a “command system” for purposes of efficiency; industrial “oligopolies” are said to exist in the functional interest of economy. But the close interplay of corporations and political institutions reveals a significant effect on the government of the society. The intricate web of relationships between corporate and political life results in what is called “conflict of interest” and “collusion.” It becomes a way of life in the business society; it advances the interests of a few people but impedes the interests of the many and the social (self) development of the society. There are many instances of such conflict and collusion on the Island that validate these propositions and the necessity to research institutional alternatives.

The rise of the governorship of Luis A. Ferrè in January, 1969, symbolizes the fruits of corporate industrialization. It suggests something about the American success pattern. It reveals the impact of the North American system on the Island.

The following vignette illustrates part of this pattern of impact that is now reaching public consciousness and is stimulating the search for alternatives to corporate organizations in Puerto Rico.<sup>24</sup>

Governor Ferrè’s own fortune began when the U.S. Government was building the Roosevelt Roads Naval Base and it needed a nearby supplier of cement. The U.S. government loaned capital to the Ferrè family to establish the Ponce Cement Corporation. The corporation soon became competitive with the Puerto Rico Cement Company. In 1950, the Ferrè family acquired its [Puerto Rico Cement Company] competitor along with other corporations (paper, glass, and clay plants) tht had been initiated by the Puerto Rican Government’s Development Company. Since these latter companies were “failing,” the Ferrès purchased them as a “package” for \$10 million and a loan from the Chase Manhattan Bank. The family empire grew from there. The Puerto Rico Corporation then came to supply more than 90 percent of all cement consumed in Puerto Rico. The fact was that “cement” was directly tied to the whole construction industry which was in turn tied to the government building program.

At the time of Ferrè's election as governor, the family had major stockholdings in virtually every important industry on the Island. Ferrè's corporations were closely linked to the three largest banks in Puerto Rico: Banco Popular, Banco Credito Y Ahorro Ponceno and Banco De Ponce. The Banco Popular President happened to also be a director of the Puerto Rico Cement Co. of which 58% was owned by the Ferrè family. John Rodriguez, attorney and director of the bank, was also director of Maule Industries of which 83% was owned by the Ferrès. Herman Ferrè (brother of Luis Ferrè) was a director and a second vice-chairman of the Banco Credito while Angel M. Rivera, president of the bank was also a Puerto Rico Cement Corp. director. The chairman of Banco De Ponce, was also a director of Puerto Rico Cement Corp. At the same time, Alberto Paracchini was vice-president of the bank and vice-chairman of the Puerto Rico Cement Corporation while a director of the Maule industries.

During the Ferrè governorship, the Ferrè family acquired access to government development plans that are vital to any large-scale business. The governor's office provided access to state agencies, which permitted the Ferrè family the opportunity to influence regulations, plans, and decisions in their private interests. After he assumed governorship, Luis Ferrè appointed his son, Antonio Luis, the president of the Island's Advisory Commission. The Commission examines all state development projects. A review of 41 construction companies by Business Week revealed that while the average gain in earnings for these companies for the first quarter in 1971 and the corresponding quarter in 1972 was 51%, the Ferrè Puerto Rico Cement Corp. registered a gain in earnings of 873%. One reason for the gain was the ending of a 23 year freeze on the price of retail cement granted by the Ferrè administration while another reason was the government's increased spending on cement construction. When Luis Ferrè took office, government investment in cement construction was \$84.5 million. The figure jumped to \$147.5 million between 1970 and 1971 while the Company's share of the cement market grew from 86% in 1969 to 93% in 1971.\*

The examples of autocracy in politics and centralization of government are intricately related in Puerto Rico. At the time when Kennecott Copper and Amax Corporations were seeking admission to Puerto Rico for exploratory mining in the center of the Island, permissions and clearances had to be obtained from different government agencies with different functions. At that time, one man, Antonio Santiago Vazquez, headed all the important commissions that needed to review the copper project. He was

---

\* Social analysts have raised questions about the bearing of such "connections" on the course of history. Does the business corporation contribute toward a pattern of oligarchy in the political life of small countries, which reflects its own oligarchic organization? Is the "oligarchy" in business transmitted to politics? Is the centralization of government causally related to the powerful corporate organization in the economic order?

Commissioner of Public Works, chairman of the Mining Commission, the Highway Authority, the Water Resources Authority, the Sewers Authority, the Conservation Fund, the Environmental Quality Board, and the Road Safety Commission. He was a member, in total, of fifteen commissions and a chairman of seven of them. The *San Juan Star* called him a “renaissance man in a technological society.”

#### Industry vs. Agriculture: Absentee Ownership

In 1940, income from agriculture was 33% of the island’s total income but it gradually decreased to 5% by 1970 due to the government’s emphasis on industrialization.<sup>25</sup> The emphasis of the Puerto Rican government on a program of industrialization has resulted in a failure of Island self-sufficiency in agriculture. As a consequence, Puerto Rico is highly dependent upon corporations in the United States for its food. Food imports coming from outside Puerto Rico reach 80% of the food consumption on the Island. At the same time much of Puerto Rican land lies idle in the hands of Fomento or private industry.

The sugar industry is on a serious decline. By the spring of 1969, the sugar crop had fallen to a fifty year low. IN the first half-century sugar production had risen sharply after North American corporations had purchased large tracts of land from the Spanish and Puerto Rican countrymen. The problem then was not production but exorbitant profits in the face of miserable working conditions and vote buying. Today there is no single cause for the drastic drop in sugar production but the conglomerate corporation is part of the picture. The new multinational corporation does not have the interest and flexibility required to operate the land effectively. The following conversations near the sugar mills

of the Island were reported by Stan Steiner. They describe the situation from the standpoint of old local managers and farmers:<sup>26</sup>

“For years, the mill was run by the South Puerto Rico Sugar Company,” he said. “They ran it well. And they took out good profits.” Then the old mill was bought by the conglomerate Gulf and Western. It was rumored that they intended to use its losses as a tax write-off. The officials of the company denied this.

“The management cut all of our fields of seed cane and fed it into the mill. Cut the seed cane,” he said in dismay. “Well, how can we improve the quality of the cane when all the seed is gone? Let men go. Let machinery go to ruin. They didn’t care about things like that. They didn’t want to invest any money. The mill went bankrupt, and then they sold it to the government.”...

On a nearby farm, in Yauco, a sugar cane farmer was not as forgiving: “The sugar companies have ruined by sugar crop,” he accused. “It was the Americanos who brought the sugar industry to the island. And is they who have destroyed the sugar crops.”

There are other reasons for the sugar decline. The farm workers are attracted to jobs in the industrial city. Many are attracted by lush stories of jobs on the U.S. mainland. Over 40,000 Islanders migrate each year. They migrate with the assistance of the Puerto Rico Labor Department that helps make contracts with North American corporations. There is the hope of high pay and adventure. The migration has hurt Puerto Rican agriculture. While twenty years ago there were 148,000 men to cut the cane, in 1970 there were only 14,000 or only half the number needed to cut the crop. The Farmer Association President Orestes Ramos feels that immigrant workers from Jamaica and Haiti are now needed to cut cane on the Island. Puerto Ricans are no longer available.

The other crops are also suffering. Coffee production is down. While the coffee industry had once been the pride of the Island, by 1971, the government was forced to bring in 75,000 hundredweight of coffee beans from the Dominican Republic for the Puerto Rican market. Banana and plantain crops declined. In 1970, there were enough plantains for only three months of the year in local supply. Some of the richest banana-growing lands had been bulldozed for urban suburbs and shopping centers. Urban expansion is

again part of the growth of corporate industrialization that has not yet creatively blended with an emphasis on agricultural development in Puerto Rico.

Protest groups on the Island have pointed to the irony in an industrial program that does not integrate with an agricultural program. They point to the fact that Puerto Rico produces tobacco but it does not manufacture cigarettes. *The Island's tobacco is sold to American companies that manufacture cigarettes on the mainland and then ship them back to the island for sale. Puerto Rico produces sugar but it imports refined sugar. It has large salt mines but it imports salt. It is a major resource for fish but it imports fish in tin cans.* The reason is simply that government policy favors American corporate interests rather than the general well being of the economy and the interests of the Puerto Rican people.<sup>27</sup>

### **C. The Religious Order: Self-Governance and the Church**

The Catholic Church in Puerto Rico came into being in the first decade of the nineteenth century with the naming of Don Alejo de Arimendi as the Archbishop on the island. The early activity of the Church was directed explicitly toward the administering of sacraments while implicitly in support of the colonial regime of Spain. The Church, for example, never came forth with a statement against slavery in Puerto Rico even when it had ended in the United States and was collapsing as an institution in the whole Caribbean. The dominant policy of the Church was to acknowledge Spain as a generous nation helping the natives to develop themselves on the island.

At the same time, it must be said that there was occasional rebellion in the ranks of the priests. Father Rufo Manuel Fernandez and the Dominican Fernando Arturo de Marino

who was a friend of Betances, for example, were exiled for their activities against oppressive colonial policies.

During the 20<sup>th</sup> century eight bishops were appointed by Rome for office in Puerto Rico. All of them were American until 1964. The American bishops were clearly supportive of U.S. policies toward Puerto Rico in a manner similar to past practices of Bishops supporting the policies of Spain. There were only variances in practice in accord with the American culture in contrast to the Spanish culture. For example, the predominance of the English language in Catholic schools has been evident throughout the period of U.S. control over the island. At least 55 of the total 92 private parochial schools in the last few years use English as their medium of education. This has involved some 42,000 students. The practice continued in spite of the argument of many Puerto Rican parishioners that it is an oppressive policy of the Catholic hierarchy to downgrade the use of Spanish on the island. Puerto Rican Catholics have found little support for maintaining their own language from an indigenous priesthood. In 1962, the Catholic magazine Debate reported that out of a total of 600 priests on the island, only 100 were Puerto Rican.

The Catholic Church has oscillated between support and opposition to political self-governance during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. One of the first Bishops appointed after the invasion of 1898 was William Ambrose Jones from the United States. Bishop Jones became one of the first socially active clergy of high rank. In fact, he became known following his appointment in 1907-1921 as “the father of Catholic Social-Action.” The newspaper, *En Mundo* reported a sermon he gave on May 6, 1920 on *La Cuestion Social and Economica de Puerto Rico*. He vigorously defended the rights of *campesinos* to keep their land in

opposition to the gradual encroachment of North American corporations. He founded the first federation of workers and inspired Catholic social doctrine.

At mid-century, the Church was opposed to efforts of the *Partido Popular* and its program of economic development. A Catholic political party, the *Partido Accion Cristiana*, brought the Church in to the center of opposition. It was badly defeated (less than 8 percent of the votes) and has not since been revived.

The clergy in the Catholic Church show mixed sentiments on island governance today but there is no sympathy for the independence movement at high levels of the hierarchy. In fact, Cardinal Luis Aponte Martinez has sympathies with the idea of statehood. At the same time, other Catholic leaders have shown different political leanings. Two Catholic orders that are engaged in social action today are the Hermanas del Buen Pastor and the Hermanas de Jesus Mediador. These orders would not be considered highly “political” in their efforts to help the poor but they are reportedly open to the radical theology of “liberation” expressed in Latin American countries in recent years. A charismatic movement has taken a strong hold in the Catholic Church. Thousands of island Catholics and hundreds of priests are involved; it has now gained the sanction of the church establishment. Cardinal Aponte has one staff member devoting full time to the charismatic movement.

Before the turn of the century, Protestantism was virtually non-existent in Puerto Rico. But after the U.S. invasion of Puerto Rico in 1898 and the transfer of control over the island from Spanish to American hands, Protestantism began to flourish. Protestant clergy arrived as Chaplains with the invading U.S. Army. The Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church put the story this way:

The Evangelical Churches of the United States soon followed the army. Long occupied before the civil government was established, the island was again occupied, this time by the King of Kings.<sup>28</sup>

In 1899, the Secretaries of the Boards of the Presbyterian, American Baptist, Congregational, and Methodist-Episcopal churches, met and decided to divide the island into four sections for evangelistic purposes. Their reason was “to seek the best economy of operation, and, far above all, to impress upon the people of Puerto Rico the essential harmony and unity of our common Christianity.”<sup>29</sup> In 1905, the American Baptist, Congregational-Christian, Disciples of Christ, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches created the Federation of Evangelical Churches.<sup>30</sup>

From this point forward, the Protestant churches grew together in support of the relationship of the island to the whole way of life in the United States. They became the common carriers of the U.S. culture through private systems of education, charity, hospitals, and many agencies of church activity associated with religious life in the United States.

The church today is interwoven with the North American culture including its form of political economy. It is generally the policy of churches, for example, to bless acts of the city government, bank openings, factories, dams, and gubernatorial inaugurations. Also, church leaders often defend the government against what it believes to be radical actions against the establishment. The church link to the United States is built into its entire institutional structure. Many Protestant denominations have North American superintendents in charge of their growth and development. Many churches depend on American “mission boards.”

For this reason, the church is often seen as an institution with an “ideological base” in American life. Emilio Pantojas Garcia argues that the Americanization of Puerto Rico took place largely through the Protestant Church:

We begin, therefore, from the hypothesis that the Protestant Church which arrived in Puerto Rico after the North American invasion of 1898, formed part of the ideological forces that would serve the new regime for sustaining and justifying the military invasion, the economic penetration, and policy, and the displacement of the Puerto Ricans from the places of power in the political economy.<sup>31</sup>

Fredrick Mark describes the general ideological orientation of leaders in the United States that led to the historical decision to institute a colonial policy in Puerto Rico. He notes that at the time of the U.S. decision, President McKinley was interviewed by a group of Methodist clergy. They questioned him about the policy of the U.S. toward both the Philippines and Puerto Rico. McKinley’s reply to them was published in the North American press as a revelation from God. Some historians consider the McKinley statement to be “doubtful” but nevertheless it represents the general context of the times in the life of both the government and the church.

I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night it came to me this way – I don’t know how it was but it came (1) That we should not give them back to Spain – that would be cowardly and dishonorable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France or Germany – our commercial rivals in the Orient – that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves – they are unfit for self-government – and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain’s was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all and educate the Filipinos, and uplift and Christianize them, and by God’s grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ also died.<sup>32</sup>

The Superintendent of Methodist Church, B.J. Haywood, confirmed the President’s position and policy.

The nation as a whole must adopt President McKinley's broad, human, and exalted view of our obligation to these people – namely, 'to put the conscience of the American people in to the islands of the sea.'<sup>33</sup>

### The Process of Church Development

In the judgment of Irving Torres, a Puerto Rican agronomist, the theology of salvation among the Protestant churches appealed to the working class and to people living in poverty on the island.

Religion became not only the escape from a harsh reality but also a way of getting back at it. 'Your sinful ways (which I cannot afford) will damn you; poverty and simple ways (of which I cannot rid myself) will save me.' This may sound cruel, but it is still the message of various fundamentalist denominations in Puerto Rico.<sup>34</sup>

The largest number of Protestants on the island is found in the Pentecostal Church of God. The total number of Protestants in 1967 was 108,359. Of this number, the Pentecostal Church numbered 19,900, the United Methodist Church followed with 11,816 members, and the American Baptist Church was next with 10,800 members.<sup>35</sup>

The Pentecostal Church has traditionally associated with the working class and the very poor. The emphasis which leaders have given to the "afterlife" and the "second coming of Christ" implicitly includes a withdrawal from the political significance of their poverty. They do not easily join in political movements to improve their lot in life.

The "withdrawal" from political realities, however, does not imply that social action will not be taken when it is observed that religious practices are contradicted by actions of the government. On March 28, 1974, the San Juan Star reported:

'Christ lives! Hallelujah,' some 70,000 to 100,000 marchers sang Wednesday, protesting a Supreme Court decision that ordered a Pentecostal Church to lower the volume of its religious services or soundproof the temple...Armed with bibles and tambourines, the faithful of the Pentecostal and Evangelical Churches marched under a scorching sun to the Capitol and La Fortaleza.

This demonstration easily matches the size of any protest marches held by the independentistas or the socialists on the island. In this case, unlike the marches of socialists, no Puerto Rican politician stood strongly in opposition to the march. The government effectively slowed down and neutralized the Court decision to force the Church to lower the volume of its religious services.

The reasons for the growth of the Pentecostal Church on the island are complicated. One study by Earl Carver suggests that in addition to the charisma of its mission it also evidences certain organizational factors of importance. First, it exists primarily in homes and rented halls instead of chapels and church buildings. This reduces the cost and capital investments required to function on the island. Second, it has encouraged lay people to start new congregations. Third, it evangelizes in rural areas. Fourth, it functions more independently of U.S. control and thus more indigenously on the island.

Earl Carver says that Puerto Ricans who immigrated to Hawaii and had come into contact with the Pentecostal movement there and then returned in 1916 started this church originally. They considered themselves as an independent body of believers. “Thus the movement was completely indigenous. They managed their own affairs. They raised their own funds. They paid their own way.”<sup>36</sup>

There are several indigenous religious groups on the island. One of the largest is the Mita. The Mita is a sect named after its founder Juanita Garcia Peraza who was born in Arecibo in 1897. She died in 1970 with followers believing that she was the incarnation of the Holy Spirit. The church reports 100,000 converts in different parts of the world today. It is large enough on the island that political candidates find it important to visit Mita leaders at election time.

The significant fact about Mita is that the members have developed a sizable cooperative system of business in low-income neighborhoods where their membership is strong. They have neighborhood coops in food stores, restaurants, drug stores, bakeries, furniture, credit (banking), clothing, farming, and musical groups. Their biblical authority for becoming active in business is taken from the Act of the Apostles (Chapter 2, verses 42-47). Mita leaders claim that members of the early Christian church lived together with everything held in common. In a similar manner this sect seeks to give goods to its membership according to need. Cooperative leaders are elected and constitute an administrative management working closely with the church elders. While the coops themselves are said to operate democratically, the higher decisions are made through the spiritual direction of the church elders. Mita has become a community in itself standing apart from the Catholic Church. It demands that women dress in skirts and not wear cosmetics. It has strict rules against smoking and drinking. It has developed special orders of nuns and monks; it has its own police services, its own museum, and its own theology.

### **CONCLUSIONS**\*

I must now draw some conclusions about this historical period that can provide a basis for thinking about the concept of self-governance in island development.

First, this historical record suggests that U.S. policy toward Puerto Rico in the past eighty years did not encourage independence as many islanders hoped and expected at the turn of the century. Instead, it encouraged dependency on U.S. institutions through military occupation and later through institutional controls in all major organizations of island life.

---

\* This note was written at the end of my studies on the island in June 1974. It followed my notes on the island's history and my completion of the journal. These conclusions have not changed in my mind even with subsequent visits to the island.

Consequently, Puerto Rico became largely a reflection of North American life and culture. (The historian Henry Steel Commager would call it “The American Mind.”) The impact of U.S. policies has been to reproduce North American values and institutions on the island with strong organizational controls remaining on the U.S. mainland.

Second, this historical record also suggests that this is not the whole story. Puerto Rico is not solely a product of American culture. The history of the island is unique in its struggle for independence and self-direction. Puerto Rico stands apart as a political entity from North American states. Its history is therefore a paradox of forces. It has fought to maintain its own values, has maintained its own language, has developed a special mix of cultural interest, and has sought a way of life of its own while it also tolerates and accepts outside rule.

Third, this record indicates that the problems of self-development are most critical in the economic order at the present time. It is not simply that all organizations, including the government and the church, are in some way dependent upon the economic order.

It is rather that so much of island commerce and business is under the direct command authority of U.S. corporations. The command system operates more directly here than in any other organizations, including the government and the church. This means that the well being and stability of the economy is very closely dependent on absentee owners, that is, by mainland North American interests. Any serious recession in the business economy could precipitate a withdrawal of mainland business leaving the island economy in a more serious state of depression.

Furthermore, the structure of economic order on the Island dictates that mainland businesses operate primarily for their own profit not mainly in the interest of the Island.

This means that the quality of working life for Puerto Rican labor and the protection of the environment for Puerto Rican citizens must be measured in terms of material gain for absentee owners. This makes it extremely difficult for islanders to protect themselves from exploitation. These points suggest my orientation that special attention should be given in social research to the problems of self-governance in the Island's economic order. It follows that alternatives for greater self-development in the economic life of the island are vitally important to study in policies of social development.

Third, this record indicates that the struggle for self-governance is not solely related to the political economy. It is closely related to the whole culture of the island. It is related to island autonomy regarding its churches, schools, university system, police, mails, etc. If we want to understand any single social problem, we must comprehend the larger picture. We cannot segregate human reality into pure politics or isolate institutional life without distorting the problem of societal development.

The fact that a large *business* may shut down and create unemployment is not unrelated to the private suffering of families. In turn, the private suffering of families becomes the critical concern of the *church*; it supplies reason for its being and suggests a direction to church policy. At the same time, the unemployment level is related to the growth of *government* welfare and housing policies. All organizations and institutions are interdependent in causing and solving social problems. Social research and social policy requires understanding the whole picture and the meaning of these interconnections between institutions.

In sum, the task is to bring a sociological perspective to the institutional life of the Island. That perspective is specialized as it focuses on the problem of self-governance and

societal development. Puerto Rico and the United States have strong mutual interests at stake in policies of social, economic and political development in the next decade.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. In the first period of development the social and political organization of life on the island stood in close alliance with the powerful merchants and *hacendados*. The top of the political hierarchy was composed largely of a military-ecclesiastical leadership. Below this leadership were groups of professional people, the doctors, lawyers, teachers, and journalists. The rural areas of the island were controlled principally through the structure of the *haciendas*, owned by the *hacendados*. The leading industries were agricultural in the cultivation of coffee, sugar, and tobacco. The cultivation of coffee was made possible by white and *mestizo* workers, the *agregados*. Black slaves and free day laborers made the cultivation of sugar possible. The cultivation of coffee remained largely in terms of small productive farms. The island proletariat was basically divided into the propertyless sugar workers who were located in the coastal areas and mountain *jibaros* who lived for the most part on the small properties or on the edge of the coffee industry. They participated in insurrections and rebellions but not of the same degree and significance as those occurring on other islands. The Spanish conspiracy laws prohibited labor organization. The *libreta*, or pass system, was introduced in 1849, controlling the freedom of movement among the workers. The island became a haven for slaves escaping from other islands but their existence proved no better as the Spanish welcomed them. For the majority of the island residents, it was a life of poverty and suffering. Slavery was not abolished until 1873.
2. Ramon Emeterio Betances (1827-1899) was a revolutionary separatist who fought for independence from Spain. After studying in Paris to become a medical doctor he set up practice in Mayaguez, a community developing on the western coast of Puerto Rico. He became known for his battle against the cholera epidemic in 1856 and his professional service to the economically poor. At the same time, he was dedicated revolutionary. He organized a secret society to work for the abolition of slavery and the independence of Puerto Rico. Other secret societies emerged in this time, and Betances worked with them to publish a program of human rights for Puerto Rican people. His efforts to claim independence became so effective that the Spanish governor sent him into exile. In exile, Betances continued his communication with the secret revolutionary societies on the island. An insurrection was planned with support from the outside.
3. Gordon K. Lewis, Puerto Rico: Freedom and Power in the Caribbean, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963) 44
4. The separatists in Puerto Rico were clear in their opinion about the War. They were suspicious of American motives and opposed to U.S. imperialism. Ramon Betances,

- writing to a friend in New York before the U.S. invasion said: “Surely, let the Americans help us gain liberty, but not push the country into annexation. If Puerto Rico doesn’t act fast, it will be an American colony forever.” Five days after the lowering of Spain’s flag at La Forteleza, Eugenio Maria de Hostos, considered by some Islanders as Puerto Rico’s Thomas Jefferson, organized a League of Patriots. They argued for rapid transition from a military to a civil government and a plebiscite where Puerto Ricans could decide between annexation and independence. But de Hostos’ demands were ignored in the United States, and he died five years later disillusioned. For other anti-imperialists’ views see Stan Steiner, The Islands: The Worlds of the Puerto Ricans, (New York: Harper & Row, 1974) p. 77.
5. Ibid, p. 74
  6. Major General Nelson A. Miles, “To the Inhabitants of Porto Rico,” document in Kal Wagenheim (editor) The Puerto Ricans: A Documentary History (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973) p. 95
  7. Edward J. Berbusse, S.J. The United States in Puerto Rico: 1898 – 1900 (Chapel Hill: The Univ. of North Carolina, 1966) p. 89
  8. Ibid, p. 90
  9. Ibid, p. 94
  10. Manuel Maldonado-Denis, Puerto Rico: A Socio-Historic Interpretation, Transl. by Elena Vialo, (New York: Random House, 1972), p. 115
  11. Kal Wagenheim, op. cit. p. 126. Munoz Rivera continued to say: “There exist at present 250,000 registered electors. Seventy percent of the electoral population is illiterate. There will remain, then, 75,000 registered electors. Adding 10,000 illiterate taxpayers, there will be a total of 85,000 citizens within the electoral register and 165,000 outside of it. I cannot figure out, hard as I have tried, how those 165,000 Porto Ricans are considered incapable of participating in the elections of their representatives in the legislative and municipalities, while on the other hand, they are judged perfectly capable of possessing with dignity American citizenship.”
  12. Quoted in Maldonado-Denis, op. cit., p. 115
  13. Gordon Lewis, op. cit., p. 53
  14. Quoted in Kal Wagenheim, op cit., p. 137
  15. The name of the Island was officially changed from Puerto Rico to Porto Rico for “linguistic reasons” by the American military government. It was official until 1932 when Congress restored the original name. See Federico Ribes Tovar, A Chronological History of Puerto Rico (Plus Ultra, Educ. Publs, Inc., New York, 1973) p. 391
  16. The Towner Letter and the Reilly letter are documentary references in Kal Wagenheim, op. cit., p. 141-42.
  17. Quoted in Maldonado-Denis, op.cit., p. 125

18. Luis Munoz Marìn, “The Sad Case of Porto Rico,” The American Mercury, XVI, No. 62 (February, 1929), reprinted in Kal Wagenheim, op cit., p. 154
  
19. Kal Wagenheim, op. cit., p. 152
  
20. Antonio Gonzales, Economia Political de Puerto Rico, (San Juan: Editorial Cordillera, Inc., 1967); For a historical standpoint, see: Juan Angel Silen, Historia de la Nacion Puertorriquena (Rio Piedras: Editorial Edil., Inc. 1973); also, La Nueva Lucha de Independencia (Rio Piedras, Editorial Edil, Inc., 1972)
  
21. Earl Parker Hanson, Puerto Rico: Ally for Progress (D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, N.J. 1962) p. 73 Hansen goes on to say: “Even today the large trade with the United States is not entirely healthful...the importation into Puerto Rico of millions of dollars of foodstuffs which Puerto Rico may some day again be able to produce themselves.”
  
22. Ibid., p. 13
  
23. H.C. Barton, Puerto Rico’s Industrial Development Program: 1942 – 1960 (Paper presented at a seminar at the Center for International Affairs, Harvard University and published by Fomento) on October 29, 1959
  
24. This is my summary of research reported in NACLA’s Latin American Report, (North American Congress on Latin America, Box 57, Cathedral Station, New York, New York) NACLA notes how Claridad, the newspaper of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party cites many other conflicts of interest. For example, the paper reports that: 1) The Ferrè-owned Cesara cannery obtained a Puerto Rico Department of Education contract in 1970 to supply foodstuffs to the Island’s schools, even though other companies had submitted more favorable bids. 2) The Ferrè’s Puerto Rico Iron Works sold 25,000 tons of structural steel to a controversial atomic energy plant. (Environmentalists temporarily halted the plant construction. 3) The Ferrè’s Cordillera Development Company bought up sizable chunks of land near the proposed Bocachica International Airport before any other potential speculators (or the public) knew the exact location of the new airport site. 4) The Ferrès broke a ten-year gambling casino permit freeze long enough to secure one for their recently-acquired Hotel Borinquen, then they reimposed the freeze. The previous owner had been forced to sell because he could not compete against the hotels with casinos.
  
25. Andres Sanches Tarniella, La Economia de Puerto Rico (Rio Piedras: Ediciones Bayoan, 1973)

26. Stan Steiner, op. cit., p. 104
27. Puerto Rico: A Colony of the United States, (Distributed by Latin American Publications Service, Box 12056 Mid City Station, Washington D.C. and PRISA Apartado 9002, Santurce, Puerto Rico) p. 8
28. Arthur James, "Progress and Promise in Porto Rico," Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., New York, n.d. p. 4.
29. Donald Moore, Puerto Rico Para Cristo, Sonedos #43, 1969, CIDOC, Apdo 479, Cuernavaca, Mexico. P. 10. Report of the Secretaries of Boards of the Presbyterian, American Baptist, Congregational, Methodist-Episcopal, churches.
30. Edward Baselya, Cultural Change and Protestantism in Puerto Rico: 1945-1966, Dissertation, Department of Sociology, New York University, New York.
31. Emilio Pantajoas Garcia, La Iglesia Protestante y Las Americanizacion de Puerto Rico: 1890-1917," unpublished manuscript, Departamento de Sociologia, Graduate Study papers, I am indebted to Mr. Pantojas Garcia for this perspective and these references.
32. Frederich Merk, Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation, (New York: Vintage Books, 1966, p. 253
33. B.J. Haywood, "Report of the Superintendent" in Methodist Episcopal Church Yearbook, 1906, pp 25-26.
34. Irving Torres, "The Churchs' Moral Dilemma and Responsibility," in "Puerto Rico; Showcase of Oppression," (Centro Social San Juan XXIII, Apartado 22097 Est UPR)
35. Earl Carver, "Showcase for God: A Study of Evangelico Church Growth in Puerto Rico" Master of Arts Thesis, School of World Mission and Institute of Church Growth, Fuller Theological Seminar, May, 1972.
36. Ibid

## Journal Notes

For a highly elaborated and skilled process of “making notes”, peculiar to this particular science besides its obvious utility in recording observations which could otherwise be forgotten, is, in sociology, actually an instrument of discovery. This process serves a similar purpose in the study of social institutions, to the blow-pipe and the test-tube in chemistry, or the prism and the electroscope in physics. That is to say, it enables the scientific worker to break up his subject-matter, so as to isolate and examine at his leisure its various component parts, and to recombine the facts, when they have been thus released from all accustomed categories, in new and experimental groups, in order to discover which co-existences and sequences of events have invariable and therefore possibly a causal significance.

Sidney and Beatrice Webb

Often we have the experience of being immersed in a mass of confusing data. We study the data carefully, bringing all our powers of logical analysis to bear upon them. We come up with an idea or two. But still the data do not fall in any coherent pattern. Then we go on living with the data – and with the people – until perhaps some chance occurrence casts a totally different light upon the data, and we begin to see a pattern that we have not seen before. This pattern is not purely an artistic creation. Once we think we see it, we must reexamine our notes and perhaps set out and gather new data in order to determine whether the pattern adequately represents the life we are observing or is simply a product of our imagination.

William Foote Whyte

In recent times absentee ownership has come to be the main and immediate controlling interest in the life of civilized men. It is the paramount issue between the civilized nations, and guides the conduct of these affairs at home and abroad. The Great War arose out of a conflict of interests and the Peace was negotiated with a view to stabilize them.

Thorstein Veblen

## CHAPTER TWO

### **Journal Notes: My Personal Experiences as a North American**

My first visit to Puerto Rico was in the Fall of 1971. I was invited by the Puerto Rican Industrial Mission to investigate the social impact of Kennecott Copper and Amax corporations in their mining ventures. Church leaders in Puerto Rico were concerned about the direction of negotiations between the copper companies and the Puerto Rican government. They felt that more evidence was needed to demonstrate that future excavations would not damage the environment or lead to political corruption.

I returned to Puerto Rico in the spring of 1974 when I was invited to teach at the University of Puerto Rico. I wanted to learn more about the environmental problems of

business but also about other organizations on the island. I was especially interested in learning about the attitudes of people in the churches because of the initial involvement of the church leaders in the political issues of copper development. I hoped to learn something about their attitudes toward social change and development.

During this time, I talked with people in all walks of life – with people in slums, nightclubs, bars, with members of all political parties, leaders in the legislature, officials in the business development program (*Fomento*). I watched the Pittsburgh Pirates play against Montreal in the Bithorn Stadium, went to movies, attended the dramatic theater, celebrated a fiesta of the Patron Saint in Manati, took tourist trips around San Juan, visited a drug prevention center, and traveled around the rim of the island talking with people along the highway and in the villages. Some of my meetings were planned, some were spontaneous, and, in some cases, I was thrust involuntarily into the midst of critical events.\*

One such critical event occurred soon after my arrival at the University in Rio Piedras. A student protest had arisen with such strength against administration policy that the whole university was formally closed. The campus was near rioting. This event gave me a special opportunity to talk with students about political life. It partly influenced the schedule of my talks later with island leaders.

My schedule of investigations was first to look at the way multinational corporations conducted their business on the island and to learn as much as I could about environmental problems and employee-community relations. In the process I began to visit island churches and talked with clergy about how they saw the problems. Our discussions turned repeatedly to self-governance in all its complicated dimensions. This record of experience with the churches led me eventually to see the necessity for creating a language that bridged sociology with other fields of knowledge. It led to thinking in terms of societal development.

I have divided my Journal notes into three sections:  
**(1) The Political Order; (2) The Economic Order and (3) The Religious Order.**

## I. **The Political Order:** Self-Governance in the State

### A. Students Protest for Self-Governance in the University

- *Nueva Ley Universitaria* (New University Law)
- *Autonomia Fiscal* (Fiscal Autonomy)
- *Co-Gobierno de Estudiantes,* (Co-Government...) *Profesores,*  
*Trabajadores y*
- Administradores*
- *Universidad Abierta* (Open University)
- *Sindicalizacion de Profesores* (Unionization)

---

\* I never used a tape recorder except for occasions where music was important to the experience. I wrote down the essence of what happened in my talks or in an event soon after it occurred. I gave my Journal notes to the people with whom I talked whenever it was possible. The dialogue that developed through their responses helped me verify my record. I have included some of these correspondences in this journal to illuminate the importance of this process to fieldwork.

- *Nuevo Reglamento Estudiantil* (New Student Regulations)  
*Cero Discrimen Socio-economico* , (Zero Socio-economic discrimination)

These words were painted in Spanish on the side of a building at the juncture of Avenida Universidad and Avenida Gandara, the two main avenues next to the University campus in Rio Piedras. I noted them in my Journal because they summarized the radical issues in the student strikes, the first of which occurred during the Fall semester, 1973 and then again, soon after I arrived on campus in February, 1974.

The first strike, which started in October, lasted almost two months. I was told that it was ended with a formal recommendation by the Council of Education (*Consejo de Educacion Superior*) that a Special Commission would be created to study the implementation of a wider consultation for the selection of top administrators of the University. The Council also recommended the study of a new University Law with new Student Rules, along with an overhaul of the University Police System.

The issues were complex and I hesitated to take the time to get involved with them but I did record the general issues and the crisis in my Journal. I was seeking connections with the other island problems I wanted to study.

When the strike occurred on February 27, however, I walked with the students who were marching in the streets, in order to learn first-hand about their concerns. They told me that the Special Commission had been appointed following the October strike but that the Council of Education had rejected it and had named a new Chancellor to the University without broad consultation to include the students. Now they had just been told of another new appointment: the Council, again without broad consultation, had appointed A Rector of the University. The students felt that the original agreement had been violated. Hundreds gathered to march in protest.

I took a camera with me on the walk to help record what was happening, in addition to what I could remember for my Journal. I later learned that this was not a sensible thing to do. The visibility of my camera and the fact that I was recognized by some of the students as a visiting professor from the United States who was lecturing on multinational corporations was taken as a sign that I was a CIA agent.

The radical student leaders were making claims impossible for me to verify. For example, the newly appointed Rector of the University, a former consultant with the United

States' State Department, was believed by students to be a spy, placed at the highest level of university administration. This appointment increased their fear of repression against them by the university administration in the coming years.

This was not my first encounter with the fear of domination and repression by the United States government. But, it was here that I first began to think about how the structure of the American political relationships with Puerto Rico must be related to the personal well being of islanders. The positive or negative effects of this relationship would be extremely difficult to study in exact terms but clearly a relationship should exist.

When I returned to my lodgings, following the protest march, I noted what had happened during the day in my Journal:

February 27, 1974: Campus Unrest

This morning, a group of students marched to the house of the university President to protest the appointment of the new Rector. An armed squad of police in Rio Piedras met them. I was told that when the students advanced, the police fired over the heads of students. One girl was shot in the leg. After a short confrontation, the students returned to the campus to gather more help and to rally resistance. As the students gathered on campus, the police also arrived with an order to shut down the university. There was growing tension in the crowd when the police arrived. One girl student standing next to me spoke to her boyfriend about how frightened she was. I listened to the speeches of student leaders as the tension mounted. The student leaders clearly saw the danger. Without losing the power of their political attacks on the University, they quietly told their audience to be calm and obey the order of the police. As the police drew near a fence next to the Social Science Building, about 25 students drifted toward them. Just as quickly, other students blocked their path. By forming a chord of interlocking arms, they kept the shifting crowd from coming into direct contact with the police. The students had clearly prepared a nonviolent discipline for their protest.

The students began to leave the campus, and gathered by the hundreds outside the front entrance of the men's dormitory. There, student leaders continued their political speeches, denouncing the action of the *Consejo* and calling for a common brotherhood with students on other campuses. And now a parade of students was about to begin around a fifteen-block area of the university campus.

I had learned from an earlier teachers' strike that a fiesta-like atmosphere, as well as seriousness, could develop in prolonged protest actions. As I walked with them they sang songs and shouted chants. The words were abundant with alliteration and rhymes. But most important was the degree of determination and morale developed from them.

*Estudiantes Unidos*  
*Jamas seran vencidos*

Students United  
Never to be defeated

*Ni con balas ni macanas*  
*Esta lucha no se para*

Neither shots nor clubs  
Will stop this *struggle*

The march continued through the streets for about an hour, finally coming to a halt at the Men's dormitory called Residencia 15 de Octubre in memory of the past strike. It was there that the "national headquarters" of the student movement was established. Again, speeches began. The radical student leaders were fighting for independence. They were also fighting for a reform law based on co-government in the university. The new law would then offer an opportunity for making some basic changes in the university system.

I understand that government leaders are deeply concerned about the student movement. They say the "radical minority" instigates it. I was told that two years ago a student (ROTC cadet) and two police officers were killed in a similar protest demonstration. This situation had been preceded by a still earlier incident in March 1970 when a student, Antonia Martinez, was shot and killed. Students tell me that the gun of a police officer was responsible for her death but no significant action was taken against the police officer.

I am beginning to see the University as an armature between the distant magnetic poles of the Puerto Rican government supported by the U.S. and the movement of the political left.

At the end of the student speeches and before the crowd finally dispersed, the national anthem was sung. The music was the same as that of the official national anthem of the government but the words were different. Lola Rodriguez de Tiò, a nationalist and a fighter for women's rights, who was protesting in 1867, wrote the words sung by the students. The anthem is called La Borinqueña. (It refers to the original name given to the island by the Indians.) The student version of the National Anthem follows below:

#### LA BORINQUENA

(Lola Rodriguez de Tiò)

Despierta borinqueño  
Awaken, Borinquena  
que han dado la señal  
The signal has come.  
Despierta de ese sueño  
Awaken from your sleep,  
que es hora de luchar  
It is time to fight.

A ese llamar patriótico  
At this patriotic call  
No arde tu corazón  
Your heart beats,  
Ven nos será simpático

Come, hear the cannon  
 el ruido de cañon  
 With its welcome roar.

Nosotros queremos la libertad...  
 We want liberty...  
 nuestro machete nos la darà  
 Our machete will give it to us.  
 Vamos nos boriqueños...  
 Come Boriquenos  
 vamanos ya...  
 Come, let us go...  
 que nos espera ansiosa, ansiosa  
 We're anxiously awaited  
 la libertad, la libertad, la libertad  
 liberty, liberty liberty

I thought about the words – La Libertad and the Machete while they sang. “Our machete will give it (liberty) to us.” In talking with students afterward, I learned more about the meaning of these words. They told me “machete” is the symbol of power and productiveness on the island. It is not the literal use of the machete that will yield liberty. It is no more effective as an instrument against the guns of the *policia* than the stones and bottles that students have thrown against police forces in their desperation. The machete is a symbol of primitive rural life and power, the symbol of independence that links the present movement with the past.

I raised questions about the force of nationalism and the power to destroy society (as in Nazism) as well as to create a new society. Some students felt that it was only through a sense of La Patria that the bonds of the old repressive community could be broken and the bonds of the new community created. They said their movement could become destructive only because of the resistance of those who hold exclusive power over others. It is therefore only in the sense of the fatherland, the Puerto Rican nation, that the “beat of the heart” can eventually draw everyone together. It is only through patriotism that people on the island can come together to destroy North American domination.

I listened to the militant student speeches, calling for political independence from the United States and the creation of a socialist government. I began to understand the reason for student fears and paranoia about the CIA. This call for liberty and a new form of government clearly involved great risks for them because if the movement were to grow strong, the U.S. military would surely be called in to repress it.

The parallel of their movement to the movement of American colonists fighting for independence from England came to mind as I walked away from the demonstration. I thought about how we North Americans celebrate the courage of our revolutionary heroes who took the same risks two centuries ago. But now these rebel students come under our surveillance. Our government could repress them as they fight for their own independence. The United States is now in a position parallel to that of 18<sup>th</sup> century England. It is helping top Island officials to stop the movement for independence through military force and police repression.

The evening of this same day found me preoccupied with the first draft of a student's doctoral dissertation. I was helping Mr. Kenneth Wadoski work on the meaning of historical events preceding the American Revolution. This academic work was coincidental with my experiences in the student protest.

Mr. Wadoski was studying the nonviolent resistance of American colonists and how their action led directly toward independence from England. He was seeking to demonstrate how these colonial methods of boycott; tax resistance and noncooperation with the British could have been the basis for achieving American independence without a shot being fired. He was arguing that the American Revolution could have been nonviolent if the colonists had continued to fight with nonviolent forms of resistance.

We had talked about the revolutionary movement of India against the British. India had achieved independence largely through nonviolent methods, tactics, and the principles of Mohandas K. Gandhi. This Indian movement then became the basis for Mr. Wadoski's study of the movement among American colonists for independence. He was asking: What are the grounds for a nonviolent revolution? What were the nonviolent actions in the history of the Indian struggle that paralleled the American struggle? How did both colonies throw off British imperialism?

I began to think about Puerto Rico and its historical movement for independence. It was all conjecture but I wrote down my thoughts that night in my journal. I wanted to remember the direction of this coincidence of academic work and my day's experiences. I wondered where it might take me in my research on the Island.

*The Evening of February 27 Comparative Revolution*

*The student leaders talk in terms of revolution. How does this situation compare with the days of the American independence movement?*

*In the events leading up to 1775, England had done everything possible to make the colonies dependent upon her. The Hat and Felt Act in 1732 was designed to protect the hat industry in England by preventing export of hats from the colonies. The colonial iron industry was restricted in 1750 in order to protect manufacturers in Britain. The Molasses Act of 1733 and the Sugar Act of 1764 were designed to prevent the colonists from trading with the French West Indies. Britain would then be the sole beneficiary of these products. These were imperial restrictions placed on American trade and hated by the colonists. They all have parallels in the control of the United States over Puerto Rico, parallels that could very well be the subject of future research.*

*But how did the American colonists finally win their fight?*

*It looks as though the colonists won it largely through their efforts to develop economic self-reliance; it was the struggle for economic independence that made the Revolution finally successful.*

*The American colonists, in an effort to become economically independent from England, began creating their own "home-made" and "home-grown" products. At the same time, they found different ways of evading Britain's economic restrictions on their trade with other countries. It was this gradual (and quiet) movement toward control over their own economy that provided the critical factor for the transfer in political power to the colonies.*

*The American colonies then needed to develop their own "parallel government" so that they could assume power at the point where England could not deny it. The first*

*Continental Congress in 1774 was a step in this direction. They decided not to import from or export to Britain until abuses in British powers were stopped.*

*This movement for independence in Puerto Rico takes on a special significance in the light of the American Revolution even though the issues are different in some respects. The radical students would call the American Revolution a petit-bourgeois revolution; the campus students were calling for a “proletarian revolution.” Nevertheless, the importance of transforming economic dependencies so that the “colony” can assume greater autonomy and self-determination may be a fundamental issue of all colonial revolutions. It is not simply an issue of State or governmental relations.*

*The issue rests on the organization of the economic trade, commerce, industry, and agriculture – and whether it can be altered from dependence on outside powers toward a greater degree of self-governance. In Puerto Rico it would mean establishing an entirely new attitude toward absentee-owned corporations, so predominantly established on Island soil. The way in which Puerto Rico can achieve a greater degree of self-governance in its economic order -- could be a major research concern for social economists in the next few years.*

### **Talks with Government Officials: Copper Mining and Community Control**

My talks with Mr. Cruz Matos and Dr. Morris Moses were directed to the copper mining proposals of Kennecott and Amax Corporations but they also were aimed at learning the degree of openness on the part of government to worker self-management and decentralized responsibilities in industry. An assistant to Cruz Matos had read my alternative proposal for copper mining and was sufficiently interested to make an appointment for me to talk with Cruz Matos, Head of the Department of Resources. Mr. Matos was responsible for the implementation of studies leading to a government decision about the copper mining proposals.

Mr. Jim McDonough, special writer for the San Juan Star, a major newspaper in Puerto Rico, arranged my talk with Dr. Moses. Dr. Moses was the chief economic consultant of Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, head of Fomento. Together they were final decision-makers in the copper development plan.

The discussions that follow may seem technical but these Journal notes are important in order to see the issues at stake in self-development of this kind.

March 7, 1974 The Limits of Bureaucratic Government: Cruz Matos\*

---

\* Since I took no notes during this meeting, I decided to write a letter to Cruz Matos to confirm the essence of our conversation. I also sent him my notes covering visits with other islanders on the topic of copper mining. His reply to me confirmed my notes to be

I arrived early at the Capitol building and decided to stop at the basement cafeteria for something to eat. I ordered a ham and cheese sandwich and sat down next to a distinguished looking gentleman. My early contacts with low-income people on the island were already giving me contrasting images as I observed the people around me.

The distinguished looking gentleman was wearing a light gray pinstriped suit with a sharply turned dark blue tie. The tie had white dots sprinkled at the top. At the bottom there were carefully embroidered images of red chariots and horsemen. A pressed white shirt and polished shoes finished the image of a very courtly gentleman of a large corporation or perhaps a high official of the government.

As I ate lunch my mind wandered toward the contrasts between high and low levels of administration. I looked at the waitress-cook fixing sandwiches at the bar and I thought of the janitors I passed in the corridor carrying buckets of water for cleaning offices. A Utopian thought came to mind. Someday all these people could be living at the same level of authority, education, and dignity. Someday, my thoughts said, the waitress and the janitors could be members of an advisory committee in charge of administration. The capitol itself, I thought, need not have the centralized power it now has; government centers could be dispersed with greater local authority throughout the island. No single group of top government officials need collude with businessmen to control corporate operations affecting the interior of the island because their power would have been decentralized. The power of the central government could gradually decrease through social planning as the responsibilities of local authorities could be gradually increased through citizen training and adult education programs.

I realized the hour of my meeting was near. I got up to head for the office of Cruz Matos. I waited for a half hour before Cruz Matos appeared. He apologized for being late and also for not having time to read my papers, which his assistant had given to him about setting requirements on the island to control the multinational corporation. [Kennecott Copper.] I told him of my concern about decentralizing authority within the corporate system of the proposed mining venture.

---

accurate. My action here refers to Rule #4 on capturing the essence of events. His letter responding to me is found in Appendix B.

In the process of his discussion, however, I began to raise key questions about issues that many of us had raised in 1971. We had pushed for greater island control over copper ownership and management. The original “bid” had involved total corporate control from the U.S. I now wanted to know what the government planned to do about “open bidding.” I had heard that the Governor decided that he would not be obligated in any way to Kennecott Copper or Amax. Our conversation then developed in various directions, which is recorded approximately below.

### Open Bidding Versus Government Controlled Bidding

SB (Severyn Bruyn): Is it true that the government is going to have open bidding?

CM (Cruz Matos): It is true. However, the governor feels a moral obligation to the companies because of the commitments of the former administration and because a considerable amount of money has been spent on the mine explorations. These companies discovered the extent of the ore. We have their information.

SB: I do not see any special “moral obligation” involved. It seems to me that it is simply a matter of business. If the government has information about the ore, which was uncovered by the company, then the government should pay for that information. As I understand it, there were no commitments to contract with these particular companies – only legal rights of exploration.

CM: We have now decided definitely that the government is going to maintain full control over the whole process from excavation through smelting, refining, and fabrication. This means that there should be no opportunity for the copper companies to exercise undue control over us.

SB: Does that mean that Kennecott and Amax are going to be given the first opportunity to get the contract before open bidding?

CM: It means that we have an obligation to give them the first option of the contract. If they cannot meet our specifications of government control, then we open the bidding.

SB: What types of bids are being considered?

CM: The following: First, a service contract in which the company would only train people in the operations of mining; second, a public corporation in which the government would have full control; third, a joint venture in which the government would have majority control.

SB: Do you think Kennecott would accept a service contract if you decide on it?

CM: No. The decision will probably be a public corporation.

SB: Who makes the decision? Who writes the contract? It would seem to me that a “service contract” would be the only real way that you could protect yourself from undue influences. You will still need a public corporation on the island to handle that training process. My concerns are about the nature of that corporation and how it will protect the workers and the consumers and the citizens who live in the area.

CM: Our office really has no responsibility to determine that kind of detail. Our job is simply to assess the social and economic costs, the source of the funding, and the nature of the contract in these three basic categories.

SB: It seems to me that you would have a certain responsibility to specify in the contract (for open bidding) the kind of corporate organization you desire to have – especially if it is to be decentralized for people who work within it.

CM: It is possible that we could consider some further definition of the nature of the public authority, which would leave the door open for the next agency to negotiate the matter.

SB: Who will be the next agency?

CM: I really do not know. It may be Fomento.

SB: But you know that Fomento would follow the traditional form of management. There will be trouble in those hills with the usual management approach.

CM: It is simply not my mandate to determine the nature of the corporate organization.

SB: But this is the most critical part of the process. It seems to me that any outside company should know what form of management would take place in the organization of the mining. Especially when it is outside the traditional form of business administration. In fact it is a basic part of the social costs, which are clearly under your jurisdiction.

CM: In what way?

SB: The traditional form of business administration will simply involve setting up an office in Utuado to begin hiring employees. The people in the area who do not like the idea of outside people entering the area without their involvement or authority will begin to resist. That resistance will mount and there will be trouble.

CM: What is the alternative?

#### The Alternative to Traditional Business: Cooperative Development

SB: The alternative is to begin with an educational process in which the people within the site area are told about the plan and the way in which they can participate. They would be encouraged to join in the process of organization and would assume some degree of responsibility for the process. As the technical excavation of copper proceeds, citizens in the area are invited to participate on a board, which controls that part of the process that affects their lives. For example, on the basis of past performances, it is possible that dust may blow from trucks into the houses or on a highway into passing cars. Citizens should be given the legal right to control these effects. And that right must have real power in it.

CM: If it is considered as a social cost, then it is possible that Gutierrez, our consultant, may want to include it in his cost analysis.

SB: Gutierrez told me he has already subcontracted out most of the work on a basis that does not include these ideas. He told me that he is very interested in them but they simply have not been conceptualized in his cost analysis.

CM: We can only think of being more definitive in our concept of the “public corporation.” The next agency will have to handle those problems. Our job is to see that the control remains in the hands of this government and not in the hands of the outside corporation.

#### Government Oligarchy versus Decentralized Authority

SB: There is then another matter of equal importance to consider. In every nation, there is a hierarchy of authority, indeed, an oligarchy in which the central authority resides at the top of the government. Even if the government were to gain full control of the operation, another administration (let us say a really corrupt administration) may exploit the workers and the people who live in the area of the mines. Is it not important that the corporation be organized in a manner that protects these people from possible corrupt administrations in the future? Is it not important to decentralize a certain amount of responsibility and control so that profiteering with absentee-owned corporations cannot corrupt the administration?

CM: I have written about this principle of local emphasis in the administration of the project. Have you seen my statement?

SB: I am not certain. Perhaps you could give me a copy.\*

CM: At this stage I can only offer principles. I have no control over the process.

SB: The "principle" of decentralized local authority is that people in the area would be assured a certain percentage of the profits, certain rights of access to information about the company, and certain rights to participate responsibly in the management of the company. I have materials with me that show how this participatory process works effectively and at the same time adds to the quality of life for the worker.

CM: Let's hope that the next government agency, which handles these problems, will take that into consideration. I hope it is not FOMENTO.

SB: But you know that Kennecott would never buy into that sort of corporate organization. Another company from Scandinavia or Japan might do it. It seems crucial that this matter be opened now as a contract issue open for bidding. Is the government aware of the range of choices among world copper corporations?

CM: Yes.

What is the Public Corporation?

SB: In the definition of a public corporation, have you ever considered how it would be constituted? Would it function apart from the administrative control of the government?

It seems to me that you have to consider the potential misconduct of future political administrations. Right now I know of U.S. Congressmen who want to nationalize the oil corporations but who do not want to do it under the Nixon administration. Their problem is how to separate this public authority from any political administration and place it squarely in the hands of the people rather than the oligarchy. This plan for copper mining is an example of how that can be done here.

CM: How is that done?

SB: It means first that the law would require all information of the corporation to be made available to anyone. It means that a tribunal system would be set up on the organization of the corporation so that all consumers and employees directly affected by its operations can enjoy the rights of "due process." It means that an employee cannot be fired for exposing information or criticizing the corporation as long as they are doing their job and there is no economic reason for their dismissal...

CM: These are interesting points but they are outside my authority.

---

\* Later, upon reading the statement I found the principle to which he referred simply pointed out that jobs should be offered first to people in the local area. It had no reference to decentralizing control.

SB: Is it possible to offer recommendations to the next agency that handles these affairs? Even though they would carry no legal weight, they might carry influence.

CM: That is true. Perhaps we can do something along these lines.

That summary above is what was said in our talk. I left the office and went down to the street feeling fairly certain about what would happen in this bureaucratic process.\* It appeared that in this case my own involvement with the higher levels of government would be at an end. The “distance” of this office from the governor and the communities was too great. My own time, energy and work would be at best placed elsewhere. If there were really governmental interests in decentralizing authority, they would have responded to earlier efforts in this direction.†

My own sense of the necessity of working *outside* the boundaries of this government was strengthened. At the same time I felt the importance of keeping open lines of communications with such sincerely concerned government officials like Cruz Matos. I felt that Cruz Matos was really concerned about the welfare of Puerto Rico. He is a sensitive man who feels he must work within the system and abide by the strict bureaucratic dimensions of his work. He was clearly not conscious of this importance of matters I was raising because of the political environment in which he works. His agency must work within the classic capitalist market.

The agency of Natural Resources had reached a point in its own thinking of the importance of national control over the total production and marketing process. But its thinking had not gone toward a critical concept of its own government power to shape the

---

\* To confirm my sense of the government’s decision, on June 18 I had lunch with Roberto Rexach, a leading member of the Popular Party in the Legislature. Mr. Passalacqua, a journalist and the director of a popular television program called “face to Face,” joined us. They both agreed that the government was committed to go ahead with commitments to Kennecott and Amax Corporations

† I had written to a Swedish copper company to inform them of island developments. I knew they would be open to self-management. They replied with interest. Later, I received a notice of their expectations of making a visit to Puerto Rico. It was clear in June, however, that the Island government had made its commitments to Kennecott and Amax corporations.

structure of business. It could not even deal with the problem of oligarchy in its own government with its separation from people.\*

### Afterthoughts

I walked down from the Capitol building and then across the street. The ocean stretched forth as far as I could see. It was a beautiful and relaxing vista. The white-topped waves came breaking in streaks across a 500-yard area out and down the beach, the length of my vision. Hundreds upon hundreds of white-topped waves were pouring in constantly toward shore. Below the cliff where I stood was a view of San Cristobal, the Old Spanish Fort. And right below me was the remains of an old wall of that Fort. Perhaps it was a lookout station for the Spanish to protect themselves against invaders. I went down the hill to wade in the waters around that wall and ponder on the meaning of our meeting.

I watched the *Jueyes*, the running crabs, scrambling over the rocks as I approached the wall. I looked at the rocks for a place to walk and then I realized that there were *Erizos* (little animals with vicious spines which dig into the skin) that I had to avoid like the plague. I let my feet sink deeply in the soft sand at the water's edge and watched the rays of sunlight sprinkle and sparkle their way through the ocean bottom. I felt myself becoming solidly placed.

I thought how far apart this beautiful and natural scene was from political struggles and the fight against political dominance. The fight for true social enterprise in whatever country was a long way from where I was on that ocean's edge. And within the pounding surf I felt a deeper movement. That movement went beyond the struggle against capitalism or bureaucratic socialism. I watched the waves pound against the old fortress wall. I thought suddenly that I was seeing that surf someday breaking down the fortress of the old capitalist state. I thought, too, about how to break the socialist state.

The creative process that breaks through the fortresses of society was the deeper reality. It was the creative process that lies within the material fabric of our being in this world that now seemed important. The ocean and this beach were part of this material

---

\* For a detailed proposal of how the copper companies could enter the island without dominance and exploitation, see the Appendix of my book, The Social Economy (N.Y.: John Wiley, 1977)

fabric – my fabric. The tiny grains of sand were real. Each grain was microscopically different and fascinating in its detail. I thought about how we could see the beauty and the uniqueness in each grain – like individuals. And then if each grain meant that much to me as I looked at it – how much more does each person mean in the great fabric of our Cosmos.

A couple of Puerto Rican boys came by and asked me if I would give them 3 American dollars for a five dollar bill from Canada. They said they could not change the Canadian bill here and get its value. They said I looked like I might be going to Canada and could I change it for them? I said No; I would only be going back to the United States. I had my own problem in “making change” when I got back.

The waves continued to roll in. I did not want to leave. My mind and body belonged to that place where the sea and the land meet one another.

April 24, 1974 Fomento and Final Attitudes on Copper

At about 3:30 PM. I arrived at the 15<sup>th</sup> floor of the Fomento building where I was to meet Jim McDonough for a joint appointment with Dr. Morris Moses. It is an elegant office-area with a plush divan for visitors who must wait for their appointments. I sat down next to a fascinating plant that was part of the décor of the lounge. The plant had five star-shaped leaves for each stem that sprouted in all directions, finally stopping two inches before the ceiling. It was almost as though it sensed its limits before touching the top. I learned from the office secretary that it was a Shefflegras. She said, “They cost only \$15 each,” in case I wanted to buy one. She gave me a card of the florist business where I could purchase it.

I remembered my last visit to Fomento. It was to see Lewis Smith about the Superport issue. Lewis Smith is in charge of economic studies. I had phoned him saying I wanted to bring a student over to talk with him about studying the Superport. He was very interested in talking with me when he heard I was teaching a course on multinational corporations. But when I mentioned that I was calling from the offices of the Industrial Mission, his attitude completely changed. I almost did not get the appointment. He later told me that people in the Fomento offices call the Mission the “Anti-Industrial Mission.” Then, in our meeting, my student became involved in a long argument with him about the

values and effects of industrialization on the island. So, I knew what to expect in our discussion on the basis of this experience.

Jim McDonough came out of a conference on the Superport in a side room just in time for us to go together to meet Morris Moses. We greeted one another and Dr. Moses asked if I had a professional card. I said “No.” He gave me his card and we sat back to talk.

I said that I have become interested in the copper mining project by chance. I was participating in a seminar with professional colleagues on the subject of Technology and Values in Cambridge, Massachusetts before 1970 when I heard about the copper mining proposal in Puerto Rico. Before that time, our seminar members had decided to select specific cases to study in order to bring our philosophic principles down to earth and possibly down to a level of practice and consultation. We heard that a number of churches were concerned about the environmental effects of copper mining in Puerto Rico and so I was commissioned by our seminar group to investigate what was happening and report back to later meetings.

This point in my story was visibly affecting Morris Moses: “Oh,” he said, “those churches! It was a trick. The churches held what they called, a ‘public hearing’ but it was all stacked against us. I took them seriously at first and worked hard to prepare a report for them. But they didn’t want to hear the facts. They just wanted to raise the public opinion against the whole effort.”

I said that I heard about that event in 1971. After it happened, I came down to investigate the situation. I was studying the problem independently from the standpoint of our seminar. It was now only by coincidence that I happen to be here on the island to teach at a time when the whole copper mining question is rising again. “Since I am here, I thought you would like to hear what I had learned in my investigation.”

He said he wanted to hear what I had concluded. I then indicated five major areas of the copper venture which needed serious consideration from an organizational standpoint: 1) where the money would come from to develop the copper, 2) which companies would be invited to bid, 3) what kind of contract would be offered, 4) how the copper corporation on the island would be organized to implement the project, 5) how the

copper industry would be decentralized to account for community development in the process.

It was clear in the ensuing hour of discussion that Dr. Moses was interested only in talking about the old pattern of industrial organization. He said that the corporations of Kennecott and Amax would be offered the first opportunity to negotiate a contract. The Puerto Rican government had an obligation to them because they had invested \$10,000,000 in the process already. I said I wanted to talk especially about decentralizing responsibility in the community. If we could understand that point, we could see the necessity to look more carefully at the type of contract that was needed and which operations could implement the plan.

Severyn Bruyn (SB): The Environmental Protection Agency and the Environmental Quality Board tell me that they are understaffed and underfinanced. They cannot handle all the problems that corporations are already producing on the island. I am suggesting in this case that more authority be given to local people to control these effects and resolve those problems which affect them in their locality.

Morris Moses (MM): These agencies have been set up to control pollution. It is a technical job. It takes time to set standards. It's a new area. You can't be perfect on it.

SB: I was out in Guayanilla recently. *The people there are suffering from the contamination of the air. And they cannot do anything about it. I was out in Arecibo last week. The fish have been killed by pollution. The paper mill is discharging waste into the ocean. These poor fishermen cannot do anything about it. Outside of Arecibo I talked to workers who are suffering from fumes coming from the Puerto Rican Chemical Company. They cannot do anything about it. There are hundreds of industrial companies on this island producing pollution.* How can a few people in San Juan monitor all of them?

MM: We are progressing toward control over pollution. In the plan for copper mining, the corporation and the government will monitor the pollution problems. The people in these communities do not have the knowledge and ability to do it.

SB: We know that any corporation, which has its own private interests, will not do the job simply in the public interest. We know the government is centralized in San Juan with only a very limited staff. Clearly, people in these communities will only continue to suffer. The local people are already seeing doctors on these problems but the doctors have no authority to stop these emissions from the companies.

MM: I think that the type of program that you are suggesting should start with smaller companies.

SB: In the U.S., it will be the larger companies that are going to be stopped first from polluting. They will have to become publically accountable. That is exactly what needs to be done here in the case of mining. The public should have access to all information about

their corporate activities. For example, if someone wants to know what percentage of ores is being extracted, they have a right to have that information.

MM: How would your public corporation be organized?

SB: I believe it should be organized in the private sector as a public (citizen) corporation. It should have a private constitution that specifies the rights of workers and citizens will be protected in the process of work and industry. It would specify “due process” to achieve their rights at the local level.

MM: Who would be on the board of directors?

SB: The people who own stock would elect the board. Island people would buy it. The corporation would need to be initiated by the government in this case because of past commitments. The government could initiate the corporation with 51% control of stock but with a legal plan to gradually divest itself of control as the corporation becomes well managed in the public interest. The government would still exercise environmental controls over the expansion of copper in other parts of the island. The copper corporation would eventually be transformed into a cooperative with decentralized responsibilities and authorities in the communities where the industry is operating. The people in Utuado and Lares are vital to consider in this process...

MM: How do you think people in this area now feel about the mining project? My feeling is that they want the mining because it will give them jobs. The *independentistas* are only a small minority who fight against it.

SB: The problem is that you will have lots of jobs in the construction period but then after that is over these people will be out of work again. The administration of the plant will eventually be only a small number of professionals and experts.

MM: About 1,300

SB: The unemployment in Utuado is enormous. The professionals and experts will not be drawn from this group of unemployed. An agricultural program is needed in this area to combine with industrial development. If an agricultural program were implemented simultaneously with the mining, you would meet the natural interests and basic needs of people in this area. It is a farming community that could use technical assistance.

MM: There is no farmland out there that is worth anything. It's all hills.

SB: I have heard -- from farm specialists -- that it is rich land. For example, the hills can be terraced.

MM: We are planning to terrace the land in the reclamation of the copper pit that is left after excavation.

SB: Then, why not terrace the land now as a measure of community development which fills the needs of people in the area?!

MM: It would cost a lot of money.

SB: I think it would do well for Fomento to consider the total values of the community in this development venture. This would mean that in addition to the copper industry, a plan would be provided simultaneously for the development of education, agriculture, and

the cultural life of people in the area. To do this, the people in this area would need to be guaranteed a certain return on the profits that are accrued in the development of the copper industry.

MM: The people are not ready for this. It will take a long time. Look, it was not long ago that Puerto Rico had no real leadership. There were no leaders here that could go to Washington and talk to the administration. We are developing them now. It has been a long haul but we are moving along very well.

SB: There is no question that there has been economic development, but we are talking about social development in the economy, about whether we can develop socially as well as economically. This is the issue at stake in the copper mining plans for the island.

It was clear that Morris Moses was not responding favorably to the ideas even though he was not totally opposed to them. He felt that the ideas had some merit, perhaps, but should be implemented some other day. He suggested that if I had some formal statement about the copper plan, he might look at it. I said I had only an outline that had been typed and mimeographed by the Industrial Mission. "That is too bad," he said. "The people here will think this is all another scheme." I said I thought it was important to consider ideas for their merits independent of their sponsors.

It was clear to me that this alternative plan would go no farther than this office at this time and I could go no higher. I left the Fomento offices more determined than before to work from below and outside rather than from the top and within the government.

I began to share the frustration of the campus students. A new political movement was needed. A whole new philosophy of social change was required, based on the principle of reducing the power of the State by introducing self-government into the economy and the corporate system.

I think the same issues that were alive in the American colonies in the 18<sup>th</sup> century are now alive here in the Puerto Rican system. They are issues of federalism and the decentralization of power in the polity. But democratic polity now applies to the corporate system. A whole new legislative program must be written which can begin to change the charter of corporations in Puerto Rico and the structure of the corporation in the context of the community. A new polity must now be examined for the economic order, business itself.

## II. **The Economic Order: Self-Governance in the Business System**

The political unrest on the island increased my desire to look personally into the kinds of problems generated by multinational business. In the process I hoped to find some potential for social change within the business system.

It seemed to me that North American business had helped in economic development but I was less certain about how much it had helped in social development. By social development, I meant the expansion of authority, imagination, sensitivity, responsibility, knowledge and leadership of islanders working together in the economic order.

I began talking with laborers and local fishermen to see how they were affected by pollution generated through industrial development. I was interested in the degree to which people at the bottom of the system were empowered to control their environment and their working lives through industrial organization. The investigation of environmental protection and community control then became a major interest during my first months of stay on the island.

#### Pollution and Absentee Ownership

I discovered first-hand the many environmental problems that U.S. industry was causing on the island. So much economic control came from U.S. companies and the mainland that I wondered to what extent true environmental control could be exercised on the Island. The petrochemical industry alone was an enormous complex with a total capital investment of over \$1.2 billion. It was composed of 5 major core facilities all of which were U.S. corporations. An exception could be claimed in CORCO, which was the largest petrochemical company on the island, with total assets in 1971 of \$357.8 million. But Puerto Ricans still owned only 1.4 million of its 12.5 million shares of stock. The fact that the remainder was on the U.S. stock exchange made it basically a U.S. owned company. There were 11 other major facilities and satellites in this core complex of petrochemicals. Among the other American companies were Phillips Petroleum, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries, Union Carbide, Gulf Oil, Sun Oil, and Shell Petroleum.\*

---

\* These facts were first brought to my attention in a manuscript by Richard Gillett, former Director of the Puerto Rican Industrial Mission. They were presented to the Consultation of Power and Development, held by the World Council of Church's Commission on Development in Puerto Rico, February, 1973. This manuscript has since been published as *Ontwikkeling als ramp*, in *Wereld en Zending, Prins Hendriklaaw* 37, Amsterdam -7.

In October 1971, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency found that discharges from CORCO and Union Carbide were significantly reducing water quality in a bay on the South coast. The two companies were discharging a daily total of 24 tons of non-filterable suspended solids into the bay as well as heated water discharged of 119,000 gallons per minute. Also, there was evidence that Pittsburgh Plate Glass (PPG) was discharging excessive amounts of caustic soda and mercury into the ocean. Chlorine gas had escaped from PPG into the nearby town of Playa Guayanilla affecting the health of residents.

There was evidence that many of Puerto Rico's 30 rivers were polluted. (The preliminary results of a government census in 1973 showed only 2 of the 112 industries, that were large water users, were complying with regulations.) Furthermore, a rise in respiratory diseases had to been reported by doctors treating patients living in towns adjacent to the smokestacks of petrochemical plants emitting sulfur dioxide. In Cataño, a suburb of San Juan, it was reported that 175 tons of sulfur dioxide per day descended on inhabitants. In this case, *Plantas de Energía Eléctrica* (thermo-electric plants) was held responsible.

It was because of such reports that I became interested in learning first hand from people in communities how they themselves felt affected by the pollution. I was concerned especially with the question of how the corporate system responded to them.

I learned of two people who were working on these problems on a large voluntary basis: Netfali Garcia and Alberto Gonzales. Netfali Garcia was a chemist at a branch of the University of Puerto Rico in the town of Cayey. Some years ago he received a grant from Fomento to study chemistry at Ohio State University and after completing his Ph.D., he returned to Fomento. But he soon ran into conflict with leading officials on the issue of copper mining on the island.

Netfali was convinced that the copper proposal by the Kennecott Copper and Amax corporations was going to have an adverse effect on the environment. Other specialists at Fomento thought otherwise. After an open conflict on the issue, Netfali was fired from his post at the university at the main campus. He later found a position at a branch campus of the university but without access to laboratories. He was, at that time, waiting for a decision on his tenure. He has since lost his faculty position.

Alberto Gonzalez is a former Methodist minister who was working for Legal Services on behalf of migrant laborers and factory workers. The Office of Economic Opportunity once supported the office of Legal Services but funds have been cut and Alberto would probably be looking for a job soon to support his family. I made arrangements to join them in their work at that time. They were in the process of visiting local people who felt afflicted by the outputs of industries in their communities.

I met with Alberto along with Kim Gerould, an American exchange participant on the island working with the American Friends Service Committee. My Journal notes of that meeting were as follows:

March 15: The Effects of Pollution on the Local Community: Absentee Ownership

Alberto took us to a construction site outside the city limits of Arecibo. It was lunchtime and laborers at the University Construction Company were finishing eating as we walked up to their group. There is something familiar about the environment of hard labor – the smell of sweat, the look of dirty faces, the rough talk, and virile relations.

Alberto called the group of some 25 workers together. They were happy to see him. He told them he needed their testimonies about the effects of the gases that were coming from a smokestack in the factory across the highway. He pointed to a tape recorder that he carried with him and asked them to speak to him about how these gases were causing them problems.

They spoke freely and at length. The gases from the Puerto Rican Chemical Corporation were drifting across the area of their work and were causing the men to vomit. The gases were also affecting their respiration and their vision. Many of the men wore goggles to protect their eyes. Some of them claimed the gases were affecting their sexual potency.

Alberto told them that he was bringing a doctor to talk to them about their symptoms. He also wanted the men to sign a petition of protest against the corporation. Apparently the men had complained to their union without any action. Also complaints have been made to the Environmental Quality Board but without any significant action. Some of the men feel that the Environmental Quality Board and the union have closer ties to company officials than to the needs of their workers. They all expressed a feeling of anger and impotency at having to continue working in the face of the gaseous emissions.

When we met Netfali Garcia at lunch in Arecibo, we suggested that the gases probably contained volatile solids (Phtalic Anhydride), which were emitted in the oxygenization of orto-xylene in the chemical plant.

We are now scheduled to talk to some old fishermen down at the beach. These fishermen had been complaining to the town mayor at to the government about how their fishing was being affected by the emissions of “waste” from the paper mill and from pharmaceutical companies in the area, but without any results. We were scheduled to look for one of the leading fishermen whose name was El Negro.

Netfali found him on the beach. He looked like an old fisherman right out of a Hemingway novel. He was dark-skinned, thin in body, aged and eager to speak of the contamination of the ocean.

He said that the men have been fishing these waters for many years, but since the paper mill has been discharging waste, their fish have been lost. He said it was not only the paper mill that was affecting the fish. It was also the pharmaceutical waste that is carried out to sea in a tanker every two weeks -- to be dumped in the sea.

We all looked over toward the long, low-slung steel barge resting in the shallow ocean water. The people in the neighborhood had painted a huge lettered sign on a holding wall next to the tanker. FUERA LA BARCASA (GET OUT BARGE! ALTO A LA CONTAMINACION (STOP THE CONTAMINATION).

The fishermen told how the tanker was supposed to go out to sea for 3 days and dump the waste at a safe distance from the shore. But it was actually observed to be gone only 12 hours. Furthermore, there was evidence that the waste was actually discharged gradually as the tanker left the shore. Fishermen and local people observed the discharge. Fishermen could see the dead fish trailing the tanker only a few miles from shore.

El Negro went on to say that it was no longer possible to catch the ceti (tiny fish) at the mouth of the river. The paper mill discharged a mixture of bagazo (Bagasse) and caustic soda that was used in the plant. The chemicals killed the ceti and their nets were filled with the straw-like bagazo making them too heavy to operate. El Negro explained that the bagazo came from the sugar plant but was discharged into the ocean by the paper mill. An ecological exchange of materials was made between the two plants. The sugar plant (cambalache) would give the paper mill (owned by the Pan American company) the bagazo in exchange for oil. Each material was used separately by each industry in their processing of sugar and paper.

The other fishermen continued to explain their inability to get anyone to act against the corporations. "They don't listen to us." "The government looks down on us like we are nothing." "We feel like we are bothering them." The fishermen felt betrayed by the government. No one listened to them. But Netfali and Alberto were listening. The question now was whether they had any more voice in the government than the small local fishermen.

We got in our car and drove down the highway. The plight of the fisherman was with us, as we talked more about the corporate system that could cause so much pollution in the environment without respect to life on the island. They talked to me about the "North American Corporations" and economic imperialism. I said that even though much of the problem stemmed from American corporations, there was still some island autonomy in the fact that Puerto Rico had a unique set of public corporations that were controlled by the Puerto Rican government.

This notion sparked major dissent among my friends. They did not feel the island had any real autonomy at all. The dissent had enough intensity to carry our discussion of the problem through the hour-and-a-half ride back to Rio Piedras.

I argued my case by referring to the little bit of Puerto Rican history I had been reading. I said "autonomy" began during the term of Governor Tugwell (an appointee of Franklin Delano Roosevelt) when nine public corporations had been created in Puerto Rico. Public corporations today produce electric power; operate irrigation systems, water supply, and sewage disposal systems. They construct public housing, operate ports, airports, a bus

system, and to some degree are engaged in farming and development banking. The formal control over these corporations is maintained by placing government officials of cabinet rank on their boards of directors. There is a careful audit by an official responsible to the legislature who is duty-bound to publicize any irregularities. This type of organization of economic activity was in the public interest. It would seem to me a positive factor contributing to the autonomy of the economy and even an aid to the Puerto Rican independence movement.

### The Strings on Public Corporations

My companions then firmly informed me that this was only the surface-picture. These public corporations were really bonded and controlled by U.S. capital and private banks. What followed in our discussion was not a picture that would be acceptable to the Chamber of Commerce. It was a picture seen by my companions in deep dissent.

They said the Water Resources Authority (*Autoridad de las Fuentes Fluviales*) is a Puerto Rican public corporation that in reality is under the control of the First National Boston Corporation and Associates. The First National Boston Corporation buys bonds (through its affiliate, the First Boston Corporation), which are issued by the Water Resources Authority. As the principal bondholder of the island Authority, it can take possession – or threaten to take possession – of the Authority whenever it sees the policy of the Authority endangering its investments. Then they said that the network of controls is much more complicated and intricate than simply being a principal bondholder. The engineering consultants and builders of the Authority's electric plants (Jackson and Moreland) and the Authority's technical assessors (Burns and Roe) are affiliates of United Engineers and Constructors, Inc., a subsidiary of Raytheon. And a principal stockholder in Raytheon is the First National Boston Corporation. The First National, in turn, is one of the principal stockholders in CORCO. It administers the liquid funds, it overseas the earnings, and it pays the dividends to stockholders.

The Authority buys all the fuel that is consumed in its thermo-electric plans from CORCO. For many years they said, CORCO has been over-pricing the fuel that it sells to the Authority. The contract that the Authority has with CORCO stipulates a price much lower than is actually paid. Complaints have been made about the situation but neither the Authority nor the government has done anything about it.

In other words, the Boston Corporation loans money to the Authority for buildings and improvements. It then receives its earnings through interest rates and through its subsidiary investments in other corporations. These formal relationships, however, are only the outer anatomy. There is a vast infrastructure of informal controls that are exercised by the U.S. over the island "Public Authority." The popular idea that the island has autonomy through its public corporations is false. It hides the reality.

My mind traveled immediately to what I considered to be positive aspects of the business system. I thought that my companions' negative attitude oversimplified the picture. "In spite of all the negative things you say about the system," I said, "It has still helped economic development on the island. The public corporations, for example, brought a lot of capital here. When the public corporations showed good earnings, this

brought more capital investments. The public corporations enabled the government to get funds. The government (as the sole borrower of funds) by itself could not get those funds. If one public corporation failed, or went into debt, it did not destroy the credit of the whole government. American investors treated the corporations independently. And, through them, the amount of economic development had been significant, even with strings attached.” I could see my argument was not too persuasive.

We were approaching San Juan at the end of a long hard day.

### Afterthoughts

The opposition that people felt against U.S. controls over the island economy was still on my mind. (I wondered how North Americans would feel if an Arab country or Japan owned 80% of U.S. business and industry?) It was not just my two friends in the car, or the small fisherman and the construction workers who were angry here. A broad constituency of professional people also was angry. In fact, I think the anger runs still deeper into the minds of all Puerto Ricans even when they do not express it. I heard professional people speak of it not simply as a right to self-determination but as a matter of personal integrity.

What are my own feelings this moment? I believe that the business system has contributed to economic development but that it is also very destructive. It is exploiting people and badly damaging the environment. Furthermore, the market system as a whole is self-destructive. The social costs of unemployment, absentee-ownership, poverty and slums, drug addiction and crime that become associated with the system will never be cured by it. Puerto Rico should not continue with this form of economic development.

What are the alternatives?

Can we focus on *social development* in connection with economic development? If the real problems are to be solved, does it mean simply a reformation of business? Does it mean modest changes in business administration? Or does it mean a reorganization of the business economy? Could it involve the social reconstruction of the entire economic order?

### March 22, 1974 Private Detectives of Environmental Pollution

This morning I had a second meeting with Dr. Natfali García, Rev. Alberto Gonzalez, and Kim Gerould. Our purpose was to visit first - some of the sources of contamination around the city of Arecibo. I took a *Pùblico* (public taxi) to the city of Bayamon and there I found another *Pùblico* that took me to the ocean port at Arecibo. Alberto and Netfalì had arranged to take a boat trip around the shore to view the sites of

potential contamination from the sea before viewing them from the land. My *Pùblico* was late getting to the Port and I missed the boat-ride. While I waited for them to return, I took pictures of the beach filled with *Bagazo* that had been discharged from the paper-mill.

At 1:00 PM the boat carrying my friends arrived. We went to eat at the home of Alberto and then on to see the sources of contamination on private land belonging to the corporations around Arecibo.

### Following Sewage and Factory Smoke

We drove across the highway to the Puerto Rican Chemical Company and down a country-path belonging to the company until we found a discharge-outlet from the company factory. We knew only that the factory was making materials for plastics. We found an irrigation ditch filled with some kind of chemical liquid that was factory waste. The ditch circled like a rivulet around the large acreage of land owned by the company. There were evidences in the ditch that the liquid contained oil. The waste-liquid finally ended in a river going straight to the ocean. It required an hour or more tracing its passageways through the pastureland and around the sugar cane fields. Netfali Garcia ran on foot through the fields following the rivulet of sewage while we kept an eye on him at a distance from our car.

When we finally came to the river mouth, Dr. Garcia speculated on the content of the sewage and the extent to which it was affecting the organic life. I had a feeling of the integrity and purpose of this man as he moved about checking each detail of the sewage effects. His mind stayed at the level of hypotheses as he applied his professional knowledge. He observed the potential effects of the factory smoke on the sugar cane. The stalks that were in the path of the fumes were visibly shorter than others. He observed the likelihood that the shape of the river mouth was changing due to the waste discharges. He was continually setting up hypotheses about the interrelated effects of the industrial system on the surrounding environment. I thought about how the government and the companies were missing the talents of this man!

Netfali then said, "I cannot get all the information I need from the government; they know me too well. They know I will give the details to the public. But even when we have the details to do something about a problem, nothing is ever done. The Environmental Quality Board told me the other day that they were planning to build a treatment plant for the sewage from the pharmaceutical companies. They were supposed to build a treatment plant to replace the barge that carries the sewage out to sea. They said it would be constructed this year but I know it won't be. So that is the next place we are going to look at right now."

### Investigating Government Promises

We drove from Arecibo toward Barceloneta where Netfali had been told that a treatment plant was being constructed this year. We found a site beside the road in which some kind of construction was in progress. But the construction sign in front of the project indicated it to be only an "ocean outfall sewer." The sign said the cost of the total project was \$2,050,567. Of this amount, the Commonwealth and locality would pay \$922,755

while the Federal government (through the Environmental Protection Agency) would pay \$1,127,812. This amount was much less than that envisioned from a treatment plant.

There was evidence of huge pipes being laid to carry sewage out to sea but no evidence of a sewage treatment plant under construction. It appeared as though the pipes were simply going to be a substitute for the barge and they would be discharging waste closer to the shore. No real corrections would be made. It could be worse than before. I decided at this point that I would report this to the Environmental Quality Board and ask them for more information.

We drove next to an inland-area where a site for a nuclear plant had been proposed. According to Netfalì no official information was available on it. It appeared as though Westinghouse had contracted to sell generators that had nuclear fuel to the Water Resources Authority. Both corporations have an interest in construction of the plant. The Authority would construct the nuclear plant under the surveillance of the Atomic Energy Commission in the U.S. Netfalì said Alcoa probably has an interest in an aluminum smelter and would use the plant energy. The plant would also generate electricity for other companies and for municipalities in the area.

We drove up to a hill on which an antenna had been constructed, some hundreds of feet in the air. It was clearly built to test wind velocity and climatic conditions. A refrigerated house was constructed at its base for testing changes outside. There were stakes driven into the ground, which indicated that some construction had already been made to determine the exact location of the plant.

#### Fertile Land Lying Fallow

We looked out from the hill and across a huge valley that Alberto told us was largely government land. He noted how the government had claimed that the island had no agricultural capacity. Yet here was this huge acreage remaining unused. The government was only interested in industrial development. This land could be planted with rice and a major part of the island's food-need could be met. As it is now, Puerto Rico depends on other countries for its food.

#### Distillery Sewage Empties On the Beach

Netfalì and Alberto said we had one more place to visit. It was the Puerto Rican Distillery Company that was built on the ocean shore. They told me it was pouring sewage directly into the sea. They wanted to get a first-hand look at the place where it was discharging its waste.

We arrived at the distillery as the day was ending. The sun was setting at the ocean was a gorgeous sight. We got out of the car and walked to the back wall of the distillery that faced the ocean shore. At the back-wall of the building we saw two huge pipes about five feet in diameter gushing forth some kind of brown liquid into sand-channels on the beach. The sand-channels had been dug to carry the waste directly into the ocean waves. The waves themselves became colored as the liquid waste reached them. Netfalì said that the waste was organic residue and that it was heavy enough that it would not be carried out too far out to sea.

We drove back to the home of Alberto while Netfalì gave a statement of his observations on a tape-recording which hopefully would be broadcast by radio in Arecibo.

Alberto is maintaining a radio program through *Servicios Legales* that seeks to inform people of environmental problems like these were observing today.

On our way back home to Rio Piedras, we talked again about the meaning of these problems in the light of the larger economic organization on the island. Netfalì said that these physical problems are really political and ideological problems. He is convinced that the physical problems cannot be corrected through the existing organization of corporate business and he spoke of the socialist changes that he hoped would come to the island.

#### Imperialism and Education

We stopped to have dinner on the way home and I had a chance to meet a Puerto Rican friend of Netfalì who is a teacher of English in Rio Piedras. I asked her how all these environmental problems were related to education in Puerto Rico. She said education was simply another part of U.S. imperialist influence on the island. The texts used in the schools are all oriented to North American culture. There is no interest in the production and use of Puerto Rican texts. Sympathy with the North American way of life reaches to the top of the educational system on the island. Teachers who were *Independentistas* are soon identified and shifted from school to school to keep them from acquiring tenure. American interests are perpetuated in the curriculum. They change only when they change in the U.S. She said some of the environmental interests, which are now developing in the U.S. will now enter into some of the studies of Puerto Rico, but only because they are now becoming the liberal interests of people in the U.S.

#### Political Roots of Pollution

Netfalì then stressed the difference between what he was doing about environmental problems and what was being done in the U.S. He said that he is not an “environmental freak” or simply a “nature lover.” As a Ph.D. chemist, he is interested in the Puerto Rican environment but he is seeking to get to the root of the pollution problems. The root, he said, is in the structure of the political economy.

Netfalì said that the schools should teach about how the capitalist system exploits people but this is not permitted. Since the problems of capitalism are not taught, the children stay ignorant of the real problems and begin to participate in the system without being aware of the source of the exploitation and destructiveness. The symptoms of pollution then simply keep reappearing. When they eventually become bad enough, they will combine with other problems to produce a major political upheaval.

The real government of Puerto Rico is hidden in the corporate system, which is controlled from the United States. The children on the island are not taught about these facts in the schools. They do not begin to discover it until they are older and can begin to think for themselves.

Netfalì then concluded: “Students begin to think for themselves at the university level. And this is why the government is constantly having trouble with the university. The independence and the socialist movements have a foothold in higher education. The government does not know what to do about it.”

March 25, 1974. Paperwork for the Environmental Quality Board (Morning)

Today I went to talk with officials in the Environmental Quality Board (*Juntas de Calidad Ambiental*) about some of the problems we witnessed on my trip with Alberto and Netfali.

I arrived at 9:00 AM at 1550 Avenida Ponce de Leon where the offices are located. When I entered on the sixth floor, I saw a number of young men talking together in one of the main offices. I asked them for impact statements about the pharmaceutical companies and then explained my interest in working on the environmental problems on the island. The men were very courteous and helpful. They led me directly to a small library room where I could study the impact statements.

There were no corporate statements on the corporations I visited which were producing waste. They had been on the island before 1970. It was in 1970 that the law requirements for registering impact statements became effective as law!\*

The general policy of the government to industrialize through multinational corporations – as opposed to a general policy of developing agriculture – was evident in the pages of the various impact statements of companies entering the island. On page 8 of the Durite Company statement, for example, it was noted that the Autoridad de Tierras did not cultivate the area covering most of their proposed hardboard plant site although it had appeared to me that it was cultivatable. Furthermore, I saw that the yield of the sugarcane fields in the immediate vicinity had dropped considerably. The statement indicated that only 2 pounds of sugar could be recovered from a quintal of cane and it was therefore uneconomical to produce it. This was the first piece of official evidence I had seen of Netfali's hypothesis that the sugar cane was being affected by the emissions of gaseous smoke in this area.

I asked for the impact statement of the proposed Nuclear Plant. A formal statement had been made in April 1972, when the site was originally proposed for Aguirre, a piece of land on the southern coast of the island. Upon reading it, I saw that the interests of industry outweighed the interests of agricultural development. The impact statement said that the Aguirre Complex included 154 acres of mangrove forests and 42 acres of agricultural land

---

\* I did find the impact statement of the company that was currently under construction. The construction workers were suffering from fumes drifting across the highway. Even though this company was not yet operating and was not engaged in pollution, I took the opportunity to examine its impact statement in the light of the growing congestion of industry in the area. The name of the company was the Durite Corporation and it was planning to use bagasse in the manufacture of hardboards. The statement indicated the company planned to discharge 3,000 gallons per minute of "waste-water of brown color with turbidity." The company planned to use this waste for irrigating land adjacent to its plant, and during excess rainfall, the management planned to discharge it into the Rio Grande of Arecibo. I found various letters from government agencies considering the issues involved. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency in particular was raising questions about physical effects from the technical process of manufacture. It did my heart good to see these first steps toward social controls over private corporate exploitation beginning to go into effect.

used primarily for sugar cane. About 2/3 of the mangroves on Site had been killed presumably by the discharge wastes of the sugar mills. However, it said that during the construction and the operation of the plants, “controls will be enforced to limit environmental impact so that only 37 additional acres of mangroves will be destroyed.” There was no statement as to how that productive land would be recovered.

When I finished my reading I looked for the division dealing with water quality on the island (*Negociado de Agua*). I wanted to raise specific questions about the waste discharges into the ocean that we had witnessed in Arecibo. I found Miss Flor Figoroso on the fourth floor in the charge of environmental complaints. She was pleased to discuss these matters with me. I told her I had seen *environmental offenders with my own eyes* – the distillery, the Chemical plant, the ocean barge, and paper mill – all of which were heavily discharging waste materials into the ocean. All the discharges were deeply suspicious and some were having damaging effects that were visible. Miss Figoroso said that she did not know about the distillery and the chemical plant but I could register complaints about them.

She knew the last two cases. She said she had visited Arecibo about three weeks ago. The formal investigation of pharmaceutical waste being dumped improperly by the ocean barge was under way. So was the discharging of bagasse by the paper mill. She said the investigations take time; they involve professional experts making studies of the problem; they must also go to the legal division where facts are evaluated to determine the authority to act on these cases.

I then asked for the forms for filing complaints about the two cases that were unknown to her office. As I filled them out I began thinking a bout the amount of time I was taking to do this and whether it was all worth it. In the minds of my friends, it would be foolish to participate with the existing government in any such manner because the existing government will only perpetuate the system that must be “abolished.” This bureaucratic action takes time and energy away from the real work of the political movement. I am “simply contributing to the on-going capitalist system and it keeps generating new problems.” I had a feeling that this complaint-process would take a long

time and that the damage would be done before any real action would be taken. So I decided to see what the Environmental Protection Agency could do.

March 26, 1974      The Gallant Effort of a Small E.P.A: Overburdened

Today I talked with David Guthrie, Associate Director of the Environmental Protection Agency. He was helpful. Indeed, I had the impression that the EPA's good reputation in the United States was being carried to the island. The only problem was that the EPA had only *two people working in it as opposed to hundreds of cases facing them*. They also could act no more quickly than the courts. And that court process was slow.

I asked David Guthrie about the Barge that dumped chemical waste into the ocean inside the prescribed limits. I said that it was killing the fish. He said he knew about it. He had already gone to sea in a Coast Guard helicopter to photograph the barge's illegal activities. He had filed cases against the offending company and he was awaiting court action.

He said, however, that he needed *abundant evidence* about each offense to convince the courts to take action. If I could take some photos myself for more evidence, he would be happy to follow up my complaint. I would need to *get a picture of the barge discharging the waste, a picture of the name of the ship, and a statement of the ship's location on the ocean at the time of the discharge*.

He said the penalty for each offense can go as high as \$50,000 but he cannot go out monitoring it everyday himself. It is hard to tell how long the cases will take in court or to predict their exact outcome. These cases he has investigated are still in the hands of attorneys. He would appreciate any more evidence I could obtain of repeated violations.

I named the other companies that were discharging waste and asked whether any action was being taken against them. He said that these companies had applied for permits of discharge under the old law that was not adequate. He could not take immediate action. The new law that went into effect in 1972, however, requires all companies to cease all contaminating discharges by 1977. This means that each company must submit a "compliance plan" that indicates they are moving rapidly toward the termination of all contaminating waste.

The Puerto Rico Chemical Company, for example, has a compliance plan that states how it should have stopped or completely "neutralized" its discharge by June 30, 1974.

The paper company, however, had not submitted their plan. If I were to write Mr. Guthrie

a letter explaining my interest in obtaining information about the nature of the chemical waste, when the paper company submits its plan, he would be happy to supply me with the answers. I told him I was very pleased at the readiness of the office to respond to our need for information.

I went away wondering how long it would take the courts to respond to the offenses of the barge. I also wondered why the government should be burdened with the problem at all. I kept thinking that there must be a way to introduce the equivalent of an EPA and the court *into the corporate system itself*. This would reduce the delays as well as the cost of government. More on this later.

### Worker Self-Management and Copper Mining

Some years ago I learned about “worker self-management” which was developing in the United States and Europe. Now it loomed important to me in Puerto Rico. Could it be part of “social development” in the Puerto Rican economy? The cases of worker self-management I knew had included types of worker participation ranging from greater “job control” to “worker councils” to complete “worker control” over the whole enterprise.

This direction of development toward increasing employee authority and responsibility had shown itself to be successful. I had the evidence. It could be part of island planning for self-governance in the business economy. Puerto Rican employees of U.S. corporate subsidiaries on the island could be trained into higher positions of authority and invited to invest in the enterprise. They could then be in a position to develop enterprises into production and retail cooperatives.

Mario Roche, Director of the Puerto Rican Industrial Mission, knew of my interests in meeting with labor leaders. He made an appointment for me with Pedro Grant and asked if I would share my thoughts on worker self-management with him.

Pedro Grant was President of *Movimiento Obrero Unido* (MOU) an organization that was attempting to coordinate and unite the various labor unions (*sindicatos*) independently organized on the island.

The formal objectives of the association included 1) “promoting the unity of the worker movement in Puerto Rico (2) providing assistance to different unions confronting a strike situation (3) resolving problems which arise between unions and promoting harmony among their activities (4) supporting legislation in the interest of the working class (5) seeking solidarity with unions and workers in other countries.”

An officer in the organization of MOU gave me some figures on their membership as well as the membership in the total organized labor movement. He stated that there were approximately 800,000 workers capable of belonging to unions on the island, of this number, 180,000 workers were organized into unions. Of this number, 60,000 workers belonged to MOU.

I recorded the following notes in my Journal:

February 28: Unions and the Socialist Movement

Pedro Grant arrived about 1:00 PM. Since Mario had already told him that I had some basic ideas about the copper mining venture. We began by discussing the idea of “worker control” and “worker participation” in industrial organization. Pedro asked me why I thought such an idea should be tried in the copper mining case.

I said it was vital that three things be accomplished in copper mining on the island: 1) that island-control be achieved over the total process of extraction, smelting, refining, and fabrication of copper, 2) that an industrial training process be organized in self-management for the workers, 3) that a significant role be given to citizens and consumers who would be affected by the copper industry. This would require a major educational effort in the communities where the copper would be mined, smelted and refined. It was important for local people to have a measure of participation and control over the effects of this industrial process. They should be guaranteed a certain percentage of the profits in order to avoid excessive profiteering at top government level of operation. I thought a position paper might be written on this subject and published by *Movimento Obrero Unido*. I knew the government would not accept this idea now because it followed the classical forms of business and placed too much authority outside the governor’s political control.

Pedro said the idea was important and fundamental to the interests of his organization. At the same time, he felt that it was not strategic to raise the idea of democratic worker-control over the copper industry at this moment because the main effort of the socialist movement must be placed toward stopping the government from doing any copper mining on the island. He felt certain that the government would make a contract with Kennecott Copper. These American companies would never accept worker and community authority in the process. The government would take the profits for its own interests in collaboration with the American companies.

Pedro Grant (P.G.): There are two different positions over the copper mining. One is that we should fight for island control of the whole process. The other is that we should fight against any contract the government signs because it will result in exploitation  
Severyn Bruyn (S.B.) I think this idea of worker-citizen participation and community control is a third position. It permits a contract with an outside company only if that company signs a service contract that commits it to train people to develop and govern their own industry.

- P.G. O.K. Why don't we raise the idea "worker self-management" as a public issue in Puerto Rico? In this way, we can still fight the government proposal and at the same time introduce these ideas. I think they are important.
- S.B. Fair enough. I have a lot of literature to give you on this question of self-management.
- P.G. We need to have information about how the idea has worked in other countries. And then maybe we can think about a position paper on this issue.
- S.B. I have materials here on how English companies, Scandinavian companies, and European Companies have organized themselves democratically. Part of the problem in self-management is: knowing how to prepare workers for the responsibilities that go with participation. In Norway when workers were given the option of serving on the board of directors of certain major companies, they were untrained and felt ineffective. In Sweden, the union began training programs for working before legislation required their participation on Company Boards. There is a law now in Sweden that all companies that have over 100 employees must have representation from workers on the Board of Directors.
- P.G. Let us have more information on these matters: the proportionate representation, the training programs, etc. And then maybe we can put together a position paper.

We said goodbye and I rode home with Mario Roche. It was a good meeting but I knew I would not be around long enough (during a sabbatical) to do more than supply the information. I was struck by the political differences that had developed on the island. The only alternative that socialists and "independents" see in Puerto Rico is to reject any government proposal whatsoever. Among the other socialists and *independentistas* whom I have met, the position seems to be the same as held by Pedro Grant.

The socialist argument is that even if the government were to agree to some of the provisions of the copper proposal I outlined, officials would soon comprise them. I sense that the Puerto Rican Socialist Party would in general accept the principles within this corporate design for copper mining but only as a basic part of the total re-organization of industry. They feel that nothing could be gained now by debating this case with the government. The Party will support only a total socialist reconstruction of industry.

I suddenly remembered the militant students on campus who were arguing for "co-government" in the University. This idea of reform for the University ran parallel to the idea of co-government and worker self-management for industry.

Self-governance in Puerto Rico could involve not only reforms in the organization of educational institutions but the economic institutions and others as well. I am now beginning to see the larger meaning of self-governance for all the institutions on the island.

I thought this evening about how strongly students felt about the importance of social reform. I wondered whether laborers might develop the same idea in business and industry.\* It involved a different model of change from classic revolution and state socialism. It was more of a “bottom-up” (grass-roots) approach to change than the coercive top-down state control advocated generally by Marxist-Leninists.

I stayed awake much of the night thinking about the problem. When I woke in the morning, I wrote the following note.

February 29 Questions of Revolutionary Reform Toward Self-Management

Can we create laws that help people solve social problems generated by the business economy? Can we write congressional bills that treat the problem of strikes by eliminating the necessity for worker subordination and alienation from management? Can we introduce legislation that allows all employees the rights to become “citizens of the economic order? Can we formulate a workers’ Bill of Rights?

Can we write a social constitution for the economic order? Can we help people attack delinquency by encouraging community development corporations that create jobs for young people in the neighborhood? Can we attack oligarchy in industry? Can we decentralize authority in industrial organization without breeding anarchy? Can we cultivate skills among employees that would allow them to assume a greater responsibility for their enterprise? Can there be a School of Management organized to train employees in democratic enterprise? Can we convince business executives and owners that everyone would win in the long run?

**III The Religious Order: Self-Governance in the Church**

The students were not the only ones on the island marching in protest. On March 27<sup>th</sup> tens of thousands of “people of the church” marched to the Capitol to protest a court order to “tone down” the loudspeakers of a Pentecostal church in Old San Juan. The Supreme Court said that residents in the neighborhood of the church had the constitutional right to domestic tranquility and that they need not be disturbed by the loud sounds coming from the church on Cruz Street. The written opinion of the court however, was widely interpreted by leaders of the Evangelical and Pentecostal churches to be an abridgement of their freedom to worship. On this day, some 70,000 religious protestors massed in front of the Capitol. A representative of Luis Cardenal Aponte, the Archbishop of San Juan, spoke

---

\* The reader should be reminded that these are subjective experiences in these events. The majority of the students would probably not argue for self-governance nor would a majority of Puerto Rican workers fight for it under present conditions. Only a minority of students and workers are actively concerned about these matters.

at the meeting along with other protestors about being “willing to die if necessary” for the right to worship God freely.

The emotional power and the determination of these religious protestors reached the heights of some socialist party protestors I had seen marching on the island. I wondered to myself about the connection between religious movements of this kind and the socialist movements on the island. The walls of city buildings were painted with religious symbols as well as with political symbols. The wall in front of the city slum, *La Perla*, for example, had this mix of symbols. At one place: the sign of *Cristo Viene Pronto* (Christ is coming soon) was painted on it. However, looking closely, you could see that over the word “Cristo” someone had painted the name “Fidel.”

The people on this march appeared to come largely from the poor and the working class. Careful interviewing of the protestors would likely show them expressing very conservative politics. Oscar Lewis’ study of a family living in *La Perla*, for example, expressed this fact. *La Perla* was just down the street from where the people were marching to the Capitol.

I talked with people on the march. They had clearly seen personal suffering and deprivation in the lives for which there seemed to be no solution. But they had found a radical solution in the living Christ. The radical solution was spiritual in this case rather than political.

I thought about Karl Marx’s theory that religion is an opiate, that is, it takes people away from wanting to change the form of government. The government court in this case had said that the noise coming from the church on Cruz Street was “scandalous.” But the marchers could have turned the accusation back on the government. The loud speakers of the religious assembly were competing with jukeboxes playing at full volume in dozens of bars where there were prostitutes, drunken sailors, heated arguments, fistfights, and criminal violence. The church people were trying to overcome the debilitation in the personal lives of people. Church members could have said that the government was permitting conditions that were “scandalous.” But while the people were angry, they did not broaden their picture of the problem and direct their anger at the political system.

My participation in church life was not strictly scientific. I did not take a random sample of churches to visit or a set of questionnaires to distribute. Instead I talked informally with people about the connection of their religious life to the social problems on the island. I asked about the relation of the church and its theology to political issues.

I took special note of my talks with Catholics, Christian Scientists, “the Children of God,” Episcopalians, and Quakers. My experience with these different religious groups suggested to me that there is probably a relationship between dogma, church structure, and

political orientation. My observations, however, were too brief and unsystematic to draw any solid conclusions. They simply suggested the need for research on this question.

The Catholic Church in Puerto Rico includes people from all walks of life. I was in constant touch with its laity; in fact, most of the people I knew on the island were Catholic. I found their views ranging widely across both the religious and political spectrum. I decided, however, to record especially my talks with priests who had experienced differences with church policy. I wanted to see how the church treated its dissidents. I also hoped to see if there were any innovative attempts by the church to solve social problems. I looked for clergy who could express a common denominator in the division between theology and social action.

The Catholic Church hierarchy tended to support the established way of life on the island. This is understandable if only because of its size relative to other churches. Catholic leaders in other Latin countries of course have shown signs of political radicalism. (The Bishop in Recife, Brazil, and the Bishop in Cuernavaca, Mexico, are examples.) In Puerto Rico, however, I found that the Church experienced radical action on its fringe while as a body it was closely intertwined with the political life of the island. The clergy on the whole would offer prayers at political conventions, arrange for marriages for children of top government officials, etc., while at the same time a few “revolutionary priests” would notoriously appear. Parishioners in general tended to be involved in religious ritual and church ceremony as something totally unrelated to politics.

The Christian Science Church has one chapel and Reading Room in Santurce, a suburban section of San Juan. There is no official record of their numbers because, I was told, Mary Baker Eddy, their founder, opposed counting the membership except for strictly internal necessities. The number of people who attended Sunday services, however, was clearly very small. They had meetings on Sunday morning and also on Wednesday evening for expressions of faith healing. My own participation in their services was stimulated by a long-time interest in learning more about their beliefs and the fact that a member of the University faculty, who was a Christian Scientist, encouraged me to attend the services.

The Christian Scientists I met seemed to move away from political involvement and toward a greater focus on inward reformation and contemplation. A strong interest in spiritual healing and a formal denial of the material world was enough to lead a visitor like myself toward mystical moments. I felt led away from outward action and toward spiritual contemplations, as my Journal notes will indicate.

The Children of God (Hijos de Dios) were located in my own neighborhood and so my participation in their activities was by chance. The Children of God, not to be confused with the Pentecostal Church, are a religious group founded by Moses David. They are strong believers in the biblical faith but with a strong reliance on the ideas of their founder. They came to Puerto Rico only two years before my arrival and were just beginning to find “converts.” Moses David published doctrinal pamphlets and sent them to Puerto Rico from his home in London where they were translated into Spanish and distributed in the area of San Juan. The members read the letters written to them by Moses David as though they were “contemporary scriptures.” One pamphlet illustrates the prophetic tone of the movement. It says, “You in the U.S. have only until January to get out of the U.S. before some kind of disaster, destruction or judgment of God is to fall because of America’s wickedness...”

The beliefs of this group combined political criticism with biblical literalism. The members were mostly young people who lived with simplicity and called their way of life “religious socialism.” Many denounced capitalism and communism as “anti-God.” The lack of “institutionalization” in their religious organization combined with the young age of the members, kept it open to change. Yet their future seemed uncertain. Many of the young members supported revolutionary ideas. At the same time, there were many parents who were distraught at the fact that the movement had captured the allegiance of their children.

The Episcopal Church appeared to be oriented to liberal social change as an official part of its church organization. Episcopal leaders were interested in overcoming political oppression and the slum squalor on the island. The Church had a close association with the Puerto Rican Industrial Mission that aided my research on corporate business. It was through this Mission that I came to talk with the Bishop about the relationship of the church to the resolution of the island’s problems.

The Friends (Quakers) did not have a Meeting House on the island. They met for worship in private homes. I spent time helping to initiate an exchange program through the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) that made it possible for five young Puerto Ricans to visit the U.S. for a period of four months for study and five Spanish-speaking North Americans to come to Puerto Rico for study at the same time. Following their period of study, the young people met jointly to share their experiences. The few Quakers who were on the island were interested in social change. Their concerns were directed especially toward the presence of U.S. military bases and the storage of atom bombs on the island. The young people studying in the exchange program reflected many of the religious concerns of Friends for peace.

I have selected a few experiences with each of these religious groups to illustrate how I was led to raise questions about religious life in relation to the economy.

### Catholics

#### April 11, 1974 Socialist Practice and Independent Clergy

Today I had a chance to talk with Catholic priests who are participating in the socialist movement. They had been in trouble with the Church and their Bishop had ordered them to leave their Parish. They had established a house and workplace for themselves and were now involved in social action independent of any official sanction by the Church. They claim to have “kept the Faith”. I knew no more about them and I looked forward to talking with them about what happened. If time and circumstances permitted, I wanted to spend a great deal of time with them.

Tony Lauria, a close friend of the priests, drove me to their community today. Vincent Ramos, an island visitor, went with us so that he could make arrangements to work with the priests for a week.

It took about an hour of driving through the winding roads to get to Comerio, the community where the priests live. It is a mountain town of 18,000 people. At one time, community life had centered on a few tobacco factories but they have since been shut down. Unemployment is extremely high and living conditions have been very poor there for many years. Because of the bad working conditions in Comerio, many young people migrate to Bayamon, a city just west of San Juan. Many others migrate to the U.S. About 37 percent of the population lives in slum areas and nearly 80 percent of the land is in the hands of the rich. It was within this context of poverty that these Dominican priests (three Dutch and one Puerto Rican) found themselves facing the meaning of their beliefs in Christianity.

We arrived in Comerio at about 11:00 AM. As we approached the house of the priests, I saw a white-haired, friendly-faced person looking down upon us from a second story porch. I learned that this was Cirilo Meijer, one of the priests.

Cirilo offered us a *Cuba Libre* (rum and coke) as we sat down to talk. I said I knew nothing about their work except that they were active along lines close to both the Catholic Church and the socialist movement. I hoped that he could tell me something about the origins of the group as well as its current activities and purposes. First, how did their present situation come about? Cirilo said: “We were simply thrown out of our parish in August, 1971.

Severyn Bruyn (SB): But why?

Cirilo Meijer CM: The Bishop would not tell us why. But it was clearly for political reasons. There was pressure on the Bishop. An election year was coming up.

SB: What kinds of things were you doing?

CM: We had begun an Ecumenical Movement for Social Action. There was such great poverty in the community that we simply could not sit back and perform the usual rituals of the church without any connection with the realities of the community. We decided we had to help people understand their relationship to the rest of the society. We call it “*conscientización de la comunidad*” – helping people become conscious of their own resources to get to the solution of community problems.

SB: What are some examples of your activities in this program?

CM: We had five projects. One project was for older persons, a kind of Golden Age Club. The members learn arts and crafts and ways to connect with on-going community life. Another project was *La Universidad de la Calle*. This was a kind of community college for poor students in the town. Very few students in our high school have a chance to go to the university. We wanted to provide an education for them in the context of the economic and political life here.

A third project that is still active is *Taller El Seco*, a silkscreen and graphic arts workshop. We hope to start a cooperative program of small industry as an alternative to slum life. The fourth project was a community theatre. We were organizing both a puppet theater and a live theater. We wanted to help people dramatize and interpret their life in the slum in order that it becomes more meaningful. Finally, the fifth project was recreation and rehabilitation program. We were looking for new types of work. The community was not supplying people with the jobs they needed.

SB: Some of the projects sound like typical programs in community organization. But in this political context I am sure that it was not a typical program.

CM: We were about to receive a grant of money from the Office of Economic Opportunity when we were discharged from our offices in the Parish. This meant that we could no longer receive this grant.

SB: These activities must have been uncomfortable for the town government. So, the Bishop simply sent word to you that you no longer had a parish?

CM: Right.

SB: Then what happened?

CM: Then we appealed to Rome. I don't know if you understand how things work in the Catholic Church but I will try to tell you a little of what we did.

Since we are a Dominican Order, we appealed first to our superiors in Holland. They responded and came here to see what had happened. In the meantime, the community had mobilized on our behalf. People did not want us to leave. A citizen's committee chained and padlocked the doors to our church so that no one could enter during our suspension. They were quite proper and dignified about it. They were supporting us all the way. Our parishioners were simply demanding reasons for our dismissal from the parish. The Bishop refused to give them reasons saying that canon law allows him to transfer priests without giving a reason for doing so.

SB: Then what happened?

CM: Our Superiors came here from Holland to investigate the problem. It so happened that six other priests in Yauco – on the South Coast of the island – had been dismissed at the same time from their parish. The Bishop of Ponce had taken the same action against them without giving a reason for doing so. So our Superiors were doubly concerned about what was happening.

- SB: Then your Superiors came here to talk with the Bishops of Caguas and Ponce. Did they also talk to the people in the parish?
- CM: Yes. When they arrived, I think there were 2,000 people gathered in front of the Church. But our Superiors could only talk in Dutch and English. So, a group of 30 citizens came to talk privately with them.
- SB: How was the whole question then resolved?
- CM: They accepted us in Holland. They decided we could live wherever we wished. They left the decision up to us. But other Bishops on the island did not want us. So we went to live on the far edge of the Comerió community for a while. We wanted to think together and ponder the meaning of it all. There was some suffering among us. Then we decided to stay in Comerió. We finally found this house to rent and we have now been living here about two years.
- SB: Tell me about the interests of each member of your group.
- CM: Well, William Loperena has been helping migrant workers organize themselves before they go to the U.S. to work on the farms. They have to learn how to protect themselves from American companies. Otherwise we know they will be easily exploited. They also have to decide whether going to the U.S. is really what they want to do. The Department of Labor has encouraged them and made contracts for workers to go to the states but only recently has that been declared illegal.
- Then, Francisco Loman is finishing his psychological studies. He is a counselor. But he does not charge \$30 to clients for each visit. He may charge them \$2.00 or whatever is appropriate to their level of income. I know he does not charge the poor anything.
- Alfonso Damman is in charge of our silk-screening and workshop. He is an active member of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party.
- SB: I want to talk with him if I get a chance. I am interested in the relationship of the Church to the activities of the Party. And yourself? What are you doing?
- CM: I started this Review. (Cirilo showed me a recent copy that was dedicated to Salvador Allende. It had a colorful cover of people holding hands in a circle around an emblem (OS) and the words Cristianos and Socialismo. Outside the circle of people were the words una convivencia nuava – Puertorriquena (a new life together – Puerto Rican.) In the editorial, Cirilo points out that neither “Jesus Christ Superstar” nor “Godspell” nor the Jesus Freaks,” nor the new Pentecostal Movement on the island, is the solution. In this particular journal is a Homilis by the Bishop of Cuernavaca, Mexico, Don Sergio Mandez Arceo, reflecting on the meaning of the life of Allende, poems by Pablo Neruda and other articles regarding the relation of the church to the community.
- SB: How do you support yourselves? Do you get any financial support from the Church to keep yourselves going?
- CM: No, not really. Last Christmas, our Superiors in Holland sent us \$1,000 but that is about it. We get some private gifts. We make posters and sell them. But we live on very little. We don’t worry about our rent or where our food is coming from. It was lunchtime. I was offered a share of rice and beans.

I had forgotten that I was hungry. I felt so interested in talking them that I had forgotten what time it was. At this point Alfonso Damman entered the house. I now had a special opportunity to talk directly about his interests in the Socialist Party. We began talking immediately after lunch.

SB: When did you first join the Puerto Rican Socialist Party?

AD: I guess it was about 2 years ago.

SB: How did it all come about?

AD: I was working in the Parish with people in the community, most of them young people. We came to realize that we could not really solve our problems unless we changed the structure of the government in San Juan. While I was in the Parish, I felt I could not join in the movement to change those structures. But when we were discharged from our office, I decided to join the Socialist Party. It was a decision that was discussed seriously and deeply among the four of us working in the Parish. I am now the only Party member among us but the others are sympathetic with my decision.

SB: What were some of the questions that had to be resolved in your mind before becoming a member of the Party?

AD: The Citizens Committee supporting us was upset with my decision. They were not persuaded, as I was, about the Party but they got accustomed to my decision. People would say to me: "Are you an atheist?" I said "No." I said I simply wanted to bring the presence of the Church inside the Socialist Party. (*It was clear that Father Damman was now thinking deeply about the consequences.*) The Party is now in a debate about what to do and what to say about religion. But now they cannot reject the Church totally. The issue is really alive right now in the Party.

SB: How is it alive? For example?

AD: For example, just the other day the Secretary-General of the Party, Mani Bras, asked me to perform a marriage ceremony for his daughter. She said her fiancé are members of the Party but they wanted someone in the Church to do it. I performed the ceremony this past week.

SB: Was there no difficulty with the Church or the Party?

AD: I asked permission from the Parish. There have been some differences of opinion. Then, some members of the Party protested the idea that the Secretary-General should permit a religious ceremony in his house. Atheists in the Party were opposed to the ceremony as a church function.

SB: What is the official position of the party on religion in society?

AD: The general attitude of members is that anyone can worship in whatever way they please. But I want to start with this attitude as a "position" and extend it further.

SB: How?

AD: When Fidel Castro visited Chile, some asked him his attitude toward Christians today. He responded by saying that they were needed in the socialist movement. They were vitally important to the movement. One person then said that he thought

- this was a tactical thing to say. Fidel responded again by saying that it was strategically important to the movement.
- SB: What does he mean? Can you explain it further?
- AD: Well, he means that the Church has to be taken seriously. We know that in Cuba, the Church continued to function after the revolution and continues today. Fidel himself has said that the socialist movement stands for what the church has been preaching all these years.
- SB: What would you say is the key issue in the socialist movement over the role of the church and religion in society?
- AD: The key socialist issues are first whether to permit religion to exist and second whether to help to promote it.
- SB: We must find the language to describe the relationship. We need to find the similarity and the difference between the Church and the State in society. What would you say is the most important factor in the development of society today?
- AD: The most important to be is liberation. I mean liberation of all kinds – social, economic, political, and cultural – the liberation of mankind. This is our principal objective. We simply need to apply this objective to each individual society. The rest is strategy and tactics.
- SB: How does it apply to Puerto Rico?
- AD: The strategies here are two: 1) to obtain independence and 2) to change the structures of the society. The second strategy is the more important one. We could have independence from the U.S. and still have domination. We must give top priority to changing the structures and then that of course involves independence.
- SB: How do you see the role of the Christian in this process today?
- AD: Christians need to participate before the revolution – not adapt to the change after the revolution.
- SB: I agree. Christians are needed to change the structures of the society. Tell me, how do you see nonviolence in this process? Normally, Christians do not see nonviolence as an essential principle in their lives. They usually support military institutions and violence as a “last resort.” It is seen as a necessary to keep order. How do you see it?
- AD: I see nonviolence as a tactic. Nobody likes violence but we live with it everyday. Christians who are North Americans have us surrounded with Naval Yards, Army training camps, armaments, target practice areas – atomic bombs are stored here on the island. If we tried to change the structure of government in San Juan, they would come down here and kill us. There are times when you simply have to stand up and fight for your rights.

I thought of what Gandhi had once said about the “passive resisters,” that it was better to stand up and fight courageously with violence rather than to turn coward and run from the scene.

By this time, two comrades had moved closer to our conversation. Vincent Ramos, the visitor who had driven up with me, and Cirilo, the other priest, were sensing the turn of the conversation. Vincent then asked Alfonso if he thought Christ had committed any

violence. Alfonso replied by saying that he overturned the tables in the temples. I then said that those tables were material things. They were symbolic but I did not see that he had injured or killed anyone.

Cirilo entered the conversation at this point and said with great feeling: “Sometimes you simply have to say NO to evil.” And he swung his arm forcibly across in front of us.

Alfonso then said: “The last time the National Guard was called out against striking workers, 400 national guardsmen refused to go.

SB: That is nonviolent action!

AD: (Turning around my question). Tell me what your strategies are!

SB: I feel it is important to cut down the excessive controls exercised by foreign corporations. That would require collective nonviolent strategy and tactical operations.

AD: And how would you get the companies to stop controlling us?

SB: There are ways to require corporations to become re-chartered with constitutions on the island. There are ways to decentralize their authority and power. Some of us have been studying this problem in the states...

AD: Your studies are a luxury. People are starving here. There is no time for that here.\*

CM: You are not living here. You live in the United States. You are not part of the colony. Look at these figures. (Cirilo showed me statistics on the arms sales and U.S. corporate control in Bolivia.)

I could not say anymore; I was not living permanently in the island. I was there to learn. I felt their anger and their frustration with the “imperialist system.” It brought riches to the relatively few and left the rest in poverty. They felt the pain, the fears, the hostilities of the people with whom they were living.

Alfonso told me of a man he knew who carried a gun with him constantly. He used to set the gun on top of the refrigerator at times and Alfonso said he was afraid some day it would fall off, when the door opened, and kill someone. Alfonso said he himself was afraid of violence but when the time comes, he was ready to fight to the end. “Look,” he said, “We’re talking about something the rich will never permit – sharing their property. They will never give up their property without committing violence first on the people who seek to take it and redistribute it. They will try to kill you. Right? Then what do you do?”

---

\* See Alfonso’s reply to me after showing him my Journal Notes on our meeting.

Alfonso had said that the Church had power in Latin America. It has power to persuade and convince the people that the military state is legitimate. So then, could it not also use its power to help people on the road to economic justice and a new society?

I agreed. But its power has been hidden behind the guns of the State. I thought out loud now “Why does the Church hide its great spiritual power?”

Tony Lauria walked in the room at this moment and said it was time to go back to Rio Piedras. Our discussion had moved to a high point. It was reaching that place where we all lived. It was beyond Puerto Rico and the United States.

I had seen some of the posters made in the workshop and asked if I could buy some. I had found the picture-poster of Camilo Torres especially moving. I mentioned this fact and Alfonso told us they had debated how to draw the figure. The issue was whether to draw his picture primarily as a guerilla or as a priest. They finally decided to draw him as a priest with a shadow in the background of himself standing with a rifle over his back. People had to know that he was a priest first and a guerilla fighter second but, he was both.

I thanked Cirilo and Alfonso for their hospitality. I told them I was learning the spirit of the struggle here and hoped that we might have the opportunity of talking again. I said my wife would be visiting me for a weekend and that she would want to meet them. They said they would be delighted to see her and they looked forward to our next meeting.

As we were leaving, I was introduced to Wilfredo Lopez Montañez who would be driving back with us to Rio Piedras. We talked about the *Rio de Plata* (River of Silver) that flowed deep in the valley below us. The road circled around the hills as we became increasingly quiet among ourselves, gazing down at the streams below. At one time El Rio was a mighty rushing current of water. It was now a little stream. The former river had left a bed of great boulders and rocks.

I felt a continuing interest over what was not discussed and of the emotion that had entered into our confrontation with the realities of revolution. I was concerned that we had not brought ourselves to a conclusion. But there could be no final conclusions.

I looked again at the huge rock-boulders below in the riverbed. They stood tall, immense, and solid in the river valley. They were signs to me now. I thought that in our talks we had made no reference to spiritual matters as would be customary in the sanctuary of the church. We had not spoken of a rock that was firmer than anything we could know in this world. The Evangelists on this island sing to a “rock of ages,” a spiritual concept with which I have felt kinship.

Our car came to an abrupt halt in front of the offices of *Claridad*, the Puerto Rican Socialist Party newspaper. Tony Lauria got out of the car to pick up a paper. He opened it and looked at it for a while. I looked over his shoulder and saw a picture of a man that looked familiar to me. It was next to a news article about a man acquitted today of the charge of a bombing at the Cerromar Hotel, the night of May 20, 1972, while the Miss U.S.A contest was in progress. The bombing did no injury to anyone. It was planted to stop the televising of a show that some protestors believed to be another symbol of North American interests and controls over Puerto Rico.

Suddenly, I realized that the man who was just acquitted was Wilfredo Lopez Montanez, the man who was sitting in front of me in the car. I discovered then that Lopez Montanez was a Puerto Rican Socialist Party member and head of the community committee in Comerió. He had been falsely charged of the bombing. He had lost his job because of the government's accusation. He was now looking for another job to support his family.

I was now again in the world of political reality. The religious world seems reserved for Church on Sunday morning. It is the secular world continues during the remainder of the week and defines our everyday world. Unemployment is the reality in Comerió. Lopez Montañez was out of work. He had to find a job so his family could eat.<sup>3</sup>

I wondered how the church had treated other clergy when they became political dissidents. I learned of a most unusual method of treatment when I talked with Bishop Antuillio Parilla, a Jesuit who had been critical of capitalism and had joined the independence movement on the island. This action brought him into direct conflict with the Church hierarchy but since he himself was a Bishop, there was some debate as to what to do with him.

On March 27, I talked with him. I found him to be a very intelligent and sensitive man. He said he wrote articles disturbing to Church officials. The Church finally found a "solution." He was made Bishop of Ucles, an old See in Algeria that the Church no longer maintains. He was made titular head of the See without any specific duties in the Puerto Rican Church. In this way, he was allowed to stay on the island and continue his independent arguments without any authority within the island Church.

Other clergy found ways to work on political action through the charitable channels of the Church. I found some clergy working with Church support in small communities, including a famous slum in San Juan.

April 18, 1974 *Concientizaciòn* in a slum called *La Perla*

I have an appointment this morning at the *Centro de Concientizaciòn* with Rev. Rernando Rodriguez, Jose Luis Reyes, Armando Ravira, and Father Girard to talk about "cultural action" in Puerto Rico.

Paulo Freire, a Brazilian educator, formulated the concepts of cultural action and *conscientizaciòn*. Freire employed them to explain a method of teaching literacy to the

poor while at the same time raising the consciousness of participants about their relation to the larger society. I was told that “Trained persons help initiate this method when people are in poverty and have very little formal education. People examine the language they use to depict their daily life but the process extends toward an analysis of their whole culture. It is a method of community self-study that leads toward social action. People become conscious of the infrastructure of political life and the myths that explain it. It has many different variations in its application by different people in Latin American countries.

My wife came with me for our appointment at 9:30 AM. We did not know the exact location of the offices of Las Curas who managed the Center. We got lost in the winding street corridors. I was partly glad that we were lost because I had the opportunity to see something of the intricate layout of the community. I was told later that it takes considerable time to know the people well enough to feel confident about walking through it; it can be a dangerous place for outsiders. The community is clearly an ecological maze with closely-knit alleys and by-ways where people live densely together.

We finally located El Centro at 10:15 AM and we were pleased to meet members of the staff waiting to talk with us. I began to speak in Spanish and continued for the remainder of the morning. I had expected to talk in English with Fernando Rodríguez at this appointment but I sensed the concern of the group as a whole that all work be based in the language of the island.

They asked what brought me here and I told them that I was here to teach sociology and also learn about social problems and social change on the island. I had some ideas about methods of social change but I was not yet sure how they all applied to Puerto Rico. I said that I thought the method of cultural action was a significant part of the process of change and I wanted to learn about its possibilities here.

They said: “How do you think this method is part of a method of change? What are *your* ideas on methods of change?” (I did not expect to be put “on the spot,” but I realized later how much this was part of the method of cultural action. So I answered.)

“I do not think that community studies by themselves can do the whole job of changing the political system. The whole job is ‘top-down, down up, and middle out.’ A top-down process involves re-constituting and decentralizing the corporate system as part of a “change strategy.” I call it “constitutionalizing” the corporation. It is a top-down process because executives and legislators are involved in the process.

The method of cultural action, on the other hand, is a down-up process because you are working in localities where people are at the bottom of the system. They have been accustomed to being poor and out-of-power. Then there is a middle-out process of expanding consciousness and responsibility of unions and workers in corporations. They move toward positions of self-management and corporations become linked to the larger purposes of the society. I think ‘community action’ is a basic part of this whole process of change. All people can become creative participants in social change; they do not need to react to changes made by others. But, I came here to learn about what is happening in Puerto Rico. How did things get started in La Perla?”

One member replied: “We began six years ago with 15 people. We were working along some of the same lines that Paulo Freire had already developed but we did not know it. Then, in March 1972, Fernando Rodríguez, who was coordinating the team in La Perla, invited a group of people who were interested in the pedagogy of Freire to come here to give a training course. The course was led by Alberto Moreno Cornejo from Ecuador and over 30 person attended. At the end of the course, we decided that in the face of the reality here that we could not remain neutral. We saw the necessity of organizing for a struggle to change that reality. We agreed to have local and regional meetings to reflect on what we each were doing and to plan forms of action.”

SB: (Me) Do you now have action-projects going in different communities?

GM:(Group member) There are ten different communities that are active now in their own forms of work in concientizaciòn. But each one is different and each is developing in the light of the realities they perceive in their own locality.

SB: Do you hold any common objectives?

GM: We all have the common Concern of Christian humanism.

SB: I would say there are many basic values that are buried in that concept which are yet to be realized by all of us.

GM: Each community studies its own ‘rules’ of living together. And each community develops its own techniques of study.

SB: Have you had many other training sessions in the pedagogy of Freire to keep in touch with each other and also to train new people in the work?

GM: We began holding “workshops in concientizaciòn” with the assistance of Jose Luis Reyes back in November 1972. This first conference lasted six days and was divided into two sessions of three days each. We are now holding about two workshops a month. We all work as consultants to different communities. People come from different places to join in training sessions. Then, if there is a strong interest and common values, a new group is formed as part of the program. Last year all the groups came together for a joint conference.

SB: Are you united into a kind of federation?

GM: No, we simply meet with one another informally.

SB: How are you financed? How do you get supported as consultants?

GM: We are funded from the Missionary Servants of the Most Holy Trinity whose offices are in Washington, D.C.

SB: Is there a group now active in *concientizaciòn* in this community of La Perla?

GM: We have a group meeting every Wednesday night. We are trying to figure out the meaning of that “Wall” that stands between La Perla and San Juan. It divides the community from people outside. A few people come in regularly from the outside and that is partly what stimulated this idea. The wall is more than physical. The members are all being very frank and open about it. Everyone seems to know their reality very well; it’s the other person’s reality that is hard to know.

SB: La Perla gives one the impression of being a tough and tight little community. Do the police venture much down here?

GM: They may come down here after everything is over. They don’t patrol here. They stay outside. Every once in a while 7 or 8 undercover agents come down together on a raid for drugs. Drugs are heavy here.

SB: What forms of social action have been taken by local groups through this program of concientizaciòn?

GM: The whole method is a form of action. Local people begin by talking with a few interested people about the method of study. They call a larger meeting in the community to explain the purpose of the group. The group may then discover certain problems that they want to correct. They then invite the press and present the facts to the public. If nothing is done, they begin to put pressure on the Mayor. They may decide to form a picket line. In these ways, they begin to become aware of the realities that exist at the community level. But their studies show more than the average citizen knows about the relationships of the community to the society.

I asked if I could sit with a particular community group to observe more closely the process of study. They gave me the name of a group in Cataño that was planning a session next Wednesday night. They said: “This group is facing a real pollution problem so you will see a special focus to this work.”

It was lunchtime and the hour for us to leave. I thanked them for their help and asked if someone could lead us outside through the maze of passageways and doorways.

On the way out, I said to Father Girard: “How much do you pay to maintain an office here?” He said: “\$40.00 a month. We are all squatters here.” I hoped to come back and “squat” with them another time. Few places on the island could merit more time, concern, and sensitive participation.

### Concluding Thoughts

On the way home, I thought about the different pictures that people have of this ocean-side slum. For some people it was a closely-knit community where people could find friendly relationships. For others, it was “the wealthiest slum in the city” because of

all the television aerials on top of the houses. For many tourists, it was a picturesque part of old San Juan, like El Morro. For still others, it was a cancer in the city.

Here people were trapped into dependency, welfare, drugs and crime. The Capitol is not too far away but no political leader dares to eradicate this sickness. This local system feeds off the larger system of drugs and crime.

I thought again about the method of *concientizaciòn*. It seemed to be vital as part of a process which respects individuality and community decision-making. It begins where people think and live in their own localities. When the larger system is treated at the same time, it can open the way for self-development. If there is no top-down approach to change, however, the method could remain at the level of ideas or minor local reforms. The question is how this local program can become instrumental in a national program that is conscious of the need for societal change.

#### May 16, 1974 Bridging the Chasm Between Capitalism and Socialism

Tonight I talk with Fr. Toño Gonzàles. The purpose of our meeting is to discuss the ideas of his close friend, Fr. Ernesto Cardenal, a major poet in Latin America. Cardenal is also a socialist who wrote a candid book about his experiences in Cuba in 1970. It became controversial in Puerto Rico. He lives in Nicaragua on a jungle island within a great lake. He has a parish there among people who are desperately poor. He writes and reads avidly and performs churchly duties on his island.

When Ernesto Cardenal came to the University last month, the auditorium was packed with students, faculty and visitors. There were four rows of students sitting on the stage behind him at the speaker's platform. The seats and aisles were filled all the way back to the entrance. He spoke directly and clearly, answering one question after another. Students talked to him about oppression at the University, the role of Cuba in Latin America, the relation between Christianity and socialism.

"There is no contradiction," he said, "between the Bible and Socialism. The early Christians were all socialists."

"Are you a pacifist?"

"No. But it is important to understand that the nonviolent movement does not conflict with the socialist movement. It complements it."

Ernesto Cardenal has pure white hair and a flowing white beard, although only in his late forties. His face has a ruddy look to it as though he were ageless, a man of wisdom. There was a special attraction to him for all of us who went there. This was due of course to his person but there was also something more in the whole setting. I had a feeling that the connection of socialism to Christianity was creating dynamic in the audience. The creative tension in these beliefs of socialism and Christianity was attracting the interest of students. The integration of these beliefs were symbolized and expressed in the poetry of this man.

Fr. Toño Gonzales was so attracted to Ernesto Cardenal and his beliefs that he decided to go live with him for a year in the jungles of Nicaragua. Toño Gonzales is a native Puerto Rican who was “precocious” as a child. In fact, he was too precocious for his relatives to permit him to remain on the island for his higher education. He was sent to Harvard for a bachelor’s degree and then to Europe where he studied comparative literature. He mastered four languages in Europe before he realized that he was forgetting his own original Spanish. He came back to Puerto Rico to live as a simple priest.

I spent over three hours talking with Toño talking about many things: poetry, Cardenal’s life, Puerto Rican politics, local humor, and linguistics. It became a warm personal evening as we talked about our deepest beliefs. I was interested in how a man like Toño Gonzales could live with the conflicting identities of Puerto Rican life.

“I am a Puerto Rican, a Christian, an academic, and a socialist.”

I wondered how all those identities could fit together. I said that I was trying to figure out the meaning of the different dimensions of religion and socialism. Perhaps he could tell me a few things. “For example,” I said, “the socialist movement cannot tolerate the deprivation of one class over another class. It demands that we organize our life in society in such a way that there is real justice and equity among people. This is certainly a Christian message. Yet we know that Christians may live in poverty and find inner happiness. This fact would seem to draw people away from the politics of change. It seems to conflict with the socialism as a political movement. Yes, how can you have asceticism and political action at the same time? If you are an ascetic you could let yourself be exploited.”

(Toño Gonzales has lived on both levels: among the rich and powerful as well as among the poor and powerless. He knows people intimately in all classes; he has lived at the bottom and at the top of the social hierarchy of Puerto Rico. He is a close friend of the former governors (Luis) Ferrè and (Muños) Marìn. He grew up with the former secretary of the Community Party. He knows personally the present Governor Hernandez Colòn. He knew the *independentistas* who went to the U.S. Congress, fired at Senators and then were imprisoned. He is a close friend and former college roommate of Mari Bras, General Secretary of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. He was a good friend of Camilo Torres. He is now close to the Archbishop of San Juan. He writes articles for him. He is to give a lecture tomorrow on Christianity and Socialism at the St. Ignatius Church.)

How can a person live with so many divergent lines of friendship?

“When things get dark here,” he said, “I go down to the cemetery in Old San Juan and sing over the graves of my compatriots. Some people think I am crazy but Pedro Abizu Campos (a revolutionary *independentista*) is buried there along with all the aristocratic families of Puerto Rico. I believe we are really all one family. Then I do not need a psychiatrist. When I am finished singing, I am ready for a new day.”

## **2. Christian Scientists: Governance of the Spirit**

March 25, 1974 Revolution and Reality (afternoon)

Today I found time to break away from my work at the Environmental Quality Board to visit the Christian Science Reading room. I hoped to learn how Christian businessmen could contribute to environmental pollution and still hold to their religious beliefs about the sacredness of life. The religious beliefs of Christian Scientists have always interested me apart from my current interest in finding the ground that underlies religious and economic values.

I met Juan Tangui, a Christian Science practitioner who is interested in talking to me about the teachings of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy. I wanted to talk with him during my break in the day from studying environmental pollution. The offices of the Environmental Quality Board and the Christian Science Church are only a few city blocks apart.

I spent 40 minutes reading the book by Mary Baker Eddy, Science and Health, and the Bible, according to the custom of church members. As I was leaving the Reading Room, I spoke to Juan Tangui about the things I was learning. I said it was difficult for me to grasp the “irreality” of the material world. The material world seemed so immediate and clear to the mind through our senses. How was I to interpret my earthly interests, my

physical needs and even my environmental concerns about pollution? They were all real and compelling in my life.

He said simply: “Spiritualize them.” He went on to discuss how the material world was really an error of the mortal mind. It simply did not exist in reality.

I said that idea was incredible but I was interested in it. If it were true that matter did not exist, however, how could I continue my work on environmental pollution? It was clear to me that material products from business were poisoning our physical environment. I said that it was peculiar that there are Christian Scientists who are working in business corporations that are producing the material pollution that I am fighting. This statement showed both my anger and my disappointment. It even showed through my slow Spanish.

At that crucial moment, several visitors entered the Reading Room asking for information. I told Juan I would talk more with him later about this.

It was in the afternoon when I had finished getting information on the environmental problems that I made the connection between the revolutionary message about materialism in Mary Baker Eddy’s Science and Health and its counterpart in the revolutionary message in Capital by Karl Marx. Marx claimed that under fully developed Communism, the ideal would merge with nature and the human spirit would prevail. Mary Baker Eddy focused on the individual and the development of a spiritual reality in the mind. Karl Marx focused on the economic order and the development of a human reality in society. This thought pursued me as I copied down the following note from Mary Baker Eddy on “Reality”:

It is not wise to take a halting and halfway position or to expect to work equally with Spirit and matter, Truth and error. There is but one way – namely, God and His idea – which leads to a spiritual being. The scientific government of the body must be attained through the divine Mind. It is impossible to gain control over the body in any other way. On this fundamental point, timid conservatism is absolutely inadmissible. Only through radical reliance on Truth can scientific healing power be realized.

This is indeed a revolutionary position in the church. It is comparable in its radical demands to that of the revolutionary socialist in material politics.

I thought about how Christians work five days a week in a business to make material profits in their own self-interest and then can speak of the sins of materialism on

Sunday. On Sunday the pursuit of self-interest is placed second to the interest of others or at least to sharing things equally. I thought about connections between worlds.

Is it possible that Christian theology and Socialist thought find a common base? In the language of Mary Baker Eddy, could the “ages of the Sense” be brought one step closer to their conclusion? In her terms, can the spiritual life be realized in the context of material world? In the language of Karl Marx, can the dialectic between the material and the ideal worlds be hastened to its destined synthesis? Could it then be said, “For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth.” (Isaiah)?

March 27 “Take away Wealth, Fame, and Social organization...”

I went to the Christian Science Church this evening to observe and participate in their testimonies. I saw Juan Tangui before the meeting began and spoke briefly with him. I said I had been following my assigned readings very carefully in Science and Health and the Bible. I had been learning a great deal. There were also many ideas I could not yet understand. For example, it was difficult for me to think of a God who could not know pain or suffering. “Yet it is true,” he said, “Jesus knew suffering and pain as the Son of God. But the Christ, who knew God directly, did not know pain or suffering.”

I went into the sanctuary and waited for the service to begin. At 8:00 P.M. two persons entered at the front and began reading in Spanish and English alternatively from the Bible and Science and Health. Following these readings, the meeting was opened for testimonies to be offered in either Spanish or English.

Four people spoke. After the last person gave his testimony, I got up and spoke in Spanish. I said that I was a new person on the island and also a visitor in this Church but I had the opportunity of studying the book written by Mary Baker Eddy. I had not yet completed reading it but I was finding her words bearing truth. I saw the book as reflecting Christ’s work. I was there to give thanks for that of God among us that works so marvelously and mysteriously in this world.

After the testimonial session, I had occasion to talk with one member of the Church to learn more about “beliefs and practice.” I asked whether the Church as a whole body had any social relationship or feeling of responsibility to act within the larger society.

I knew the question was a terrible one for them. It was a personal question. My own knowledge about society had to connect with the life of the Church. His answer was as follows:

This Church does not engage in any political activities. In fact, that goes for the church as a whole. I know of no single church that would attempt to get involved in politics. The church is for individuals. Some churches that get involved in politics do not know what religion is about. Religion is concerned with the spiritual life of individuals.

Later, I asked my friend how the Church had entered into his own life. He said,

I would not be here talking with you now if it had not been for the Church. My life had fallen apart. I had reached the end of everything. I had my pistol out and I had loaded it...”

We looked at each other directly and clearly. He knew I understood that he came to know Christ through this experience. My own testimony bore witness.

#### Late Evening

This evening as I read the words of Mary Baker Eddy, I see passages that point back to the age of individualism. At the same time, there are other passages that point toward a spiritual evolution.

“In the midst of imperfection, perfection is seen and acknowledged only by degrees. The ages must slowly work up to perfection.” (p. 233 – my underlining). I read further and thought to myself: If her teachings were followed seriously, they would challenge the existence of the institutional church today. In my judgment, much of her writing reflects the orientation of “the early Christian church.”

Take away wealth, fame, and social organizations, which weigh not one jot in the balance of God, and we get clearer views of Principle. Break up cliques, level wealth with honesty, let work be judged according to wisdom and we get better views of humanity. (p. 239)

She was saying in effect: If the members of the Church – not just the clergy – were to really take up the Cross and follow Jesus – living and teaching among the poor, the insane, and oppressed minority of society – there would be no need for the Church.

Today, the issue is how to move in that direction collectively. The Church is a collective body. The question is whether large corporations can act with sacrifice and loving care in the same manner that individuals can act with sacrifice and loving care.

March 29      Materialism vs Spiritualism, vs. Socialism

Today I had my reckoning with Juan Tangui. He has been so clear in his mind about spiritual matters. I hesitated to confront him with political matters. Nevertheless, I arrived at the Christian Science Reading Room at 10:20 A.M. I told Juan Tangui that I had two questions to ask him. We sat down and I decided to go directly to the question that was most crucial. The discussion went as follows:

- S.B. I have a question about the material world. When is it right to withdraw from it and when is it right to participate in it? For example, the practice of prostitution and the use of drugs are activities very close to our senses and the material world. I would assume they are considered types of activities in which Christian Scientists should withdraw and not participate.
- J.T. That is right. This also includes rejecting the use of alcohol and cigarettes.
- S.B. Now, what I want to know is whether it is also important to withdraw from the business system. The business system is based on material interests and incentives. Thus its activities perpetuate the very opposite of that which is taught in Science and Health.
- J.T. Absolutely right. No Christian Scientist would participate in business.

I exclaimed my disbelief. This was not true. I told that I knew Christian Scientists who were wealthy businessmen. It took at least five minutes to unravel our confusion in language. Tangui had thought I was still referring to drugs and prostitution as a business in which no Christian Scientist would participate. Tangui could not believe I was including business in the same category as these other materially oriented activities until I mentioned the names of specific companies. Silence. I then tried to make the distinction still more sharp. In the process, I changed the question.

- S.B. Can I be a Christian Scientist and a socialist at the same time?
- J.T. There are no Christian Scientists who are also socialists.
- S.B. What do you think about Russia as a socialist system?
- J.T. There is no democracy in Russia.
- S.B. How about China and Cuba?
- J.T. The same. The Greatest country in the world today is the United States.
- S.B. Do you mean that democracy could not exist in a socialist country?
- J.T. Look. Democracy exists when everyone participates and no one dominates. *(Tangui then went into a detailed description of how a company distributes its earnings between owners and workers. His purpose was to show me how it is a fair system even if it were not perfect).*
- S.B. Are the stockholders engaged in the productive system? Are they not like welfare recipients?
- J.T. Let me tell you something. The Bible says you cannot make judgments about anyone.
- S.B. I understand that. But you are making judgments about a system involving prostitutes and drug addicts. Why can't you make a judgment about people in the capitalist system? You are also making negative judgments about the socialist system. It seems to me that you can separate the roles people take in that system from seeing them as persons in that system.

After some discussion, Juan Tangui concluded that it could be possible to have democracy under socialism but he has yet to see it happen. However, it was clear that Tangui's interests were focused on the spiritual life of the individual. He was not about to think with me about "politics" much less the broader issues of "dialectical materialism." Finally, I said: "The power of the spiritual message coming through this grand woman Mary Baker Eddy, has carried me deep into religious studies. My own study of her work will not stop."

Juan Tangui saw that I was about to leave and suggested that I repeat a prayer after him:

Gracias Senor, por haberme dad, entendimiento y comprension, para que nos Amenos unos a otros. Como tu nos amas por medio de Cristo.

I said Adios to Juan Tangui and went to catch a bus back to Rio Piedras.

I sat in the back of the bus and began to ponder over some of the things we had just said. Suddenly I saw everyone in the bus looking out to the left as though something important was happening. I looked out just in time to see a huge crowd of students gathered in front of the Inter-American University. Some of them were throwing oranges at the passing cars. It appeared as though a fight was developing on the street. The bus moved on.

In front of me sat a most distinguished white haired gentleman with a clipped moustache. He looked very much like a North American and so I asked him if he spoke English.

Passenger: Of course I do, goddammit. I speak four languages. Whadyawanna know?

S.B. I wondered if you could tell me what was happening at the Inter-American University. I couldn't see clearly what was going on.

P. How should I know?! *They* don't even know what they're doing. Goddammit, they ought to shut it down. The problem is all over this island. They ought to shut down the whole educational system here.

He spoke so loudly that the whole back half of the bus could hear him. Next to him was a husky dark-skinned Puerto Rican. He asked the Gentleman: "What good would it be to shut down the university?"

P. They couldn't make it any worse, I'll tell you. (Again, speaking to me in English) Look, we just sent them \$850,000. They're biting the hand that feeds them.

S.B. You mean we sent it to them through federal agencies, like OEO, Social Security...

- P. For Christ's sake, 800,000 of them are on welfare. They don't even have to pay taxes.
- S.B. Are you in business here?
- P. Yeah, but I'm getting out. I'm leaving. I've re-chartered three times but this is the last. I'm going back to Honolulu.
- S.B. Well, at least you can say the weather is good here. You can count on it being steady.
- P. I tell you there is a vicious undercurrent here. It is going to destroy this island. The white haired gentleman then got up to leave. The dark-skinned man next to him looked at me and said, "They don't give us money for nothing. They are getting' something out of it."

I thought I heard Mary Baker Eddy in the background saying something about the destruction of materialism: "Take Away Wealth, Fame...which weight not one jot in the balance of God."

#### April 2 A Day of Spiritual Contemplation

I drove out to a nearby community of San Juan this morning to hear a lecture by Irving Torres on the agricultural problems of the island. In the afternoon I am scheduled to talk to participants in AFSC's Reciprocal Youth Project about social scientific methods applied to their studies here. Both activities are scheduled to take place on the country grounds of an Episcopal high school.

I have a feeling that I am not going to be completely participating in either session in the morning or the afternoon. As I drove through the countryside, I began to contemplate the meaning of Science and Health. I thought: "The key to science and health is not to withdraw from the physical world but rather to be very much in touch with it. The challenge is to be in spiritual touch with physical and organic things, not to retreat into abstract ideas. To "spiritualize" the material world means that we love that world and help transform it. If we can do this, we participate in the great creative process that continues siempre.

I am now sitting here on this hill by the countryside Episcopal school waiting for Irving Torres to arrive and looking at an array of trees before me. I see the Australian Pine to my right, the Queen of Flowers to my left, an African Tulip and an Avocado tree straight ahead. What a fantastic island of organic life!

If people move in the path of Mary Baker Eddy, all things are spiritual. Do I say that these beautiful trees do not exist? Only the absolute Truth and Love of God exist! But

what is to be said of what I see before me? Are these trees of no value? I suppose the answer is that these trees are only approximations to the Truth. They represent only a dimension of truth and beauty and therefore they are unreal when one can see what lies behind them. These trees point to a Truth that we are being led to witness. I asked myself: If Mary Baker Eddy denied a reality of the organic world in her revolutionary vision of the Spirit, would she accept this world in all its truth, beauty, variety, grandeur, color, form, quality, as an approximation to – or as an allegory of – the world of the Spirit?

If Mary Baker Eddy were alive today, would she accept the idea of stages of spiritual development? Do the human senses become less prominent in guiding our lives, as we grow more spiritually mature? Do people become increasingly spiritual in the evolution of society? Would she recognize “stages of disengagement” of the five senses (as the controlling factor of human consciousness) in a gradual spiritual transformation of human mankind?

What do Christian Scientists mean by the “Eternal”? Is it possible to know history and at the same time to know that there is no history? Is it possible to comprehend an Eternal Spirit and at the same time realize the factor of time in human development? Can people understand Eternity in the Now and still remember concrete things of the past? Can we understand the Timeless and also the continuity of the ages?

I am now looking at a hibiscus flower. I find myself returning to concrete nature in the midst of my meditation. My intuition tells me to move into matter, love the natural world. Move in not away. If we do, we overcome its control over us. We then can interpret things in all sorts of ways: sensibly, intuitively, rationally, scientifically, poetically, and spiritually. Perhaps it is by knowing the spirit of the hibiscus plant that I can begin to see all the other forms of reality. Perhaps Mary Baker Eddy means that the material world (my hibiscus flower) has no reality when perceived by my mind. Does it gain its true place in my mind rather than outside it?

I thought the philosophy of idealism in both socialist and Christian thought.

#### My Hibiscus (what do I see?)

I first see and feel the shape of the lower. As the green stem shoots from the plant toward the flower, there is a star shaped formation with six points. These star shaped points are green and narrowly formed. They serve as the base for the next vase-like container with five star points. This vase-like container now introduces

the brilliant red flower in all its glory. There are five flower petals that thrust upward and then outward in a circle. The underside of each petal has a felt-like shimmer and the topside has a soft-like quality to it. The petal itself is altogether smooth and delicate with many tiny ribs within it causing me to see deeper red lines – almost like the wrinkles in my skin as I looked at them. The dramatic quality of the flower lies at its center from which a long stem shoots skyward. That stem in turn has an array of tiny yellow dots. What are they doing there? Now at the very top of this stem are five final stems with black dots at their end. It is really an incredible phenomenon.

The flower reminds me of rocket explosions in the sky at night on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. The star-studded complexes of light explode into particles in the black night and then re-explode as they fall ground ward and are eventually extinguished. I have always wanted to capture and hold that ecstatic sight of fireworks which motivates the watching crowd to cry out with “Oh’s” and “Ahs.” Well, here it is all captured for me in intricate detail before my very eyes. It is a permanent picture of an explosion. And I have the opportunity of enjoying it as long as I wish! What a blessing. This hibiscus is beautiful outside, not eternal. Yet do I see something eternal in it, a signal of transcendent Beauty?

The spiritual ideas of Mary Baker Eddy are like those of Guatama Buddha. They point toward the impermanence of things in this world, toward a Truth behind the truth, a Reality behind the reality. Can we say with Buddha and Mary Baker Eddy that the material world, in all its variety, is a symbol of what lies behind it? \*

Will my description of the hibiscus plant tell me something about the development of Puerto Rico, a land of material beauty?<sup>4</sup>

Is there a “spiritual evolution” along with a physical evolution of the material world? The history the world and humankind says that there will be a New Age. Even though we cannot yet comprehend it, we can imagine it. It is good scientific theory as that latency existing in all things.

When we were just plants and vegetables – if I can go back in time a bit – the sounds, colors, and shapes of what we now know in our human world today were not conscious to us. Even during our recent past as being the fish and the snake, we did not

---

\* This section on religion illustrates the complexities of researching life between such different institutions. I am studying what might be called “societal development.” The beliefs of the church led me toward the symbolic life of existence, the inner life, while politics and business lead toward the outer life, the practical meaning of life in reality. There was a strain in the differences of these institutional beliefs. These separate beliefs were in tension and part of the causes for change on the Island.

have the same multi-sensory awareness. Each epoch of life has revealed a new sense of reality.

Why should we believe that we are at the end of the evolutionary process of history? Why should we not realize with Mary Baker Eddy and the Buddha that a new “sense” is developing among us? Why should we not anticipate that this new “sense” would reveal to us a new level of reality? Why should we not believe that we are approaching the end of human development – and the beginning of a new age based on what Christian Scientists today call Truth and Love? “The ages must slowly work up to perfection.”

### **3. The Children of God: Personal Self-Reliance**

March 23, 1974 Idolatry and Love

I spoke tonight with several members of *Hijos de Dios* about the letters that Moses David writes to them from London. Moses David (affectionately called Moe) is their leader and the founder of the Church. His letters are translated into Spanish and then distributed locally by the members of the community. I said that I had some differences of opinion with some of the things MOE said and I wanted to talk with them about it. I could not join them in their communal activities unless they knew where I stood on certain matters.

I sensed the delicacy of criticizing MOE’s ideas with these members of the community. The letters of MOE seemed to represent a contemporary Bible.

I realized that I was in a kind of “love atmosphere” where people had great feelings for one another. I said that I was concerned above all that we be able to talk critically about ideas and still love one another, otherwise our discussion of ideas is of little value. I then spoke to them critically about MOE’s ideas regarding inequity between the sexes, different sexual practices, the issue of a catastrophe befalling the U.S., and other matters which MOE had so directly discussed in his letters to the group.

The members of the community were clearly dependent upon their leader and prophet, Moses David. In their words, the relationship was “heavy.” But they told me that MOE wants them to think independently. They knew that other community groups including Puerto Rican socialists had criticized them for their naiveté or gullibility in the

face of political realities. I said these other groups were also dependent in many ways upon the beliefs of their own “founders” and leaders. They were also dependent upon contemporary communications, encyclicals, and letters from central offices of their organization. The members of other movements also have a great capacity for “followership.” In fact, so does the general public have an enormous faith in following their contemporary leaders.

When I first read some of MOE’s letters I was quite concerned about the direction of the group. I even said quietly to myself, “No wonder parents hire detectives to steal away their children from them.” Then I thought about how many of these parents are living in their own worlds built on myths. I knew from talking with the young members of the community that their parents condoned the killing of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese because their leaders – President Nixon and President Johnson – had said that the massive U.S. bombings were necessary, done to save democracy. My young friends said these political policies of the U.S. sickened them. It was one reason they came to join this religious community.

I decided that insanities in this world are all around us. They are legion and cling to us. We need less judgment and more intelligent participation in community life in a manner that eliminates these insanities – wherever they may be.

They had asked me to talk about my work. I debated in my mind how best to approach it. I said my main concern tonight was to discuss with them the question of whether it was possible to love corporately just as we were called upon to love one another individually. I asked them if they knew much about the way business corporations were organized. I said it was my own personal burden to study how these corporate bodies can operate. My concern was whether corporate groups of all kinds could cultivate a basis for people to love one another. My question was whether we could love another outside a religious community. If this idea had merit, we needed a language to talk about it. The language of the business corporation today is not the language of Jesus. Nor is the corporate church. They said, “Amen, brother.”

Furthermore, I wondered whether people could love corporately today in systems of hierarchy. It would be hard for corporate members to express the life of Jesus directly to one another in a formal bureaucracy. I have thought the corporation would somehow have

to be decentralized into communal groups in which all members knew one another well enough that they could act with a deep feeling of respect. But I said local “communality” was not enough. Each local group would have to establish social links with other corporate bodies also communally oriented. I said it looked to me like it would really be a tough job but it appeared as though that was exactly what they (*Hijos de Dios*) were saying through their personal example. The question is: How can you get a whole society be organized in a similar fashion?

They replied “right on”. Their communal group was organized as a living example of an alternative way of life. I said, “Are there links between the great work of Karl Marx of the last century and what we know to be the incredible life of Jesus Christ. I think we need a bridge between what we see as the external controls of corporations in society and the inner life of people. We needed to create an external organization which encourages personal growth and self governance.” I said, “Marx seems to draw us *outward* to change the organization of society and Jesus draws us *inward* to change ourselves.”

“The corporate problem – relating our *outer order* with our *inner order* must be solved in the business system: with the telephone company, the petroleum industry, the petrochemicals, and all the other corporate types which had grown up on the island. It seems to me that there are as many types of corporations as there are types of plants and trees on the island. And they are in great need of pruning if we are to survive. Our problem as Christians is to find how to change the political order so that the divine love can show through it.”

They said: “We understand.” They had faith in what I was saying.

I was getting late. We decided to talk more about these matters at a later meeting. It would be their turn to tell me more about what they were doing.

#### March 25 The Creation of a Play: Neighborhood Governance (Evening)

This evening I met a few members of *Los Hijos de Dios*, on the street near my house. They asked me how things were going in my work. I said I had been studying environmental problems created by corporations. I read them a passage from my journal that I had just written about my readings on socialist development in China.

I said that in China a different kind of social development is taking place, differently than in the U.S. or Puerto Rico. On the basis of my conversations with Chinese scholars and my own readings, most Chinese neighborhoods are now organized for purposes of discussing social problems. Why couldn't we do that here? This

neighborhood in which we were talking at this moment, for example, could be organized for this purpose. People would then not be afraid to go out at night; they would not fear being hit over the head and robbed. People would come to know each other well. They would be meeting regularly to talk about the resolution of local problems in relation to the municipal government, the region, and the society-at-large.

They all responded favorably to the idea of neighborhood organization to discuss social problems. "Amen." Their religious community meets each evening at about 7:00 P.M. to discuss what happened during the day and to give religious testimony. I was invited to join them in their evening meeting.

I went over to their house and we found a group already gathered. They were singing and dancing. Indeed, they were all practicing Puerto Rican dances and songs because they wanted to open a coffee house as a means of reaching more people in the neighborhood with their spiritual message. Several Puerto Rican members of the community were there in the group teaching them island dances and songs.

During a break in the dancing, someone suggested that they should have a neighborhood fiesta. They would invite the whole neighborhood to their backyard. Why? Because neighbors had told some members of *Hijos de Dios* that they were an "exclusive group." The Puerto Rican neighbors did not know how to act toward them. Since this was exactly the opposite of what they wanted, they decided they would hold a *fiesta* to "break the ice" with people who were living around them.

"Why not hold the fiesta two nights from tonight? Thursday."

"Good. We can do it."

Someone then suggested that they write a play for the neighborhood fiesta. And that idea started a 3-hour discussion of what it could be about.

This evening a one-act play was plotted by 25 young people sitting together in the living room of their residence in Santa Rita, Rio Piedras. The course of the conversation that created the play surprised me. It began with many suggestions offered for a general plot until one idea in particular captured the interests of the whole group. And as is the custom of the community when everyone feels something great is happening, everyone joined in a crescendo of "hallelujahs." One person after another then began to contribute ideas and the plot and the dialogue unfolded. I joined them.

The central idea stemmed from a song that was known to several members. A member of the community who lived in Peru wrote it. In this song the names of Che Guevara, Camilo Torres, and Savadore Allende are mentioned together as revolutionaries along with Jesus Christ. The song depicts all of them having been killed by imperialistic systems. Their struggle and martyrdom then became the theme around which the story was built. The following dialogue is a synthesis of the discussion as I recall it.

- Let's have scenes from the actual story of each revolutionary. Let's begin with a scene of Christ overturning the tables of the moneychangers in the Temple. We'll have to think through the right scenes leading to his crucifixion.
- We'll need to find some old robes.
- What do you think we can do with the scene of Camilo Torres?
- Let him walk the streets and see oppression. Then, have him plead over and over with government officials to do something about it. When the officials do nothing, he will cast off his priestly robe in anger.
- Right. And underneath his priestly robe are fatigues. He has made his decision. He heads for the hills where he meets with the guerrillas. Then, the soldiers come on the scene and kill Torres. In fact, we can use the same soldiers that killed Christ in the first scene.
- What about Che Guevara?
- We need some symbols to identify Che. We would need a priestly robe for Torres. What about Che?
- Why not a beret, a cigar, a diary, a campfire in the countryside. He can be writing his diary when he is attacked.
- We want to make these scenes short. We need a narrator. The "narrator" can be students in a school talking together about the great revolutionaries of the world. Then they can introduce the scenes through their conversation. The revolutionaries in each scene can go throughout the motions without saying a word. The students will explain it all.
- Then we will need special lighting for each group. The lights will shift from the students to the revolutionaries when their scene comes up.
- I am not sure whether the light in the backyard would focus on the scenes well enough. I will have to check on it.
- What about the scene with Allende?
- I would say the symbols of Allende are his books. He is neatly dressed. Let us say he would be in his office-library when the police forces invade to kill him.
- We've got to keep the play simple. But with moral force.
- Let's be clear about its meaning. Can someone summarize what we are trying to say?
- I would say that the message is that Che and Camilo are struggling on a physical level for what Christ was struggling for on a spiritual level. Allende was struggling on a political level. They are all very close. All fighting oppression.
- But Christ is a living presence throughout this play. His struggle was the same in many respects but it was also different. We have to show how different it really was.
- We have to show the significance of Christ's struggle in relation to the struggle of Che. We cannot give less meaning to Che's struggle or the others. But we believe it is through Christ that victory is finally realized.
- It's not going to be easy to show.
- We can do it.
- Let Christ come down from the cross – as the symbol of final victory.
- That is too simple.
- No, it is not.

- Then let us all rise together with the song that started us on the idea in the first place.

They decided to sing the song together. Not everyone knew the words. They wanted to see better where the idea for a play had come from but they could not remember all the words.

I joined in their evening all the way. I offered a cigar to one of the members who looked like Che and encouraged him to play the part. And since I was the oldest member there and I looked like an “intellectual” to members of the group, they asked me to play Allende. Tomorrow, members begin looking for costumes. They have only two days to prepare for the neighborhood fiesta and to practice the play that we have just roughly composed. Can they do it? They said they could do it if God provided them with the musicians and the costumes tomorrow. We shall see.

March 28, 1974      The Play is Enacted (Evening)

The neighborhood Fiesta of *Hijos de Dios* is tonight. Yesterday I tried to help them get costumes for their play to no avail. I thought they abandoned their plans to put on the play but here they are. They found costumes, musicians, and stage equipment. Apparently, “God was willing.” The neighbors are all here.

I had missed the dress rehearsal but they still wanted me to play the part of Salvadore Allende. They made my scene short and simple so I did not need to practice it. They gave me a toy gun and some books to read at a desk. And then I was told to look surprised at the heavily armed guard that would enter my office before they were to shoot me. I then would fall to the group. I complained that this was not quite the way it happened in Chile. Allende was not surprised. They said I was not to take the play too literally.

It started to rain just before the play began and we waited for it to stop. The Puerto Rican neighbors sang island songs while we waited. Finally, we started the play even while it was still drizzling. In fact, the rain was a perfect backdrop for the opening scene where Jesus turned the tables on the moneychangers in the Temple and was finally crucified. It was a dark night and everyone looked their parts. Che Guevara read from his diary by the country fireside before he was killed. Camilo Torres argued effectively with government and American executives (whose Spanish was humorously mixed with

English) before he made his decision to join the guerrillas and was finally killed. Then, my short scene: I sat at my desk reading *La Constitutiòn* in my formal shirt and tie. The rain had stopped but it had left the terrace quite wet. And when the military guards shot me I accidentally fell into a puddle of water left from the rain. I heard a sympathetic groan from the audience.

An unseen singer then sang the revolutionary song. The person who played Christ had been left on a ladder-cross all this time and he now came down and touched all the dead revolutionaries who woke up and followed him. Just as they reached the edge of the stage, from the back door of the house and on to the stage, came the Gypsies. Twenty to thirty members of the community began a rhythmic, wild dance that really made the climax of the play. I marveled at the choreography. Free, swirling, intricate movements that were all planned and created in two nights. The community had put three known dances into one dance. One was a Ukrainian dance, another an Israeli dance, and the third dance was known only by members of *Hijos de Dios*. It was their own dance and was accompanied by the singing of their community song!

#### Gypsy Caravan

Come along and join our gypsy caravan  
 We are headed for another mountain  
 for another land  
 (*repeat*)  
 And if you'd like to go for a ride  
 we'll go so high  
 And if you've got the faith  
 we'll climb up to the sky

Our wagon wheels keep rolling on  
 Our caravan keeps moving on

There is always laughing coming  
 from within our camp  
 And the voice of children playing  
 sitting on the lap  
 (*repeat*)  
 Of the old men who have been  
 around for many a year  
 And strong young men watching  
 maidens massing near

Our wagon wheels keep rolling on  
Our caravan keeps moving on

Following the Son and His light  
throughout the day  
And the moon will give us light  
to sing and dance and play  
*(repeat)*  
We'll sing out songs of love  
As we dance around the fire  
And as the Spirit grows  
He will lift us higher

Our wagon wheels keep rollin' on  
Our caravan keeps movin' on

We were there with Moses in the wilderness  
Abraham and Isaac and all the rest  
*(repeat)*  
We've been around ever since the beginning  
This caravan will never stop travelling  
This caravan will never stop travelling

Our wagon wheels keep rolling on  
Our caravan keeps movin' on

The trials before us will be very hard  
But you can make it with a broken heart  
*(repeat)*  
And we know that this is the price we have to pay  
Because we're headed for that great and glorious day.

Our wagon wheels keep rollin' on  
Our caravan keeps movin' on  
Step out of your pride and get on board  
This is a caravan of the Lord  
We are the gypsies of the Lord  
We are the gypsies of the Lord  
We are the gypsies of the Lord

After the dance, we ate and drank and I met the Puerto Rican neighbors.\* I asked some of them if they would like to learn English. Many of us (referring to the *Hijos*) would

---

\* The fieldwork principle here is Rule #7: Ethics. Take part in activities in ways that increase the awareness of people's interdependence. This "on the ground" field experience

like to learn Spanish and perhaps we could help each other. I said some members of the community of *Los Hijos de Dios* know very little Spanish and they needed to know the language to talk to people here. Three neighbors said they were interested. “Why don’t we start an educational program? You teach us Spanish and we will teach you English.” “How about starting tomorrow?” They were ready to talk more about it. “Tomorrow,” I said, “We may have a new educational program for the neighborhood.”

I also met several new members of the *Los Hijos de Dios* who were living nearby in a neighboring suburb of Santurce. They had come tonight to join in the fiesta. I asked them how they came to join the religious community of *Los Hijos*. The story of one young man went somewhat as follows:

Member: One day I was sitting in a park in Texas and one of the members of The Children of God came up to me and asked me if I knew Jesus. He talked to me for only 15 minutes but right then and there I felt Jesus come into my heart.

S.B. What kind of work were you doing?

Member: Oh, I was a hippie. I was really into heavy drugs.

S.B. Did you join the community right there on the spot?

Member: No, I came back to the Virgin Islands where I had lived with my parents. But I was beginning to read the Bible. It was like drinking water. I was thirsty. Then a buddy and I started a coffeehouse because we thought we might reach the hearts of people. One day four members of the Children of God came into our coffeehouse. I was surprised to see them again. I never knew anybody to give me so much love.

S.B. Then you joined them at that point?

Member: Right. I’ve been with them ever since. It’s about two years now. Hallelujah!

It was late and time for me to leave. As I walked home, the music of those people seemed to stay with me.

### **3. The Episcopal Church: Church Autonomy**

#### **March 2, Church Governance and Social Action\***

(Written two days after our meeting)

---

showed how the *Hijos de Dios* were alienated from not only the radical socialists on the island but their conservative neighbors who were appalled at their living habits. Also, Rule 8: talk with people at all levels of the system. I was crossing the lines of social class in this work.

\* I failed to record my meeting soon enough to feel that I was accurate. Therefore, I checked my notes with Andre Travathan later to confirm that I had captured the essence of our conversations.

Reverend Andre Travathan, Associate Director of the Puerto Rican Mission, made an appointment for us to talk with Reverend Jorge about 10:30 A.M. Immediately after our greetings, I spoke directly about my interest in learning about the Episcopal Church in relation to social development in Puerto Rico. I said I knew that churches have been generally very active in charity of various kinds, supporting old people's homes, orphanages, helping to start Boy Scout troops, etc. But I wondered if any new social directions had been developing. I was particularly interested in any relationship the church was developing around the problems of corporate dominance or political exploitation. Also, did he feel that the church had any relationship to the socialist movement?

Jorge said he could summarize such developments in three "capsules." First, the church's "Pilot Project" has been an effort to enter the field of social action on issues related directly to the political economy. Second, there has been an effort to create "autonomy" within the Episcopal structure itself in order that the activities of the Puerto Rican Church could be more independently related to the cultural life of Puerto Rico. Third, there has been the beginning of an "underground church" or "informal church" in which members are to take action on problems directly and outside the formal aspects of the institutional church.

I wanted to know more about each "capsule." The following dialogue is a summary of some basic ideas discussed. I am including Jorge and Andre together answering my questions even though each one was answering separately at different points in our discussion. I cannot recall exactly which one answered which one answered which question:

S.B. Let's start with "the Pilot Project." I know nothing about it.

(I had heard that Episcopalians help slum residents fight the government)

J.&A The Pilot Project grew largely from the concern of the Presiding Bishop Hines who himself was responding to minority members of congregations – blacks, chicanos, Puertoricaneans, and others. There were eight dioceses chosen to participate in the Project. Special funds were sent to each diocese for experimental programs and five priests were sent to the Chicago Urban Training Program to help implement the Project. There were three main project-activities that stemmed from this Training Program. The first activity was "community organization" in Caño de Martín Peña, a slum in Santurce. This project grew because of the fact that the government had given notice that it was going to tear down the slum through an Urban Renewal Program. The slum dwellers were told by the government that they would be given first priority to live in the new apartments. But we knew that this had not happened

- in the past. The new apartments are too expensive and the people are simply re-located to other slums.
- The Church, therefore, donated \$25,000 to help people in the slum organize themselves so that they might be in a better position to negotiate with the government. The slum-area has since been accepted as a Model Cities project.
- S.B. The money for Model Cities has been cut back substantially under the Nixon administration. I suppose that project must be facing major problems.
- J.&A. Well, that is true but there is still a citizens' committee functioning there. It is a viable entity and we believe the action has been of great value to the community. The community committee will continue to be effective for future development.
- S.B. What about the other two service activities of the "Pilot Project?" I think Episcopalians engage in social research.
- J.&A. The Church has donated funds to the Puerto Rican Industrial Mission and PRISA. These are two social research and action projects that are designed to obtain facts regarding problems of economic development. They are slightly different in their purposes. The Mission is designed primarily for research and also as an advocate for people who have no real power. It studies the impact of industry on the island and then communicates its findings to the public. It has three full time members and a secretary. PRISA is designed principally for more direct action. For example, it has helped develop a fishing cooperative, organized leadership training programs in communities, aided the students who are concerned about getting accurate information about problems in the corporate economy, etc.
- S.B. And the third type of Pilot Project?
- J.&A. The Church is also supporting Community Action Programs that were organized originally through the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunities (O.E.O.).
- S.B. But now O.E.O. programs are also being seriously cutback. Both Model Cities and O.E.O. are heavily curtailed by the present administration in Washington. This means, I suppose, that the Church cannot depend too much on the government to take the leadership in social action. The most active projects are now those of the church, the Mission and PRISA. Do Episcopalians act to increase autonomy on the Island? What about Church independence in Puerto Rico?
- J.&A. Much of the instructional material for our church schools has been in English – not Spanish – and with an orientation that is strictly American – not Puerto Rican. But we do not use much of this mainland material now. We are developing our own. Also, two-thirds of the budget for the Puerto Rican Church comes from the mainland. We have felt an obligation here to become as financially autonomous as possible. This would give us a greater opportunity to create programs that meet the needs of the Puerto Ricans. We held a special convention of the Church in Ponce in September 1970 to work toward financial autonomy.
- S.B. I guess that project is getting at the heart of Puerto Rican independence throughout the political economy of the church. How has it progressed?
- J.&A. There is progress but not enough.
- S.B. What does that progress figure in dollars and cents today? (Andre showed me the budget for the last few years.)

- J.&A. These figures show that out of a total 1972 budget of \$328, 640, we raised here about \$90,000. In 1973, we raised about \$110,000 out of \$349,169. There is a steady advance from past years but we have a long way to go.
- S.B. What about the third capsule? The “Informal Church.” I think you also call it the “Underground Church.”
- J.&A. We found ourselves so deeply involved with raising funds and so engaged in purely administrative activities that we could not give ourselves directly to the spiritual life of the church. We have not been engaged directly in what we considered to be the most fundamental purposes of the church.
- S.B. What do you mean?
- J.&A. The Informal Church grew partly from the fact that we felt an absence of Christ’s message being communicated directed into our work. It may seem strange to say this but I think it grew partly from the political policy toward statehood that was developing with the election of Governor Fererè. We simply cannot completely separate religion and politics here on this island. They are separate in one sense, it is true, but they are really interdependent.
- S.B. I agree. Tell me more about the Informal Church.\*
- J.&A. It is simply an informal network of people concerned about the essential message of Christ. It is based on three fundamental ideas.
- First, people who participate in it seek to live in the present as though it were the future. It is what we call a “realized eschatology.” It is living on earth in the manner that one would ideally hope for – as though we were in the Living Presence. This is done while facing the realities of oppression and bureaucracy. It is a practice that tells us better what decisions to make. It tends to link us with the socialist movement. There are indeed close relations among socialists and members of the Underground Church. We work on common projects. The difference is that we are Christ-centered in our work and our lives. Marx’s work is then an instrument to our orientation and understanding of society. It gives us a way of looking at society that helps guide our policy and our work.
- Second, there is an ecumenical spirit in what we do. We sometimes participate in activities of other churches even when it is not considered legitimate. For example, there are rules in some churches against participating in communion services. Yet that rule is waived among those who do not subscribe to it.
- S.B. What is the third basic idea?
- J.&A. Members of the Informal Church seek an Integral view of man. We know that as Christians we tend to act one way in the Church and another way at the office or at work or at home with the family. We are trying to eliminate that difference. We are trying to think and act as one Christian person. We are finding that you cannot really separate religion and politics. We are really all one and the same person.
- S.B. How does the church structure affect you as persons? For example, how does the U.S. mainland Church affect you here on the island?

---

\* I was struck by how the church was taking action in relation to the community. Unlike the Christian Scientists and the children of God, for example, radical Catholics and liberal Episcopalians were “connecting” with key segments of community life.

J.&A. The Church itself tends to swing back and forth, a few degrees, between liberal and conservative positions, depending partly upon the election of the Presiding Bishop. A principle factor, however, is that the Church tends to follow the policies of the political administration in Washington, D.C. There were the Johnson years with O.E.E., and there was also the invasion of the Dominican Republic, anti-discriminatory legislation; now there are the Nixon years of Law and Order.

S.B. So how is the Church itself governed in the U.S.? Does this church structure have an effect on how you act as persons on the island?\*

J.&A. The Church government is bi-cameral. There is a House of Bishops and a House of Deputies. All diocesan Bishops participate in the first House. In the second House there are an equal number of priests and laypersons that are elected. At the convention of our own diocese, for example, we sent four priests, four laypersons, and one Bishop. The lay people who go to these legislative meetings are people who can afford the time to go. As a rule, they are not *campesinos* and industrial laborers. They are generally businessmen, retired people, and the wealthier people of the Church. This then leads us toward a more conservative policy in the Church as a whole.

S.B. How is the Presiding Bishop chosen?

J.&A. He is chosen by the House of Bishops and confirmed by the House of Deputies.

S.B. How long does he serve?

J.&A. He serves for life or until he wishes to retire.

We continued to look at the tension between the structure of the church and its beliefs.

I left the meeting with a greater appreciation for how the structure of the church can affect its policies and its social action. I began to see how the administrative control of the church from the United States places it in the same category as a multinational corporation. The island units of a church can be compared in the structure to the subsidiary of a big business. This image left me pondering how much the problem of self-governance was really an island-wide problem of all organizations.

#### 4. The Quakers: Independent Friends

The Friends (Quakers) do not have what they call a Meeting House on the island. The small numbers who live here have gathered to meet in private homes for silent worship. My contact with the Quakers was primarily through the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), which had established an exchange program on the island. The AFSC is a social service organization affiliated with The Society of Friends.

---

\* This dialogue shows my “increasing awareness” of how self-governance operates within the religious structure as well as the political and economic structure of the Island.

The purpose of the exchange program was to make it possible for young Puerto Ricans to finance a trip to the United States for independent studies. The idea was to help them obtain more information about the relationships between the island and the mainland to increase intercultural understanding. The staff member assigned to the project on the island was Puerto Rican. He knew that I had consulted with AFSC in the past and asked if I would become a member of his “support committee.”

The support committee consisted of islanders who would advise him in selecting young people who were interested and capable of making a four month trip to the mainland for study; North Americans would do research at the same time in Puerto Rico. Following these separate field trips, the two youth groups would then come together for discussions about their findings. I said I would be happy to serve on the committee.

We met frequently without my taking notes. One day, however, a serious dispute arose over the issue of “American imperialism.” In fact, the Puerto Rican members carried the issue straight to the relationship of AFSC with the island support committee. At that point I noted my own reply to the arguments. My response is reported below. It was related to my discussions with officials in the Episcopal Church that had taken place three days earlier.

March 5      An Island Charter: A Corporate Associate of AFSC

Some members of the support committee were talking today about the problems the young people expressed in their orientation, the bureaucracy of the AFSC, the difficulty of officials to comprehend the problems of people on the island without being here, the propriety of the AFSC to begin a program on the island rather than having it initiated from the island, the kind of authority which the support-committee had in its activities relative to the authority of the AFSC in Philadelphia, etc.

Later, I suggested to members of the support-committee that they should have a constitution of their own which is separate from the charter of the AFSC. As it now exists, the island support-committee is a “subsidiary” of the AFSC in Philadelphia. It is chartered on the Island under the name of AFSC. In this respect it is no different than ITT or Kennecott Copper. The final authority for all matters must be given to the top officers of the AFSC who are working in Philadelphia. In other words, in spite of all the talk about equal participation in decision-making, the corporate structure does not reflect that equality as a fact. The director of the exchange program on the island is really working for Philadelphia in terms of organizational relations. However, if an independent charter for this island-group were created, then the director and the people on the island would be working with Philadelphia and with their own structures and their own purposes.

Is the island-group agreed in principle with this idea, it seemed to me that the key issue was really the process by which this independent charter was created. Clearly, the

island support-committee had purposes that were the same as the AFSC in Philadelphia but it also had purposes that were unique to people on the island. The question was whether the unique purposes of the island group were either 1) not contrary to the purposes of the AFSC and 2) fulfilling AFSC purposes. The island support-committee was in a position to move toward its own corporate authority if the answer to these two points were in the affirmative.

The island support-committee could then write its own charter and work with Philadelphia as an affiliated group. AFSC in Philadelphia then becomes an affiliate of the island group rather than the mother corporation. The Island group is then an associate of the AFSC rather than a subsidiary. In this type of corporate relationship it is possible for the AFSC to encourage the independent spirit of associate groups in different countries. In the manner of friends a new form of authority is created. It serves then as an example for other corporate bodies (church, state and business) that seek to reduce multinational controls and encourage diversity with responsibility. At the same time, the affiliated group can function at its own discretion within the circle of programs, activities, and aims of the large corporate body of friends.

The financial arrangements between the affiliated (AFSC-Philadelphia and the Island-group) would continue but assume a new meaning. The Island-group is now supported entirely by Philadelphia funds. It can continue to remain so constituted with external support but it can also begin raising its own funds. It can eventually build some of its own programs that grow out of the relationship originally formulated through contact with AFSC.

What is important in this process is the relationship that can be developed among affiliated bodies. If this process develops on a friendly basis, there is always a deep concentration of the purposes of the other – including increasing the resources of the other. The spiritual bonds between such affiliated corporate groups then can be greater than the legal affiliations. The members of each group have in their own minds and hearts a common goal. That goal is to break down the institutions of exploitation and domination that pervade modern corporate systems. At the same time, that goal is to deeply honor and respect the people who are part of – though not fully identified with – these exploiting and dominating institutions. It is with this quality of purposes and also with gentle consideration of one another in the process of change, that the life of friends can grow across these country boundaries.

### **Part Three    A Social Interpretation**

The serendipity pattern refers to the fairly common experiences of observing an unanticipated, anomalous and strategic datum which becomes the occasion for developing a new theory or for extending an existing theory...it stimulates the investigator to “make sense of the datum,” to fit in into a broader frame of knowledge. **Robert Merton**

The sociological imagination, I remind you, in considerable part consists of the capacity to shift from one perspective to another, and in the process to build up an adequate view of a total society and of its components...know that you inherit and are carrying on the tradition of classical social analysis; so try to understand man not as an isolated fragment, not as an intelligible field or system in and of itself. Try to

understand men and women as historical and social actors, and the ways in which the variety of men and women are intricately selected and intricately formed by the variety of human societies. **C. Wright Mills**

The Marxist theory was significant in that it gave a language, a concept a direction to industrial production at its advent and disclosed the new creative energies inherent in this industry. **Henri Lefebvre**

Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary-power, which takes itself upon itself alone to secure their gratifications and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent if, like that authority, its object was to prepare men for manhood; but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them in perpetual childhood... Such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd. **Alexis de Tocqueville**

## **I. Charting the Basis for Social Theory and Research: Abstracting and Generalizing**

Following my return to the United States I went over my notes carefully to review what I had learned on the island. The course of history in Puerto Rico and the key experiences in my Journal raised a series of questions for me. The upshot of this review was to work toward a theory of self-governance that I found in the history and the cultural life of the island. The following questions represent the sequence of my thinking about the data I had gathered:

### **1. What is the course of societal development? (What did I learn sociologically about the history of Puerto Rico?)**

These field notes suggest that at least two historical tendencies are vital to understand island development. First, the history of Puerto Rico shows a struggle for self-governance in all major institutional orders. The struggle becomes evident in the origins of political order and proceeds next to the economic and religious orders. Second, the institutional orders show a close interdependence with each other in the development towards self-governance on the island. The development of one institutional order can affect (retard or advance) the development in another.

The struggle for self-governance was first defined on the island over a century ago in the political order. The idea appeared as “autonomy” on a continuum of beliefs that ranged from complete “assimilation” into the Spanish empire to total independence from it. These beliefs emerged in opposition to one another in the nineteenth century. Over time, however, there was a gradual movement toward increasing the level of self-governance toward “independence.” This trend in political development continued up to the 1898 invasion by U.S. troops. The U.S. invasion then stopped Puerto Rico’s development

toward independence momentarily but deepened the forces of resistance. By placing the whole island under the command of the U.S. Army, the steps toward increasing self-governance were halted temporarily. But the steps away from U.S. “dependency” and toward self-governance then started all over again through island leadership and some help in the U.S. Congress. At the same time, resistance against the movement toward independence was evident on both the island and the U.S. mainland.

A major step toward autonomy in the political order was achieved during the 1940s with the establishment of an island Commonwealth. Yet succeeding decades saw shifts in popular sentiment toward the concept of annexation with the United States and statehood for the island. This shift in public sentiment, however, may be explained in part by the impact of increasing external controls over the economic order.

At the point where the movement toward autonomy in a Commonwealth was made in the 1940s, there was a major change in the direction of economic development. The new government, in an attempt to overcome poverty and to stimulate economic progress, encouraged multinational businesses to come to the island. U.S. investments helped to initiate new enterprises, increase productivity, and broaden the range of commerce and trade on the island. The new business investments were not made with the social purpose of encouraging the economy toward self-reliance and self-governance. They introduced instead a system of command management and absentee ownership. The ultimate authority in the new corporate subsidiaries rested in the U.S. mainland. U.S. commerce and industry therefore helped raise the level of GNP and provided an influx of capital while at the same time it increased the island’s economic dependency on the United States.

The effect of this new “annexation” of the economy with the U.S. corporations now showed a correlation with the shift in public sentiment back toward political annexation and statehood. The power of North American business to dictate the direction of development and the level of economic well being, however, was openly debated. A new “problem” of self-governance in the economic order then began to appear as a public issue on the island.

The history of the religious order closely paralleled the political and the economic orders. The Catholic Church, for example, had arrived originally with the expansion of the Spanish empire. It became the established Church on the island governed under a direct

command system through Spanish clergy. The island's religious order changed significantly, however, when the Protestant churches arrived following the U.S. invasion. The Protestant churches divided the island's territory according to denominational agreements and began to compete with the Catholic Church for members. Levels of autonomy for local denominations increased. Some churches have shown a significant interest in democratizing and decentralizing authority within church polity or the governance of the denomination. There is also a significant indigenous movement in the number of churches with no outside affiliations.

The close web of interdependence among these three institutional orders in the historical struggle for self-governance has yet to be studied in detail. Many of the connections are hidden from public view. The close ties between the business system and the church, for example, were brought to my attention when I visited Puerto Rico in 1971. Kennecott Copper and Amax corporations had made overtures to the government to extract island ore. Island churches had begun to resist the new "invasion" of U.S. companies that they felt might exploit workers and the environment. The churches had achieved a high sense of autonomy and had gained an island identity. In their resistance to the copper companies, however, the churches discovered that they were shareholders, that is the "owners" of Kennecott and Amax. A select number of leaders began to discuss the close connection between the church and the business system. Some clergy even drew a parallel between the church and the business as "multinational corporations;" they were both seen as corporations with ultimate authority resting on the U.S. mainland. The basic question that arose among them was: "How should these corporations be governed?"

## **2. What is the meaning of self-governance?**

(What happened in my personal experiences?)

The experiences in my journal began to sharpen my picture of self-governance in this web of institutional life. The Journal offered me an opportunity to define the meaning of self-governance as I saw it first-hand in the life of these great institutions. I could observe the details of self-governance in the conduct of every office at every level of organized life on the island. I looked first at education as part of the political economy.

My first weeks in Puerto Rico involved a major university strike. (February 27). It centered on the issue of self-governance as students and various faculty were claiming that

because the newly appointed Chancellor was a former U.S. State Department official, he could not function in the interest of university affairs on the island. The organization of the University made it clear that the Governor had the right to appoint key board members to oversee the administration of the university. The board, in turn, made the political appointments it felt import to govern campus life. The effect of these political changes of course could be felt down through the Deans who in turn could fire and hire department chairs. Academic credentials were only part of the decision to retain or to remove a Department chair.\*

In my mind, the meaning of self-governance could now be traced straight from the bottom of the organization to the top. Self-governance in the university begins as an issue for students who are expected to develop self-reliance and manage their own studies. It continues as an issue for faculty who are expected to manage their own course-loads responsibly and professionally. It continues on up through the department chairs, the Deans, the Chancellor, the Board of Trustees, the political party, and finally the head of state. Each level of governance within the University was interdependent with another. The degree to which self-direction functioned well at each level was dependent in some measure on the definition of positions at each level. Self-governance was a function of how an individual conducted his or her role in each position and at the same time a function of the expectations of people in offices in relationship to each other. The vitality of self-governance in the university as a whole was in part a function of the structure of duties, privileges, obligations, and powers in a system of offices within the institution.

Self-governance continued to show its complex range in my experience in the business economy. The corporate pollution that I investigated was a result in part of a lack of local control over U.S. companies. (March 15, 22, 26). If instead, *U.S. companies had been owned locally and chartered in the public interest*, the polluting would have been stopped immediately in most cases, or new techniques of production would have been

---

\* Major steps toward self-governance had been made in the history of the university. There were many checks and balances that had developed over time to provide faculty and administrative autonomy. The development of tenure for faculty, for example, was a historic step toward providing security for scholars who thought independently, protecting them from the danger of removal from office because of their politics.

quickly pursued to stop pollution. In fact, the idea of “community control” over U.S. subsidiaries was beginning to be discussed among citizens in some localities.

In talks with some labor leaders, the concept of self-management was readily accepted. (February 28). In fact, the struggle of labor for control over jobs in the capitalist system has been the historical theme of unions. It was not surprising therefore that the idea would be recognized. The question was how much autonomy did labor want to develop within the corporation?

My experience in the churches continued to reveal more evidence of the complex meaning of self-governance. It was clearly a problem in the role of Catholic priests. (April 11). But it was also a general problem in the clerical order of all denominations. Again I could trace the issues of self-governance from the bottom of the organization, starting with the laity, through the levels of the church hierarchy.

The main issue in church polity was that the final authority for major denominations rested outside the island. This outside authority was extensive over such matters as the selection and training of clergy, the interpretation of dogma, the printing of religious books, the supply of Sunday School literature, financial support, etc.

My Journal indicated that the Episcopal Church was actively attempting to resolve these issues especially through the encouragement of greater island autonomy for the parish. (March 2) It also records the call for independence for the island organization of the American Friends Service Committee affiliated with Quakers. (March 5). Finally, it showed that the Church itself was interested in supporting neighborhood autonomy. (April 18).

The question of self-governance for the religious individual came to my attention especially with my talks with The Children of God (March 23, 25, 28). The dependency of laity on the church’s interpretation of dogma or dependency on a single leader is a phenomenon of major significance. Religious idolatry could become a characteristic of church members depending partly on how the church was organized. Therefore, the meaning of spiritual self-governance over one’s life now seemed related to the organization of the church.

The connection of religious studies to self-governance became most apparent through these church experiences. My experience with the Christian Scientists especially

brought this matter to attention (March 25, 27, 29, April 2). The relationship between the political life and the spiritual life of people became a critical issue in my mind. It proved to be the main stimulus to search for a suitable meaning for self-governance in the larger context of society.

5. **What does self-governance mean in general?**

(How is self-governance a social theory?)

After reviewing these field notes, it became possible to “abstract” a definition of self – which could apply to all levels of organization. I decided that in the case the concept of self-governance should refer to the capacity of people to manage their own affairs apart from outside controls regulation and supervision. It is a concept that expresses both a fact and an ideal about how we conduct our daily life. It is at once the subject of scientific study “as a fact” and simultaneously the principle of setting social policy.

It is a fact about the way we live because we each govern our lives autonomously to some extent regardless of how much outside control we may experience. No outside individual or institution can control everything we do and think. We are always self-directing to some degree. This degree of self-governance that exists in any situation can then be studied scientifically. At the same time, self-governance is also an ideal because people generally want to be independent in some measure, that is, free to move about and make decisions according to their own beliefs and discretion. It is thus a principle that guides social policy and practice. As a rule people are interested in developing their own autonomy and generally value self-reliance in the way they govern their lives.

*Self-governance is a general concept that explains a continuum of conditions between total dependency and total independence. The two absolute ends of this continuum are really fictitious. Even the “slave” has some measure of autonomy and the “fully independent person” has some external controls. The concept of self-governance, however, refers to more than individual self-reliance and autonomy. It refers also to the way people manage their lives together in groups, neighborhoods, communities, organizations, corporations, institutions, and the society as a whole. A community can be self-governing; a corporation can be self-governing; and a whole society can be self-governing. Furthermore, each level of organization is self-governing in some degree. In this sense, it becomes a sociological theory of human development.*

The meaning of self-governance did not come easily. It appeared slowly through my experiences with the institutional orders in Puerto Rico without my knowing what was happening. I saw gradually that people managing affairs at higher levels of organization were significantly affecting the capacity for self-governance of people at a lower level of organization. The degree of self-governance for people in a church or a business was partly determined by the degree of self-governance for that entire corporate body. And this degree of self-governance would have an effect on the capacity for self-reliance of its active members. The degree of autonomy in each organization determines the degree of autonomy for the individual who is active in it.

Thus, I began to see the Puerto Rican society as a body of self-governing associations all of which were in some measure affecting the autonomy (or conversely) the dependency of their members. Each association had some affect upon the capacity of their members to manage their own affairs according to their own degree of independence as a separate corporate body.

In this multi-tiered picture of individuals related to the operations of higher associations, “self-governance” becomes an important concept to explain society and its development. The concept of self-governance became fundamental for me to understand the problems of societal development. It becomes the basis for sociological analysis of Puerto Rican development.

One more analytical step should be made, however, before the concept is carried farther into Puerto Rican development. I believe that self-governance is a protean concept that goes to the root of explaining social theory itself. It is a vital factor in the explanation of scientific methodology as well as a development in society.

#### **4. What is the meaning of self-governance as a root metaphor?**

(How does self-governance become a theory of society?)

A metaphor is simply the juxtaposition of one image on another. It is a fundamental characteristic of all language and the basis of all theory. In everyday speech we might say that the “Ship plows through the ocean.” We use the image of a plow moving through the earth to convey what we mean when we see the ship moving through the water in the ocean. In social theory, we say that society is like an organism. The organism is then used as an analogy (an extended metaphor) for the explanation of society.

The image of an organism then offers us an opportunity to build a theory about society based on what we know about the organism. The classic theorist Herbert Spencer carried the organic analogy to its limits by picturing the autonomic nervous system as analogous to the government of society, the veins and arteries of the body as analogous to the trade and commerce in society, etc. Today we have sophisticated theories about the “functions” of organizations in society, based on the original metaphor of the organs in the body having functions within the whole organism.

The concept of self-governance can now be seen as a metaphor of major significance to our understanding of societal development. In fact, it becomes the root of any explanation of our “being.” Self-governance is a metaphor with a power in social scientific theory like the concept of “system” of “organism.” Its power is observable first in the concept of “self.”

The “self” expresses the most basic and unitary meaning of any word in the modern language. It refers to an indivisible being. We all can understand it. It is universal, personal, and concrete. Everyone can understand it through experience and personal insight. Its special characteristic is in being *the agent of its own action*. Thus it becomes the root of a host of words including self-operating, self-regulating, self-reliant, self-confident, etc. Its meaning, beginning with the individual then can be projected outward to explain other entities (organizations) and finally, the workings of the entire society.

As we trace its projection on to higher levels of association, we see ourselves in some degree of unity with others who express the same principle of being the agent of their own action. We see our likeness in the personhood of others acting together in the higher level of organization. In other words, we see our “self” in the higher organization and eventually within the society to which we belong. A whole society is finally seen as self-governing when it is an agent of us.

We say that an organization is self-governing to the extent that it expresses the will and the interests of all its members as agents of their own action. A higher association is self-governing when it has the freedom to determine its own direction in the sense that we do as persons. The nature of our own self is thus embodied metaphorically in the higher levels of organized life in society.

At the same time, each level of organization in which we have membership is interdependent with other organizations with which we also belong and with which we identify ourselves. This includes churches, governments, and economic enterprises. There is a resonance of our self – a kind of tintinnabulation – at all levels of organization in society. There is an expression of a “generalized other” as George Herbert Meade called it, at each higher level of organized life. Self-governance then is the simplest expression in life that we know and at the same time it expresses the highest, most complex levels of organization and human consciousness.

The complexity of self-governance as a concept suggests that it should be approached through different types of theories. These theories should then give a fairer representation of its meaning for Puerto Rico. I decided therefore to look first at a “positivistic” orientation and then at a “dialectical” orientation to self-governance. The first orientation emphasizes a strictly scientific and empirical approach while the second orientation emphasizes a “rational” approach to knowledge. These two orientations are so different from each other that they open a whole range of possibilities for the social interpretation of self-governance. They form the basis of the last questions before proceeding to apply the concept to Puerto Rican development.

**5. How can the concept of self-governance be studied as a “positivistic” theory and applied to Puerto Rico? (How can hypotheses be developed and tested?)**

Positivistic theory requires careful definition of variables and the formulation of a set of a set of hypotheses that can be tested under controlled conditions. The ultimate test is not “reason” or “logic;” the observer must actually see the results of testing through experiments in the field or laboratory. The experiment then begins with a definition of the concept under study.

The concept of self-governance has been defined here as *the capacity to manage human activities apart from external controls*. All organizations function in this sense by degree as self-governing entities; some are more self-reliant and self-sufficient than others. Some organizations show a higher degree of dependency while others show a high degree of independence. This relative concept then leads to propositions about the internal and external governance of organizations.

The internal governance of an organization can range from an extreme autocratic ruling system to types of bureaucracy, then, to types of democracy, and finally, to types of collectives. In each case the authority shifts on a continuum to include a larger number of people in the organization. In the autocratic organization, the formal authority resides in a single individual although in practice it is generally given to a distribution of officials. In a bureaucratic organization the specific authority to act is shared among many people in offices but with a general authority remaining in a formal hierarchy. In a democracy, the authority is shared still more widely by everyone through the election of leaders who then assume the final authority over an administration for a limited period of time. In some “collectives,” all people may share authority equally by consensus (rather than “majority”) although leaders are generally asked to assume key duties in the governance of their organization.

The external governance of an organization can be seen operating along a similar continuum of authority. If the local unit of a national organization is studied for its external relations, we can see a continuum dependent to independent authority. At one extreme is the corporate subsidiary under formal control by the larger corporate command system. Next, we see the federation in which the local unit is given democratic powers to elect a central governing body. Then, we see the confederation in which the final power rests with the local units of a national organization while a limited authority is granted to a central body. Finally, there are different forms of alliance and informal agreements binding independent organizations to work together yet without any formal authority in a central body. Each local unit in this case has retained total authority to itself.

Translating this conception of organizational governance into empirical propositions to be tested begins at different analytical levels. To illustrate the study of self-governance in Puerto Rico, we can formulate a series of propositions about decentralizing authority within organizations bridging the mainland and the island. These propositions then represent only a small portion of the propositions that can be formulated to explain the internal and external governance of organizations. In positivistic theory, all propositions would need to be brought together at some point to provide a holistic picture of organizational governance.

The following propositions are directed toward the study of autonomous development in the lower divisions of a bureaucratic organization. They focus on the consequences of decentralizing authority from the higher to the lower levels of administration. They point to the consequences of a shift from authority on the U.S. mainland toward greater authority in the domestic subsidiaries on the island. Such propositions are to be studied of course for their general application to all organizations. They apply to a socialist administration as much as to a capitalist administration. They could be adapted to circumstances in federal province of the Soviet Union of China as much as to the island of Puerto Rico. The transfer of authority takes places from the “top-down,” the “bottom-up” or through a “joint-process” of decision-making.

### **Hypotheses for Empirical Investigation**

#### Top-Down Process

1. Increasing the degree of official authority in a set of local offices of a multinational organization (e.g. whose authority is one the U.S. mainland) will increase the level of personal authority exercised by the individuals in those offices.
2. Increasing the degree of official authority for local people to administer all the main operations of a subsidiary (or affiliate) of a multinational organization will tend to increase the effectiveness of that organization in the locality.
3. Increasing the official authority of local people to administer the main operations of the multinational subsidiary will increase their own feelings of self-respect as persons.
4. Increasing the degree of official authority in the administration of a local subsidiary will increase the degree of personal responsibility that is felt and exercised by people toward one another in that local subsidiary.
5. Increasing the degree of authority for local workers in the administration of a subsidiary will tend to increase the degree of self-confidence among workers as persons.

#### Down-up Processes

6. Members of a local subsidiary who take more official authority themselves apart from being granted it from above will have a greater success in exercising that authority than were it “given” to them from above.
7. Members of a local subsidiary who assume more authority themselves without it being offered from above will tend to show more social responsibility to fellow employees and the community of which the organization is a part.

8. The greater proportion of local members of an island subsidiary who participate in the process of assuming authority for the operation of a local subsidiary, the more the probability of its success in functioning independently.

#### Joint Process

9. The more the members of the total organization participate together in transferring (granting and assuming) authority in a local organization the more likely will be its success.

10. The more members of the local organization maintain a desire to support the interests of the larger (U.S.) organization after assuming control over the local organization, the more likely the transition of authority will be successful.

11. The more there are mutual benefits agreed upon in the local purchase of property from the outside organization the greater the motivation for (Puerto Rican) employees to make a success of its operations.

12. The more that top officials in the higher administration of the organization (U.S. mainland) maintain an interest in the developing autonomy of the local subsidiary, the more the goals of their own mainland organization will be fulfilled in the process.

These hypotheses apply to all major associations in each institutional order (government, economy, religion) with their various levels of authority. They can each be studied experimentally to determine the conditions under which they prove to be true or false as propositions. It is important to note some of the “intervening variables” which must be studied in association with these propositions:

Proposition one suggests that increasing the official authority of people in lower offices should increase the level of personal authority actually exercised by those people. Certain conditions may intervene in this case to affect the outcome. This proposition may or may not be true, for example, depending upon the leadership qualities of people in lower offices and their interest in assuming more authority. The success of the action also may depend upon the kind of interpersonal relationships that exist between people in the higher and lower offices.

Proposition two broadens the idea to top officials increasing the authority of people at all levels of the local organization which may then increase the effectiveness of the local organization. Again, various conditions may intervene including the interest of local people in assuming the new authority. Success in “effectiveness” may depend upon the extent to which local people perceive the new authority as functioning in their own interest.

Proposition three suggests that there is a connection between the increase in official authority in the organization and the feeling of personal self respect which members have within themselves. It assumes that there is a relationship between the role that people take in an organization (citizen, worker, parishioner) and their own personal life. The degree to

which this may be true depends upon the degree to which people invest themselves personally in the role they take in the organization.

Proposition four assumes that there is a relationship between increased official authority in the administration of local offices at the interpersonal responsibility of people to each other in that subsidiary. This connection depends of course on the kind of added authority that is offered and its relationship to the types of interpersonal responsibility that are expected to develop from its exercise at the local level.

Proposition five assumes that there is a relationship between increasing degrees of official authority with an increase in degrees of self-confidence among the officials. This depends upon the way in which that authority is transmitted and what kind of authority is developed in the offices. An increase in supervisory authority over local workers by local administrators may require a great deal more confidence on the face of it but real authority is more complex than that. Real authority and real personal confidence may develop only when it is exercised with people rather than over them from above. The way that formal authority becomes practiced then becomes a critical variable in the truth of this proposition.

Proposition six suggests that success in decentralized authority is realized when local people take official responsibility themselves rather than having it given to them. This depends of course upon many variables including the kind of dependency that an organization has on its higher levels of administration. If the pharmaceutical workers on the island took control over an island company in opposition to the U.S. Company's policies, they might not have the supplies or sales contacts critical to its continued operation. They also might not have the scientific or managerial skills to continue successfully. If sufficient "resources" are available in the island subsidiary, the proposition is more likely to be true.

Proposition seven assumes that more authority results in more social responsibility to everyone. This may or may not be true depending upon many variables including the beliefs and attitudes of the members who assume authority.

Proposition eight assumes that the more members who are involved in the process of takeover, the more likely will be its success. This depends on various factors including the financial stability of the organization. If the city council or business or church does not have an adequate economic base from which to operate, the total participation of the members in the takeover may not result in its survival.

Proposition nine assumes that the more the top (U.S. mainland) officers and lower offices (island) work together to make the transfer successful, the more likely it will prove successful in the long run. This depends, however, on the kind of leadership training that may be introduced into the process, the openness-to-change of the people involved, and their confidence in each other.

Proposition ten assumes that the greater the interest of local members of an organization in the purposes of the larger (U.S.) organization, the more its success will be insured after the takeover of authority. This assumes there is an interest in the purposes of the multinational organization on the part of the local people. Otherwise the transfer of authority becomes a fight and the takeover can be seen as rebellion that the higher (U.S.) organization will resist. This fight or rebellion may be considered necessary in some cases where there are severe forms of dominance, profiteering, or where absentee ownership is purely exploitative. In other cases, however, there can be joint advantages in the development of self-governance in the local organization.

Proposition eleven suggests that the purchase of the subsidiary property by island employees will increase their motivation to work for the success of the organization. It is assumed that local ownership of the facilities and equipment will increase the motive to work hard. This depends of course upon the interests of the employees in purchasing the company, their capacity to purchase it over time, the availability of low-interest loans or capital gifts. It depends also on the legal process of purchase and type of social ownership for the islanders. Finally, it depends on the degree to which both sides see benefits from the purchase.

Proposition twelve suggests that the more personal interest is maintained by former officials at the top of the hierarchy (e.g. U.S. executives) in encouraging independence and local responsibility in the island organization, the more likely the mutual arrangements will succeed. This proposition presupposes that a new pattern of relationships can be created between the affiliated (and autonomous) organizations even in the face of a past hierarchy of formal authority. This new pattern of relationships could involve the autonomous groups (U.S. and island) forming new bonds as trade partners, joint contractors, friends holding common beliefs, or new organizational ties such as marketing agreements, employee interchanges, training programs, joint conferences, joint memberships in regional federations, contracts to supply goods, etc.<sup>5</sup>

This process of transferring authority from the top-down and taking authority from the bottom-up in island organizations may sound complex in its administrative changes but the most critical dimensions to it are society-wide. Each change in administrative policy has multiple effects throughout the corporation and then on other corporations. This brings us to the larger dialectical question of self-governance.

## **6. How is the concept of self-governance a part of dialectical theory?**

(What does the “self” mean in the Hegel-Marx tradition?)

The modern expression of dialectical thought is found in the works of Georg Friedrich Hegel and Karl Marx. This intellectual tradition assumes that the world is composed of contradictions and that the search for truth is a problem of transforming them into a higher state of consciousness and being. The dialectical tradition is concerned with the process of “overcoming opposites” and is distinguished from the positivist tradition partly because it does not require empirical validation. Herbert Marcuse, an advocate for combining the best of Hegel and Marx argued in effect: “Dialectical truth need not be brought to empirical verification; it expresses its own validity through self-evident logic and rational insight. It could be convincing to the mind by its own nature, its own coherence of meaning.”

In the midst of these island experiences, it did not occur to me that this dialectical tradition pointed to “self” as an inner-and-outer reality. Re-reading the works of Hegel and Marx brought it back. Hegel’s concept of self, for example, was interpreted as an inner process of spiritual development and transformation. Marx’s concept of self, on the other hand, was interpreted as evolving through societal development and transformation. Reviewing the work of these two great scholars then helped clarify the gap between the inner and the outer meanings of self-governance. It pointed to the need on the one hand to see the self as an “inner development” and on the other hand as an “outer development” in the political economy of society. Their “combined work” could lead toward a more complete concept of self-governance.

Hegel began by conceiving the *self* as spiritual idea. In essence, he said the self is an inner reality that is dynamic and changing. Reality is the process in which the self as it exists becomes other than itself. Nothing is real which does not sustain itself in a continuous life-death struggle for its existence. True identity, Hegel said, is the continuous negation of an inadequate existence. Reality is a process of developing ourselves into something other than our selves. It is the development of subjectivity, the inner life. We realize ourselves in history through progressive forms of consciousness and freedom. Freedom is therefore the very subject of one’s existence. It is in effect not succumbing to external conditions but transforming them into the realization of our selves.

This process of self-transformation in Hegel’s view is in the very structure of our inner being. The world in which we find ourselves denies the potentialities inherent in our self and therefore the “world” outside must be opposed. The world is a negation. Therefore, we must “negate” this negation in the world.

Reason is at the center of Hegel’s work and it is related to the problem of what is sacred. Reason, he said, has its true place only in the whole. The whole, Hegel continues, is found in the Absolute Idea. To achieve a true sense of the whole (the holy) every external condition must be continuously transformed into a phase of self-realization. The fully “self conscious” is the nearest example for Hegel of the presence of infinity. Essence is the process of self-realization without being limited by “determinates” or by the “qualification” of being.”<sup>6</sup>

This philosophic view does not oppose the empirical world of sociology but it does represent a different level of human understanding. It fits closely to the spiritual outlook of Christians in Puerto Rico who spoke personally about their “inadequate existence.” The old world of sin must be negated. Through salvation, a new world becomes possible and the self becomes something “other than itself.” They did not have the grand language of philosophy to interpret their world but they nevertheless saw the “self” like Hegel as an inner reality. It was a spiritual expression of the individual. But this picture of reality does not gain its full meaning without its connection to Marxist thought.

Marx took Hegel’s encompassing thought and extended it toward the transformation of self-in-society. The transformation was revolutionary; it went beyond the single society toward “society” in general. In effect, he became the first sociologist therefore to identify the problem of self-governance within society. He rejected Hegel’s concept of state as a final synthesis of self-development in the outer world. He looked instead to a body of *self-governing associations* where the real potential of the individual could be fulfilled.

Marx began his work with an analysis of “alienation” in 1844 based on his reading of Hegel’s concept of self. He saw people separated from themselves, from the product of their labor, from their work systems and finally, from their own humanity in the structure of capitalism. The individual self was separated from its human potential; it was kept from being realized in the capitalist order of society. In 1848, Marx and Engels then called for a radical interpretation of societal self-governance in the Communist Manifesto. They called for a society in which “the development of each (is) the condition for the development of all.” Individuals then become the basis for building a society based on their own humanity. In this conception *Marx hoped to unite the particular self (individual) with the universal self (humanity)*.

Marx carried Hegel’s notion of the self thus to its logical conclusion in the development and transformation of the economic order in society. He saw the “self” alienated in the capitalist system, unable to reflect its own humanity. Marx envisioned instead a small government in a society of self-governing producer associations managed by workers and designed to function in the public interest. It was in part this simple yet profound vision that motivated so many people toward revolutionary movements.

The intellectual limitations of Hegel and Marx have been discussed at length in philosophy but bridging the gaps left by them is still ahead. Marx optimized the concepts of “society” and “humanity” in a new order of the economy. He did not appropriate Hegel’s concept of self-as-spiritual-idea. Marx did not treat the position of theology as an authentic discipline or the church as an authentic body. Marx’s view of the secular self without a sacred dimension is thus no less problematic than Hegel’s view of the spiritual self without its secular realization in society (not the state).<sup>7</sup>

These problems in the intellectual traditions of both Hegel and Marx are still being worked out but we know the gap is so deep and complex that no single text (or theory or experiment or policy in society) is sufficient to make the bridge by itself. It is a gap that can be bridged only through long-range study in the dialectics that they both recognized as important.

This was a major turning point in my interpretation of my field notes. I came to see that it was largely through the dialectical tradition in its fullest sense that a new language could be developed to explain the “transformation” of self in a transforming society. The new language could begin in the disciplines of academia. New studies in this dialectical tradition might then help us understand the meaning of post-modern development.<sup>8</sup>

The work of Hegel and Marx points toward a need for new concepts of reality (ideal vs. material) in new fields of knowledge. Their separate works complement each other in the sense that one fills the gaps in understanding that is left by the other. The lack of recognition in Hegel’s work for recognizing the importance of the economy and for developing the “self-in-society” is good reason for building a field called *social economy* in the dialectical tradition. The lack of recognition in Marx’s work for recognizing the importance of the sacred and for developing the *self* as both a secular and religious idea is good reason for building a new field of religious studies in the Hegelian tradition. These fields are the domain for interpreting the “self” and self-governance in its more complete sense. A full picture of selfhood invokes both the secular and the sacred aspects of knowledge. The full nature of self-governance can then be explored through studies of “economy in society” and matched through “religious studies.” This is the direction I finally took to interpret my Field Notes in Puerto Rico.

### **CHAPTER THREE Toward Social Economy: Theory, Research, and Policy**

Social economy is the systematic study of how a society organizes its material resources. It is a field of knowledge that includes the study of organized production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services in society. It also includes the study of nonprofit corporations like the church, trade unions, professional groups, hospitals, libraries, universities, and other private associations that are engaged in making an income. Its subject matter involves all self-governing associations that sustain themselves in the economic order. It is therefore a most appropriate field to apply to the development of Puerto Rican society and its institutional life.

The field of social economy today seeks an integral perspective linking the separate traditions of such scholars as Karl Marx and Max Weber. The intellectual heritage represented by such writers indicates the scope and intent of this field of knowledge. Marx and Weber laid the foundations for the secular study of the economic order in the context of society. They help us look at the gap between the critical study of capitalism and socialism.<sup>9</sup>

Put another way, social economy is an intellectual framework for explaining the direction of society based on the material foundations of mutual self-governance. The field began to be formulated in the context of the dialectical tradition of Hegel and Marx. It grew dialectically from a growing opposition to the classical image of capitalism presumed and critiqued in the field of political economy. Classical political economy had been a scientific model for studying the business system in the nineteenth century. It was the central “idea” guiding the development of modern society. In the Hegelian tradition it might be considered a major “thesis” of how modern capitalism works. It was the intellectual model for studying and guiding the “laws” of the market economy. We could say that dialectic began its critique in the work of Marx.

Marx wrote a Critique of Political Economy in 1859 that was the curtain raiser for an in-depth attack on this classic model (political economy) and the capitalist system it represented.<sup>10</sup> Three volumes of Capital followed to explain the reason for his critical attack. Marx exposed the contradictions of the capitalist system and pointed to its self-

destructive path. He said the system would eventually destroy itself and that a new system would take its place based on a new model.\*

Hidden within Marx's Critique therefore was a "social concept" which he saw implicitly to explain the new foundations of the economy. This social concept was in effect Marx's affirmation of reality. It was buried beneath the weight of the negation (*The Critique*) of the political economy. The new social economy would be self-governing, reducing the need for a large state. In the Hegelian tradition of the dialectic, Marx's negation carried the seeds of a new synthesis. A new scientific model would follow to explain the emergent economic order. The key analytical concept of the new model was not economics but rather the human nature of "sociality."<sup>11</sup>

Marx never described the details of the new "social model" because he found it important first to be clear about the negation of political economy; he wanted to expose fully the contradictory forces operating in the old model. The new social model therefore remained unformulated in the Marxian tradition. It would emerge hopefully on human terms.<sup>12</sup>

It followed that all revolutionary (and political) attempts to create a new social order as socialism then developed without a clear model. These attempts took their direction from particular leaders and from historical conditions peculiar to each nation. Without a model guiding the political process, however, the attempts to create socialism from capitalism paradoxically resulted in a bigger state; resulting in *less self-governance in the economy*. Violent revolutions carried with them the burden of the "total state"; political reforms in the social-democratic countries carried with them the problem of adding government bureaucracy through commissions, bureaus, and agencies with state regulation of the business system. The state thus grew in size and importance in a direction opposite to Marx's expectations and hopes about the direction of social development. *The economic order became regulated and controlled from the outside by the state bureaucracy*. The

---

\* Staying with Hegel's dialectic, we can say that The Critique was an "antithesis" of the classical picture of the world. It was an antithetical idea, which also carried the seeds of a new synthesis in the notion of "society." Marx said the only way that an economic order could be understood fully and accurately was in the context of the class structure and the whole society. The economic order had to be treated as part of the reality but in the final count it rested on social foundations.

new social model of economic order had yet to be formulated. The economic system capable of governing itself with minimal state regulations and control has yet to be conceived in its detail.

*Social economy then is a scientific model emerging with a theoretical framework to study the economy as a self-governing order in society. Its key concepts are social governance and social development. Its norm is self-governance through mutual governance in agriculture, industry, and commerce. Its principles of development are social accountability in decentralized systems of management. Its ultimate concern is to find the social links connecting the organization of production and consumption. The field thus encourages studies of how economies function in the final analysis by self-direction.*

This framework of thought provided a basis for seeing the problems of Puerto Rico in a new light. Its concepts directed me to observe social changes taking place in business societies with relevance to solutions on the island. Examples of this social transition of the business system are important to review here before looking again at the conditions of dependency in Puerto Rico.

#### D. Social Planning

The answer to these questions involves a whole new approach to the problems of governance on the island. It requires a new analysis of societal problems, new types of social research and new directions for social policy.

The question of self-determination in the economic order involves issues in government, business, and the church. Its study begins with an analysis of levels of self-governance and “dependency” in each major institution. The following list of U.S. controls over these three institutions illustrates such an analysis. They are only a few examples drawn from my experiences on the island.

The basic issue of social planning which must be answered by research in each of these cases is: How can U.S. controls be converted into island self-governance with advantages to organizations in both the U.S. and Puerto Rico?

## **Indexes of U.S. Controls Over the Puerto Rican Society (Examples)**

### The Political Order: The Government Corporation (U.S. Controls over the island government)

1. Military and police security (This includes North American control over: military conscription into the U.S. Armed Forces, the National Guard, U.S. military bases, the FBI, Secret Service, and C.I.A).
2. Intergovernmental Relations (This includes North American control over: the mails, customs, currency, citizenship, and naturalization).
3. Federal Regulatory Commissions (This includes North American regulatory control over aviation, maritime services, trade and commerce, environmental protection, etc.)
4. Other Federal Agency Controls (This includes North American control over welfare services, education, manpower, labor, commerce, etc.)
5. Federal Laws and Federal Court Jurisdictions
6. International Affairs (This includes North American control over foreign diplomacy, commercial treaties, etc.)

### The Economic Order: The Business Corporation (U.S. controls over the island economy)

1. Multination Corporations (This includes North American “command” authority over:
  - a. Island investments
  - b. Hiring and firing of employees
  - c. Quality of the products
  - d. Environmental protection
  - e. Contributions to welfare and charity
  - f. Nature of the production process (labor participation)
  - g. Distribution of the production
  - h. Company-government relationships (taxes, political “contributions”)
2. U.S. Banks (This includes North American control over the continuance of bonds and the loans offered to island corporations)

### The Religious Order: The Church Corporation

1. Appointments of clergy (This includes North American control over the selection of archbishops, bishops, priests, ministers, etc.)
2. Production and distribution of religious literature (This includes North American control over the formulation of dogma, teaching materials, language, style of writing etc.)
3. Observance of ceremonies (This includes North American control over the performance of marriages, funerals, communions, etc.)
4. Church Membership (This includes setting criteria for admitting new members to the church and for “excommunication”)
5. Church court decisions for clergy (This means North American authority over the social and political behavior of the island clergy)
6. Financial allocations (This includes North American control over funds that can be retained and used by island churches, the manner of their uses, etc.)
7. Education and training of clergy (This means North American control over the selection of clergy, clerical attitudes, etc.)

Each institutional order requires special study. The careful observer would find degrees of self-governance in each sub-area mentioned above. The problem for a researcher is to identify how self-governance can increase in each area while maintaining common interests and trade with the United States. Each step toward self-governance in this case could involve a cost-benefit study that pointed toward how decentralization over island churches, for example, would be measured against the extent to which local contributions or revenues would take their place and provide the same services. The process could even lead some local churches into more of their own economically-productive activity.

Developing island participation in the governance of U.S. corporate subsidiaries must be measured against the interests of island workers and their skills in assuming new responsibilities. In some companies a great deal of training for island workers would be necessary. The movement toward self-governance could move quickly in some cases and

very slowly in others. The important point is that external controls can lead to self-development through training and the process can be beneficial to both sides.

If Kennecott Copper Corporation, for example, were to help train islanders in the excavation and refining of copper, they would need external control over the production process. If the preliminary agreements were made that Kennecott were to turn over the control of the copper production on the island to the workers at the end of a specified period of time, then the “external controls” over the training process would be justified. They become salutary, a boon to social development.

The company of Kennecott, and the government of Puerto Rico, could both benefit from a program in self-management. Kennecott should, of course, receive fair payments for its help in training islanders in copper development and refining. This could be done through loans drawn from the World Bank or from the profits of the new Puerto Rican company. Kennecott could also insist on the sale of Puerto Rican copper to U.S. industry for a specified period of time.

Social planning for institutional self-governance then involves deliberations, pressures, and negotiations between islanders and North American interests. They set time tables together for the development of island resources. The process clearly involves cultivating a whole new set of skills and a whole new set of attitudes for Puerto Rican people who do it by choice and do it successfully.

#### Import Substitution: Planning for Self-governing Enterprises

The standard method for gaining greater self-governance in the economy is by import substitution. Import substitution requires an economic analysis of the areas in which the island is dependent upon outside sources and an economic analysis of the ways to substitute local production for the products purchased outside. The fact that North American investments in Puerto Rico exceed \$15 billion indicates the extent of research that must be done in this area.<sup>13</sup>

Let us look at the potential for import substitution in food, fishing, forestry, and oil. There is no question that economic self-governance could be increased substantially, if the U.S. and Puerto Rico encouraged it.

The U.S. now supplies about 65% of all the foodstuffs consumed by islanders. The 1975 imports of island foodstuffs amounted to \$787 million. At the same time, more than

60% of the land in Puerto Rico lies fallow. Many island leaders as well as island agencies such as the Puerto Rican Planning Board have called for agricultural development. The problem lies, however, in the competition from U.S. producers. Their power and constant advertising cannot be matched by local producers.

In 1976 almost a billion dollars of the total billion-and-a-half dollar food market in Puerto Rico went to U.S. corporations. At the same time, the U.S. government supplies over \$640 million in food coupons to more than 50% of Puerto Rico's households. Over 70% of households are eligible for food stamps. This means that the U.S. Government is effectively subsidizing U.S. food corporations in the Puerto Rican market. The U.S. Government is paying mainland business to keep the island dependent.<sup>14</sup>

Puerto Rican agriculture nevertheless needs to be developed to replace U.S. food imports. The Socialist Party has called for agricultural development of 700,000 acres of available land emphasizing vegetables, coffee, citrus fruits, rice, grain, plantains, and bananas. The present Governor, Carlos Barcelo, has stated repeatedly that he wants the island to become more self-sufficient. His interest in statehood for the island does not stop him from seeing the need for a self-reliant economy.

It is ironic that the sea island of Puerto Rico is dependent on outside sources for sea food. In 1972, a select citizen's committee of Governor Ferrè reported that of the 22 pounds per capita annual consumption of seafood on the island, more than 21 pounds was imported. Yet research by the University Department of Marine Sciences shows that fishing could be a profitable venture for islanders. Tests have shown that commercially significant fish production could be increased threefold, from five million pounds to fifteen million pounds annually.

Forestry is another target for import substitution. In 1970 Puerto Rico imported \$144 million in lumber materials from the U.S. This accounted for 14% of its trade deficit. At the same time the Director of the Institute of Tropical Forestry of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has stated that there are at least 500,000 acres of island land with "few alternate uses" where the forestry industry could develop.

A study of the petroleum potential by the Western Geophysical Company in 1973 revealed an 85% probability of oil on the north coast on Puerto Rico. Minimum reserves would likely be 1.8 billion barrels, which represent a potential daily production of 200,000

barrels for 25 years and an income of \$500 million a year. Current daily use of oil by Puerto Rico is 140,000 barrels. There are still other parts of the island that show potential for oil discovery.

The shift from U.S. controls to island control implies another shift. Island corporations then must develop a system of equity on the island itself. The issues change from overcoming U.S. colonialism to issues of internal colonialism.

## 2. Institutional Development

The studies that indicate how to decentralize U.S. authority and increase island authority over corporate life -- have still another function. The change in vertical relationships with the United States implies establishing new horizontal relationships among corporations on the island. The new horizontal relationships mean new social links between corporations and a common interest in the socioeconomic development of Puerto Rico itself.

Different scholars and writers in the field of development have suggested important new directions which should be considered in this process. The following practical steps are a few examples which would involve a basic shift in the direction of social research at the University of Puerto Rico and a new direction for social policy in the island government.

### a. Steps from Private to Socially Oriented Corporations

The international economist, E.F. Schumacher, has described how private businesses have operated effectively with full worker participation and co-management in the enterprise. He describes how such types of businesses have operated in England and the United States as well as European and Scandinavian countries. He also outlines a scheme whereby big corporations can be decentralized so that local communities can have a proper measure of control over a share of the profits in lieu of taxes. The concept of small size and

the elimination of the tax element applies itself especially well to the Puerto Rican environment.

Schumacher's central point is that corporations can be placed in the "public hand" without losing the rights and the know-how of private management. This is done by creating shares representing fifty per cent of the equity of a firm. These shares are issued to a local body in the city or district in which the company is operating. One-half of all distributed profits would then go automatically to the 'public hand' which holds the new shares. This distribution of profits serves in effect as a substitution for taxes and is, in principle, inalienable. The revenue could not be sold as if it were a capital asset just as the right to levy profit taxes forbids them to be sold. The plan is applicable to the multinational subsidiary in Puerto Rico which then distributes shares to a local body responsible for its distribution and application in the development of the community.

Schumacher calls this local body a "Social Council." The membership of the Council is composed of the following people:<sup>15</sup>

...one-quarter of council members to be nominated by the local trade unions; one quarter, by the local employers' organization; one-quarter, by local professional associations; and one-quarter to be drawn from local residents in a manner similar to that employed for the selection of persons for jury service. Members would be appointed for, say, five years, with one-fifth of the membership retiring each year.

The Social Council has legally defined rights and powers of action. It is publicly responsible and obliged to publish reports of its proceedings. The local government is entitled to send an observer to the Social Council in its district since a pattern of reciprocity and of cooperation must be developed between the two bodies. In cases of serious conflict between the formal government or the Council and the Corporation, they apply to an appropriate court for temporary powers of intervention. The point is that Social Councils have full control over the revenues flowing to them as dividends on the publicly held shares. The shares exist in place of taxes which would have been sent to the central government and provide the basis for widening the distribution of responsibility and authority in the development of community life.

The plan is especially significant where big U.S. corporations are operating on a small island and the disproportionate power becomes evident in the local towns in which

subsidiaries operate. It is a method of decentralizing corporate power and public expenditures. Principles guiding the expenditures can be laid down by legislation but they would in any case provide a high degree of local responsibility for the development of the community.

b. Steps From Welfare Payments to Community Development Corporations

Many people believe that Puerto Rico has received great financial welfare payments from the United States. The fact is that the Puerto Rican government itself has also spent millions of dollars toward this aid because of high unemployment on the island.

A new policy here would direct funds from manpower agencies, welfare agencies and the Office of Economic Opportunity toward the creation of cooperative businesses or community development corporations that would supply jobs for people. A program of corporate development could be based on principles of co-management in which working members share in their profits. The enterprise would be designed to function in the interest of the community. Government funds in the past have gone toward training people for jobs that vanish when American subsidiaries disappear in a slight recession. These new businesses would be permanent since they would fill basic needs of the community. Their objective would be to eliminate the debilitating practice of giving welfare payments to people and, instead, provide an opportunity for them to become productive in their own right. The community enterprises would strive to become economically self-sufficient and help put an end to the welfare system.

In other words, where the capitalist job market does not open opportunities for single women with children, the elderly, and the handicapped, in each of Puerto Rico's seventy-six municipios, it is possible to create productive centers which will fill this gap. This has already begun in the United States in the form of nursery centers, food cooperatives, recreation centers, handicraft centers, etc. Such enterprises can eventually pay for themselves and provide goods and services which people in the local community need. They are organized on the same principle of cooperation which is applied in a socialist country. People are then no longer dominated and dependent but are a self-governing part of local community life.

c. Steps from Rent-Free Land to Payments for Agricultural Development

Since the United States maintains rent-free military bases on about 12% of the land in Puerto Rico, it follows logically that steps toward self-governance would include rent-payments. The 72<sup>nd</sup> Bomb Wing of the Strategic Air Command occupies 4,000 acres at Ramey Air Force Base on the northwest coast. The Antilles Command of the U.S. Army holds 14,000 acres among several camps. The Navy has 44,000 acres under the Caribbean Sea Frontier of the 10<sup>th</sup> Naval District. The U.S. base at Roosevelt Roads is one of the largest in the world.

The amount of rent paid for the use of this land could be calculated by an international court of equity on international standards. The money could then go directly to stimulate economic growth and organization in rural areas, to the development of agricultural cooperatives and technical equipment so vitally needed in Puerto Rico today. This investment would serve to reverse the migration from *jibaro* country to the crowded industrial cities and the tendency of Puerto Rican young people to migrate toward city slum districts in the United States. The savings on welfare payments alone in New York and other major U.S. cities where Puerto Rican enclaves exist could be considered as part of the Mainland rationale for encouraging a rural economic and cultural development on the Island.

The military security of the Caribbean area is maintained by U.S. Armed Forces who are guaranteed access to these sites and land areas. It is similar to the continued existence of the Guantanamo Base in Cuba where the U.S. retains rights of “occupation.” But, if in the Puerto Rican case, the issue were placed on economic grounds, where rent justifies the use of the area, rather than one of “occupation,” the basis of the island dispute over these military bases would shift. They would then turn on economic questions as well as political questions and become a negotiable item in the future. In time, certain land areas may become less needed by the U.S. and may be considered a part of the economic development plans of the island. The issues can then become rationally discussed in terms of the real needs of both countries.<sup>16</sup>

#### d. Steps from Old to New Beliefs: Looking Ahead

The new model of social economy points toward a business system which works to solve social problems within the economic order itself rather than through the state. It is only a model for research and planning of course and does not reflect the practices and

beliefs of people in everyday life; it has yet to reach the center of controversy in politics and become written into party platforms in great detail. Nevertheless, the logical direction of a research and planning model is toward its activation in everyday life. When new research facts about the productivity of worker managed corporations become known, they tend to become persuasive in management policy. When new experiments in community development corporations become successful, public attitudes become more open and other experiments begin. Old beliefs mix with new beliefs in ways that touch lives of people in every major institution.

New political beliefs about the purpose of the state, for example, then becomes the subject of debate. Under the old beliefs, the state existed to solve the social problems created by the business corporation. The state assumed the responsibility for treating unemployment, environmental pollution, consumer exploitation, labor conflict, inadequate farm supplies, etc. The state created welfare departments, environmental protection agencies, consumer departments, labor departments, agriculture departments, conservation agencies, etc. Under the new model, however, the state offers incentives for corporations to become socially responsible. It takes itself out of the role of solving social problems by transferring that responsibility to business. It encourages banks to develop “social criteria” of investment to combine with their economic criteria. It encourages business corporations to anticipate job lay-offs and train workers for new jobs, to write corporate charters providing for citizen and consumer councils, and to take steps toward worker-self management to reduce the cost of strikes. The purpose of economic enterprises in the new model is to enhance the quality of working life and to contribute to community life as well as to gain fair economic returns for themselves.

The business corporation now becomes defined in the law with a “social motive” as well as an economic motive. Its purpose is to function in the interest of the workers, consumers, suppliers, the local community and the society, as well as in its own economic self-interest. TO do this effectively is of course involves a process of experimentation but it also involves a new set of attitudes and beliefs.

New religious conceptions about the role of the church also become the subject of dialogue in theological circles. T he church has lived a long time with contradictions between what it claims on Sunday and what happens during the rest of the week in the

business economy. The church speaks of unselfish love as the good life, while during the rest of the week people work in business which demands self-interest as the good life. The church claims non-materialistic values on Sunday while during the remaining days of the week business claims priority on materialistic values.

The separation between the cultural life of the church and the business system extends into fields of knowledge within the university. The university is largely a secular institution. The concept of God or Christ is not a part of economics, sociology, or the school of management. The separation of theology as a field of knowledge from the rest of the university makes the topic of self-governance difficult to pursue within the religious order of society. There is a cleft between the secular and the sacred worlds of knowledge.

The problem now is to look more carefully at the gap between the secular and the sacred domains of knowledge. Finding a more complete understanding of self-governance in the daily round of life means finding a connection between the fields of knowledge that were separated in the university. It is a task that could begin only with the development of a new interdisciplinary inquiry: the relation between society and culture. This means entering into the symbolic life of society.

Fourteen years of Marxism have ruined Germany...(The national government) is going to conserve and defend the foundations on which the strength of our nation is based. It will take Christianity as the basis of our entire morality, and the family as the seed cell of the entire body of our people and state, into its safe protection.

Adolf Hitler

In traditional society authority is hardly recognized as having separate or even distinguishable identity. How could it be? Deeply embedded in social functions, an inalienable part of the inner order of family, neighborhood, parish, and guild, ritualized at every turn, authority is so closely woven into the fabric of tradition and morality as to be scarcely more noticeable than the air men breathe...

But when men become separated, or feel themselves separated, from traditional institutions, there arises, along with the specter of the lost individual, the specter of lost authority. Fears and anxieties run over the intellectual landscape like masterless dogs. Inevitably in such circumstances, men's minds turn to the problem of authority. What, it is asked, shall be the source and nature of an authority sufficient to replace lost authority, to restrain the natural anarchy that even in civilized society thrusts itself now and then through the crevices of law and morality? And paralleling this question: What shall be the means of checking the kind of power that always threatens to rise on the ruins of constituted authority?

Robert Nisbet

I have given no definition of love. This is impossible, because there is no higher principle by which it could be defined. It is life itself in its actual unity. The forms and structures in which love embodies itself are the forms and structures in which life overcomes its self-destructive forces.

Paul Tillich

In any domain – whether it be the cells of a body, the members of a society or the elements of a spiritual synthesis – union differentiates. In every organized whole, the parts perfect themselves and fulfill themselves. Through neglect of this universal rule many a system of pantheism has led us astray to the cult of a great All in which individuals were supposed to be merged like a drop in the ocean or like a dissolving grain of salt.

Teilhard de Chardin

#### **Chapter Four The Cultural Order**

The fieldwork Journal posed questions that I could answer fully from an objective perspective. For example, I had spent an hour pondering the meaning of a flower. (March 21) What did this have to do with self-governance in Puerto Rico? This would seem to have no relation to island self-governance. But I realized how it was a sign that I was caught up in the experience of nature on the island in ways that people on the Island embraced. The physical environment is so different from the “states.” One has to be there to sense the wonder, the beauty, as do the Puerto Ricans I met. The flower symbolized what my friends felt was being destroyed by American corporations. The significance of the island culture came to me gradually as I realized the power of symbolic life.

Also, the quest for self-governance in religious life was intimately connected to political self-governance. The beliefs of people in the island churches were sacred, that is, absolute, irreversibly true. They became part of my field experience, thus, important to interpret as data, part of the round of life of people in Puerto Rico. The connection between politics and religion became my final inquiry into the meaning of self-governance in Puerto Rico. They could not be omitted from the fundamental question of self-governance.

Since sociologists are trained to make objective interpretations from “data,” it raises a question about whether religious symbols and what local people deem sacred can be translated properly into secular language. In sociology the church is a “social structure;” sacred beliefs are understood in terms of their “function” in society. But there is no basis for assessing any truth to religious beliefs or an “invisible church” or the creditability of what is deemed holy to anyone. Subjective beliefs can be treated only as they appear to people in a field inquiry.

But sociologists consider their objective explanation as the basis for determining the truth in the “facts.” My question: Are objective interpretations superior to religious interpretations and to what people believe to be sacred and holy?

The problem in field interpretations is that a scientific (“factual, objective”) interpretation could demean what is sacred in religious life sometimes without warrant; it could cast a shadow on religion and what people believe their own pursuit of truth. The fieldworker must face the fact that a scientific interpretation places the religious experience outside the pale of the reality in their daily life. The “real” in today’s parlance is believed to be in the sciences. So can the secular attempt to interpret what is held sacred the truth? Does it demean the experiences that people feel to be sacred?

An interpretation on secular grounds introduces this problem. It represents a deep division in modern culture. The division between science and religion as separate pursuits of truth has its parallel in the institutional separation of church and state. People in Island churches believed God governed their life. It is a separation between secular and sacred worlds that touches the very meaning of governance in society.

The separation of the secular and the sacred exists in university life. The pursuit of knowledge is largely secular in the halls of academe. To refer to sacred concepts like God or Allah or the Buddha or the Christ as “real” and “true” is not possible in sociology. Indeed, there is a gap in the academy on this point that is significant.

The separation of university departments (e.g. science, humanities, and religion) without a connection between them has existed for centuries. But today there is a feeling that a dialogue should begin. The separate paradigms have not been accounting for a vast amount of challenging contradictions. Many psychologists and psychiatrists, for example, have been aware that there exists a gap between their secularity and the great spiritual traditions and it should be bridged.<sup>17</sup>

The language of sociology is secular at its roots while many aspects of everyday life are deemed sacred at their roots. The concept of self-governance is a social concept, a human idea, not based on any assumption of a divinity. The nearest secular discipline with a language that might help me make that bridge was anthropology. The gap between the secular and the sacred might be examined by means of the concepts of “culture” and “symbols.” It is approached by participant observation and recognizing the power of a culture.

My notes on a flower, for example, seemed outside the scope of my inquiry, a random meditation perhaps, until I begin to think about it. As I reflected back, I see two reasons for writing it down.

First, the Journal note is related to my “self.” The term “self,” as in self-governance, is concept that has both secular and sacred meanings. In Eastern religions developing human *self-awareness* is critical to understanding a larger reality. The Yogi, Swami

Muktananda for example, sees self-meditation as a means for approaching a larger Self. Meditation links the inner self with the outer self in a process of transcending human reality. In this Hindu tradition people are viewed as evolving in a process of expanding self-awareness, moving toward a higher consciousness. Gaining a higher level of consciousness is said to lead toward spiritual enlightenment with total self-governance implied in this religious tradition. The concept of the *self* is a unitary idea that stands between the secular and religious worlds of thought.

In the Christian tradition, gaining *self*-knowledge is also found through the contemplative life. The flower becomes a metaphor for personal and spiritual growth; the *self* is linked to nature and humanity. “Consider the lilies in the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.”<sup>18</sup>

In the Christian tradition, one is encouraged to expand self-identity by losing one’s ego, and loving with one’s neighbor and enemies as well. It means self-expansion to the point of fulfilling one’s humanity. The concept of the “self” can be seen then as a unifying concept; a bridge between what is deemed secular and the sacred, human as well as spiritual in its meaning.

Second, I realized this random note in my Journal was reflecting what I felt in my experience with Puerto Ricans: the beauty of the Island. A “self-identity” with nature is easily found in this special land. Every islander I met was proud of this special island beauty: its unique vegetation, special flowers, magnificent forests, rolling hills, and crashing seas. The culture and symbolic order of society would now take on a new meaning for me. It led me to think about the difference between “culture” and “society.”

Buried deep within “society” is an emergent level of reality within it. Hidden within social life is a cultural life that suggests a power, and even another dimension yet to be understood going beyond the social age. A cultural order is evolving beyond society.

Like the nineteenth century evolutionists, we could speculate that historical laws operate differently within epochal stages of evolution. Karl Marx and Auguste Comte both acknowledged a degree of *self*-determination, within a period of historical transition. The degree to which we can “see” the new laws of development, the more we can act as a determinant of our own course of cultural development.

In sum, a cultural order should predictably become more active in the process of societal development. It must be taken seriously if Islanders continue to shape their own direction. If it becomes the “ground” underlying social change, it could become the basis for a new kind of revolution. Our consideration of this cultural order is important since it connects the meaning of self-governance to symbolic life. Let me take a moment to reflect on the theoretical dimensions of these two orders of life.

The distinction between a social and cultural order is reflected in the separate fields of sociology and anthropology. The “unit concept” of sociology is *social interaction* and its “master concept” is *society*. On the other hand, the unit concept in anthropology is the *symbol* and its master concept is *culture*.

The framework of anthropology is more comprehensive by the nature of its key concepts, its subject. It is anything created by human beings. It encompasses the study of music, philosophy and technology, as well as social action and society. It can refer to both the material and non-material dimensions of culture, buildings as well as ideology.

The symbol – anything that stands for something else – is the basis for understanding both the superficial and the deeper dimensions of human life. It is the words in language, as in the “number,” the idea,” the “tree,” the “flag,” the “cross,” the “star.” It is the foundation for understanding the entire world in which we live. Its power as a

governing factor in society is barely noticeable in the parlance of politics and everyday life. The full significance of the “symbol” is hidden in the study of the social order.

The term “social” has many connotations but its broadest usage can be understood in the work of Max Weber who said that “social action” is always oriented to the behavior of others. In Weber’s sense, social action is not oriented to abstract ideas, numerology, musicology, trees, buildings or general values. We are “social” when we are oriented to the motives and the behavior of other people.

The field of sociology builds from this unit concept and “society” is understood through concepts that are rooted in social action. The study of society has a variety of definitive concepts with a universal reference to the social order such as “status” and “role.” Social concepts like “state,” “corporation,” and “bureaucracy,” have historical origins in the evolution of society. Such terms explain the social order even they are part of the larger cultural order.

Culture -- in its broad (not local) sense -- has three contradictory meanings. First, it is a product of society. Second, it is autonomous in society. And third, in its broad use, it is the whole of society. Anthropologists have described all three concepts and have thus set it apart-and-within society dialectically. Culture is essentially everything created by people including words, ideas, beliefs, language, technology, values, and physical artifacts such as buildings and automobiles, leaving out only the subject of Nature. When we think of ideas or listen to music without speaking to each other, we are in the autonomous cultural order. Ideas and music are a product of society and yet relatively independent from it at the same time.

This reasoning is important to follow because it leads us to understand cultural life in reference to the social order. Theology and aesthetics are developed within society and yet set apart from it at the same time. Society is the “ground” within which the cultural order emerges but in the final analysis society is a part of the larger cultural order.

The cultural order originates in social (symbolic) interaction. The elements of culture include, as we said, such areas as language, art, government, technique, and religion. They all arise through social interaction and are a product of society. At the same time these “products” develop autonomy and a complexity on their own, apart from social action. In social history, *language becomes linguistics, art becomes aesthetics, government*

*becomes political science, technique becomes technology, and religion may become theology.* At a certain stage of development, social interaction is no longer needed to add power and meaning to the newly formed symbols and beliefs. (Reading a book on physics or listening to chamber music alone is not a social experience except as it first arose symbolically.) Symbolic systems develop their own “take-off” in higher levels of consciousness.

This autonomous development of symbolic systems however does not prevent them from being applied creatively to everyday life. The symbols of a physicist (e.g.  $E=mc^2$ ) are in the culture, independent of the symbols of everyday life, but they still connect back with this life, as in the construction of Betatrons. In the same sense, the symbols of the philosopher, political scientist and the theologian become independent of the conventional symbols of society and yet apply back to it in everyday life. They are part of the governing system of society.

Religious thought can thus be seen objectively as an autonomous development based on symbols to that point to that lies beyond the social. Religious “symbols” (e.g., the Christian Cross or the Jewish Star) carry a non-social meaning even as they have their social root. People become socially oriented to one another with reference to these symbols but these symbols also have a more complex expression of humanity with a reference transcending what is social.

Look at the field of music. Musicians become socially oriented to one another according to different fashions of rhythm and mood but the sounds and symbols also have a non-social meaning. They have both an aesthetic meaning and rhythmic sense in the human body. We can likewise say that the symbols of religion have their place in spiritual thought just as the notations of music have their place in musicology. Musicology goes beyond music and yet is always grounded in it. The same is true for art and aesthetics, or technique and technology.

This development of symbols from the social order into the cultural order can be illustrated further with the development of mathematics from the original arithmetic.

In ancient times people found a common symbol to express “quantities” in nature. The use of “positive” real numbers as symbols of arithmetic arose first through social interaction. They referred to particular visible things. These symbols then grew more

abstractly into mathematics as a field of knowledge. Mathematics became the study of the “exact relations existing between quantities.” The development of subfields of knowledge such as “differential calculus” then became relatively independent of social interaction. Mathematicians developed their own set of symbols to explain the nature of the relation between quantities as the language became more complex. Mathematics emerged as part of the symbolic systems of the cultural order relatively autonomous of the social world. The field developed its own rules, internal logic, imagination and “fantasy.” But the fantasy of mathematicians still retains a connection to the social and physical world in its application.

This is a process of development of symbols from *music-to-musicology*, *law-to-jurisprudence*, *technique to technology*, and similarly with other fields. These new symbol systems become part of the evolution of culture.

If social evolutionists of the 19<sup>th</sup> century had this anthropological perspective, they might have argued that the evolution of culture was both an integral and simultaneously an autonomous part of the evolution of society, metaphorically, the seed within the earth.

Each learned field has its development in society. Physics, astronomy, biology, chemistry, psychology, and theology have stages of theoretical development, that is, levels of “symbolic development” in the cultural order.

These fields of knowledge grow in their importance with the development of society. They evolve as “determinants” of the economy in society. They become in effect the hidden but developing substructure of the society, so to speak, a virtual inversion of the original Marxist view of society.

Marx had originally interpreted culture as an epiphenomenon, an outcome of the substructure (economic order) of the society. The substructure was a capitalist economy that in turn determined the forms of knowledge. These forms of knowledge can now be seen as evolving to become a major factor in the development of society. The field of economics has become a determinant of political policy. It evolved as “political economy” with Rousseau, Smith and Ricardo in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries and concluded with Alfred Marshals’ “Economics” at the end of the century. Marx critiqued the political economy as it was based on the premises of capitalism but the field developed in any case with an emergent social factor, as in subfields like social economics, evolutionary economics,

welfare economics, and institutional economics. These special (subset) areas of economics became a precedent for the field of social economy.

The cultural order is evolving as a significant force in society. The special culture of the university with its fields of learning becomes an important agent of change in the economy. These fields of learning are a growing influence, becoming part of the “governing systems” of modern life.”\*

Such fields as theology and religious studies have roots in the social order even as they develop to be part of the cultural order. The social foundations of religious studies and theology are studied in the same sense that foundations of the law and the economy are explored in the cultured fields of jurisprudence and economics.

The future of these fields of knowledge is in the development of interdisciplinary studies. Each discipline has the problem of identifying the intersections of its symbol system with other cultural systems, or fields of knowledge. In biology, for example, we see the development of biochemistry, the basic unit originally the human cell and the master concept the organism, now seen as a molecular phenomenon and thus a problem to be jointly resolved with new field of biochemistry. In sociology, it is a matter of determining when the “market price” in economics becomes understood as a social phenomenon.

These field notes are helpful to understanding life on the Island but they do not fully reflect the cultural life that involves so much more. The cultural life requires understanding the substantive categories that are hidden inside these notes, the poetry of the Island, the feelings of people, the music, the parties, the gay life, the idioms and variations in language and all those processes that take place between the inner and outer world of people.<sup>19</sup>

Substantive categories can be seen in these field-notes that invoke an interdisciplinary perspective. Categories that I we will examine here are “experience,” “transcendence,” and “transformation.” They illustrate how social and cultural interpretations have a common foundation.

*Experience* is required to understand the “self,” as it plays in the inner life as well as the outer governance of the Island. The “self” is not something to be seen just rationally or

---

\* This point is not unrelated to the reason why the University in Puerto Rico has experienced a continual series of crises. It is a crisis in culture as well as a crisis in the social order. The university represents the “integration” of the social and external order.

empirically with human eyes and ears. It is interpreted through reflective intuition. The concept of self-governance can be understood through the reflective consciousness of experience, notice:

*Experience* is a basic source of knowledge for all people, notably by students of religion. Harvey Cox, for example, suggests that experience is an important source for interpreting religious truth. He suggests that theologians have much to learn from “the thing itself” rather than from “derivative reports about it, detached observations of it, or theories of how it should be.” He calls the interpretation of experience alternatively “experimental liturgics” and “participatory hermeneutics.”

Participant hermeneutics combines elements of the venerable theological science of hermeneutics with the social scientific method called “participant observation.” “Hermeneutics” comes from the name of the Greek god Hermes (Mercury, in the west), whose main job was to carry messages among the gods and from the gods to men. Hermeneutics is the study of messages or, more exactly, the study of how one interprets the meaning of texts. It is generally used in relation to documents stemming from a different historical period. My questions, however, is how can we have a hermeneutics not of the past but of the present, not of texts but of people? How can we learn to read the message of a Pentecostal revival in Chile, a Kimbangoist church parade through the streets of an African village...I am asking what it all means to the people now involved.<sup>20</sup>

Participant observation is a method of “social discovery” focusing on human experience in everyday life.<sup>21</sup> This method of discovery has been juxtaposed against what theologians call “spiritual revelation.” Peter Berger, for example, has suggested that the “already achieved” status of “revelation” is critically important to examine in theology. He suggests that the “theological method” might well start with “discovery” rather than “revelation.” “To speak of ‘revelation’ before one can speak of discovery is to put the cart before the horse.”<sup>22</sup>

The meaning of “experience” as a source of knowledge has both a secular and a sacred reference in the search for the truth. A process of co-discovery and co-revelation was taking place among neighbors in *La Perla*. (April 18: Journal Notes.) Paulo Freire describes the process as “cultural action.” Cultural action is a collective experience of

people who discover the meaning of symbols in their community. In the Catholic Church it is a method of “laicizing” professional methodology in everyday life, balancing “personal involvement and detachment.” Not easy.

In cultural action people examine the class structure and the religious symbols by which they live. They examine their own sacred symbols in the context of this secular (anthropological) method. Churchgoers examine the sacred symbols with which they identify in light of objectivity and social analysis. They do it without elaborate thought or any systematic philosophy. They must discover the connection between the secular and the sacred meanings in life through their common effort.<sup>23</sup>

My Journal included the practice of cultural action by priests engaged locally with citizens. It might be called “reflexive social theory” in the field of sociology but people were examining the sacred and the secular meanings of the church with which they lived each day. It was a laicized (non-professional) method by which slum dwellers were able to discover meaning of their culture. They were transcending their environment socially and culturally, rationally and spiritually together. It is an example of how the “experience” of people can be grounded in the possibility of converging secular and the sacred domains of knowledge. It could be called a process of transcendence, going beyond their local culture.

Peter Berger sees *transcendence* as a concept that can help explain human experience from a secular and a sacred standpoint. He suggests in effect that the concept helps to link sociological and theological thought in the interpretation of everyday life. He describes “signals of transcendence” which he says occur within the “empirically given human situation.” This phrase allows us to overcome misconceptions in the modern separation of the “natural” and the “supernatural.”

Berger in this way begins to define “phenomena that are to be found within ‘natural’ reality but that appear to point beyond that reality.” He speaks of the normal transcendence of everyday life, looking for experiences that express essential aspects of being human.

For example, Berger describes how a mother may respond to an anxious child waking from a bad dream in the middle of the night. The child is terrified but the mother says, “Don’t be afraid – everything is all right.” The mother’s assurance that everything is safely in order carries beyond (or transcends) the immediate situation. The mother is making a statement about the *reality in general*. “Have trust in being,” she says implicitly. She is invoked as a high priestess of a “protective order.”

Berger’s discussion of this ordinary event then leads toward a dialogue about the relationship between the conflicting worlds of discourse in fields of sociology and theology. He suggests that the meaning of “faith,” “hope,” and “courage’ have roots in the world of everyday life and they signal transcendent experiences, which have a meaning to be understood in both human and religious terms.<sup>24</sup>

The concept of *transformation* also has reference to social and religious studies. In sociology it can refer to basic changes that occur in the institutional life of society. The history of Puerto Rico, for example, is a story of transformation from a simple (agricultural) society to a modern (industrialized) society. Island socialists today anticipate a revolutionary transformation that they think is in the future of the island.

In theology on the other hand, transformation refers usually to basic changes that occur within the individual. Individual transformation is seen as “salvation.” The saved, or “re-born” Christian, experiences a transformation in selfhood. The old ego, formed in the

family and neighborhood, is destroyed; a completely new self, resourceful and sharing, breaks through the life and culture of the church.

The concept of transformation has meant objective changes in structure of society while for theologians it has meant the subjective changes that occur within the individual. There is much yet to be learned about how the different changes in the objective dimensions of society change the subjective life of individuals.

There is a similarity between the transformation of the individual and the transformation of society. In the experience of salvation, which I witnessed on the Island, there is an inner revolution; the old governing power of the ego is destroyed. In the revolution of society, however, there is outer change in which the old elite structure is destroyed and changed.

Greater personal resources can be released for the individual through salvation like greater social resources can be released for the society. A new inner self-governance is created in the “saved” Christians that I saw in Island churches. It was based on what was conceived as the universal consciousness of Christ replacing the egocentric self. Similarly, through societal change a new consciousness can emerge that changes the class-centered consciousness in society.

In both cases the change or “transformation” may not last long. The re-born Christian may relapse into the former self-ego and a revolutionary government can relapse into a revised authoritarian system. The continuity of the new “self-government” is dependent upon many factors. In both cases, however, a new self-consciousness is born allowing for new resources to be realized.

The meaning of transformation is beginning to be explored in dialogue between Marxists and Christians on the Island. Socialist theologians have sought to empathize the connection between the sacred and the secular. They have called for a “liberation theology” that treats these issues. Gustav Gutierrez, a Peruvian theologian, started such a dialogue that continues to be active in Latin America.<sup>25</sup>

The concept of liberation is central to the theology of many Latin American theologians. Josè Migue Bonino, Dean of Post-graduate Studies of Higher Evangelical Institute for Theological Studies in Buenos Aires, writes sympathetically about their viewpoint. He reflects the general argument when he says that “Liberation is not simply a history that breaks in from a future totally unconnected with the present: it is a project which springs from the protest born of the suffering of the present; a protest to which God grants a future in which man enters through his action.” Then, he continues, social action cannot occur merely in the “subjectivity of the individual – nor in the construction of a welfare society...but in politics, understood as human action carrying out a humanizing project in a historical future.”

Bonino describes the work of Ruben Alves, a Princeton-educated theologian in Brazil, criticizing the old values of Protestant theologians. Alves argues that Bultmann does not see the value of social change in his “transcendentalism” nor does Moltmann in his “futurism.” A political language is developing in theology to bring spiritual values face-to-face with the reality of political oppression. Bonino concludes:<sup>26</sup>

Theology, as here conceived is not an effort to give a correct understanding of God’s attributes or actions but an effort to articulate the action of faith, the shape of praxis conceived and realized in obedience. As philosophy in Marx’s famous dictum, theology has to stop explaining the world and to start transforming it.

It will be interesting to witness the future of this social movement on the Island. The use of violence as the method for achieving these values professed by theologians is one of the most heated areas of Island debate. Orthodox Marxists believe that violence is *the* way to achieve their ends. The question is where theologies of liberation will go in the future. It raises the question of “what is most sacred” in the practice of religious beliefs.

Nonviolent actions in the pragmatic sense of boycotts, strikes, sit-ins, sit-downs, protest marches, etc. are as old as civilization. Such actions are fundamental to implementing changes in society but they are generally practical efforts to gain power. They are nonviolent in a tactical sense, not principled. They are strategies to do something about oppression within the limits of minority power. But something new is happening.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century a number of nonviolent action movements have developed which are based on principles and associated with Christian beliefs. These movements include such figures as Mohandas K. Gandhi in India, Martin Luther King, Dorothy Day, and Cesar Chavez in the United States, Toyochik Kagawa in Japan, Dom Helder Camara in Brazil, Danila Dolci in Italy, and Lanza del Vasto in France. These movements are based on principles of nonviolence and have demonstrated their power to overcome oppression by measured degree. They require theological as well as social scientific studies to comprehend their meaning in our time.<sup>27</sup>

Social scientists have begun to study the “pragmatics” of non-violent action. Gene Sharp, for example, provides an important compendium of historical events expressing nonviolent action. He claims that historians have ignored its power to transform oppressive political structures. He describes 198 different nonviolent methods that have proven successful over the centuries. Some nonviolent actions have been transformational in their achievements. In San Salvador and Guatemala in 1944, for example, people in every walk of life refused to comply with cruel military governments. They were able to overthrow dictatorial regimes through society-wide, nonviolent withdrawal of support. Sharp describes how small countries have resisted invasions and have achieved independence without a violent revolution. Such cases are multiplied many times in their diversity throughout Sharp’s carefully documented book.<sup>28</sup>

Gandhi saw self-governance (“self-rule”) as the all-prevailing principle of development for India. In fact, his approach to nonviolence appears to integrate the

philosophic traditions of Hegel and Marx. This movement for independence is unprecedented in history for its capacity to translate religious principles into political action.<sup>29</sup>

Gandhi did not place “reason” at the center of his work. Reason remained central to his practice but he did not conclude that self-development was solely a function of thought. Nonviolence was rooted in the heart, a realm of thought-in-action, requiring the expression of one’s total being, realizing one’s own humanity. In contrast to the thought of G.W.F. Hegel, who thought the state represented the “ultimate value,” Gandhi remained separate from government refusing to take office. He saw the State would obligate him to violence. His own example of nonviolence required that he remain outside the state even as he worked with politicians to further the objectives of self-governance (“self-rule”) for India. He helped politicians fight their way toward independence from Great Britain.

Gandhi saw social structures of dominance causing an internal dominance/submission within the individual self. To become something more than an individual “self,” as it were, to become an authentic self, he argued to transform the dominating structures outside. In this way we help overcome oppression generally, and finally achieve self-governance for society and for individuals.

Gandhi believed that social transformation could be brought about without major violence. Violence did occur in India of course when the British reacted against the pressures of the Independence movement and killed Indian citizens. But the extent of the violence was, Gene Sharp argues, calculably less than would have occurred in conventional warfare. Gandhi sought a nonviolent revolution that could be understood in the hearts, minds and collective actions of people. In this process, he maintained continuous contact with British officials while he openly opposed their imperialism. The British were respected even while making it necessary for them to leave the country.

Can I speculate?

Gandhi introduced a new meaning to the dialectic in this process of seeking self-governance for India. He felt that the underlying reality as *affirmative* rather than negative. In his “negation of the negation” – opposing the brutality of British rule – he affirmed the positive. He worked with the concept of a “truth” but he acted “experimentally” as he saw

it, knowing he could make mistakes along the way. He wrote about his errors in his *Journal* and made corrections; he admitted what he called his “Himalayan blunders.”

Gandhi did not act from a view of the whole truth as though he were holy. He saw himself as an ordinary man and rejected all attempts of followers to make him into the “Holy One.” He asked others to seek that which was holy within them. He felt that anyone could act nonviolently to realize the values they held most dearly. He established training centers where people could learn about the philosophy and practice of nonviolence.

Gandhi held that self-governance (Indian “self-rule”) was a primary principle of action in all events. It was no less important for the individual than it was for the country as a whole. He considered it a principle called *satyagraha*, that is, holding to the truth. He expected all followers of *satyagraha* to be self-reliant with self-authority in their nonviolent action.

Gandhi’s nonviolence was a way of life that could be seen as a “dialectical transformation,” close in kind to the secular Hegelian-Marxian tradition. The whole process was newly rooted in the affirmation of life and good will, which was deemed sacred. Nonviolent action did not call for overcoming the enemy in order to create some new form of political dominance. It involved respecting the enemy and seeking the basis for continuing friendship. Gandhi repeatedly called upon *satyagrahis* (followers of truth) to find in their hearts the basis for respecting British officials against whom they were fighting for independence.

Nonviolent action for Gandhi involved a fierce struggle against the opposition while being prepared to negotiate by these principles. It meant planning ahead for alternatives to every action so that people did not move blindly into a chaotic situation.<sup>30</sup>

The movement for independence in India called upon people to move holistically so to speak. *Satyagraha* meant keeping opposing principles in mind when dealing with every situation, in effect, the rational, the empirical, the universal, the particular, the ethical, the pragmatic, the secular, and the sacred. The affirmation in this movement was finding a higher principle within the opposition without ignoring its connection to a lesser principle. In theory, it could be said that Gandhi sought the “universal” in the “particular” and the “sacred” in the “secular.” He felt a sense of “infinite” worth for each “finite” individual. He acknowledged the majesty of a great spirit moving among all people – high and low.<sup>31</sup>

Here the search for the meaning of self-governance (self-rule) reaches its quintessence as the secular and the sacred are brought together in thinking about the process of development. This process accounts for transformations within individuals in connection to the larger society. The full meaning of self-governance is then found in the relationship of the inner and the outer changes of the *self*, developing throughout society.

### **Concluding Notes**

A number of premises are implicit in this outlook on the evolution of a cultural order within a social order. First, the meaning of self-governance is not defined in scientific or objective terms alone. Self-governance is also defined through an experiential process that involves the disclosure of *the subject in the object* in (let us imagine) the philosophy of Hegel. It is also involves finding the ideal in the (real) material in the tradition of Marx. The great opposites are found within each other. This is the premise that underlies the evolution of culture.

The study of self-governance in the social order involves the subject entering into the object at every turn of the way. The “subject” contains the self that is discovered in the object of study. The development of a cultural order is a process expanding self-awareness through participatory study of the object becoming the subject under investigation.

Second, the “subject” contains a sense of the sacred as well as the secular. The sacred is what Emile Durkheim once distinguished from the “profane” or the everyday world. It was described theologically by Rudolf Otto as the “wholly other” (*ganz andere*), as totally different from the mundane world. A sense of the sacred exists implicitly in the minds of people in every culture. Thus it becomes the subject of hermeneutic study for sociologists and theologians.

Third, the method of participant observation is based upon the premise that the “self” is understood through the “other.” The “other” is everything outside one’s self. The method seeks to find a relation between parts of our selves alienated in modern culture. The alienation exists in the structure of knowledge in the university as well as in the separation of the church and state in society and nature. The university is the place to search for the ground behind the separation of life-worlds by which we live.<sup>32</sup>

We know that human life is not segregated into separate departments of knowledge. We can seek an interpretation of life as a whole and search for a language that connects

“facts” with “values” imbedded in the culture. The method of participant observation in this sense plays a critical role in helping to overcome the separation of the secular and the sacred in the process of augmenting self-awareness and governance. Social scientists can then look at social and religious knowledge as though they were within one methodology. We can begin to accept the search for the self through nature in the structure of a flower as well as through society in the structure government. We can build a framework of knowledge that permits the search for the unity of the larger self in the sense that the slum-dwellers in *La Perla* were searching in the winter of 1974.

### **Epilogue**

The method of investigation in any study defines in some degree its outcome. The way interviewers formulate their questions is critical to the kind of answers they get; the way scientists define operational variables has to do with the results of their laboratory experiment. This power of “method” to shape the results of an investigation is seldom studied and is often ignored by the investigator. Yet the means and the ends of the investigation are intimately tied together and therefore vital to understand.

This study of self-governance in Puerto Rico is no exception. In this case, the method of participant observation is central to the conclusions of the study. The connections between this method and conclusions become more explicit as we think further about the nature of self-governance as a theory for planning post-modern development.

#### The Method

Doing fieldwork through participant observation goes against some of the most cherished principles in the scientific tradition and yet it can offer a more complex understanding of the subject under investigation. Because this method accents the subjective side of study it can therefore be open to special biases; yet by treating people as subjects and not merely as objects of investigation, it can yield greater truth than traditional scientific methods by themselves.

Participant observation offers important opportunities for the investigator to see the world in ways impossible to the conventional scientist. It reveals the meaning of everyday experiences in a new light and opens the researcher to a wider understanding of what it means to be human. It expands social awareness beyond the narrow confines of a scientific experiment in the usual sense and introduces human sensitivity to the gathering of data that cannot otherwise be obtained. It transcends the narrow confines of the “experiment” with

its “planned hypotheses” and operational concepts. Then, remaining in the spirit of science, it generates hypotheses and concepts that deepen our understanding of human life.

The method of participant observation draws from the rhythm of everyday life, as everyone is a participant observer to some degree. Everyone “participates” in human events and at the same time “observes” their meaning. Participant-observation is therefore like breathing; it has an alternating rhythm that is constant in all people. It is always active and yet forgotten in the daily rounds.

People develop their sense of “self” by participating and observing in different social settings. In effect, they identify (inhale) the “world” and detach (exhale) the “world” continuously in becoming human. The growth of one’s self continues in this fashion, through ever expanding circles, becoming more complex over a lifetime. Self-powers increase through involvement in different sectors of society.

The concept of the self begins in early socialization. We learn who we are, to be our self with friends, our neighborhood, our church, our business, our home, our union, our nation and its flag. And then we detach ourselves to some extent from all these identities. We reflect on the roles we take. The process is the key to understanding the nature of self-governance at all levels of society. The method of participant observation builds a sense of “self” from this natural rhythm in each day.

There are fieldwork rules, however, that help researchers become more refined and accurate in their observations. For example, people everyday have a tendency to identify closely with friends and with the symbols of organization where they work and worship. They do not see the larger meaning of events. Fieldworkers are trained to be conscious of these tendencies and to correct them in their work.

It is a balance between detachment and involvement. Social scientists that are not disciplined in participant observation can easily make the mistake of over-detachment. They can lose sight of the people they study. They may not see them as valued in themselves, may lean toward abstractions and impersonalize “data,” thinking it to be “real.”

The method of participant observation is a synthesis between involvement and detachment in the process of learning “who we are” as humans. It is a process of learning linked to what George Herbert Mead called the “generalized other,” a method of discovering us in others with whom we come into contact every day. Fieldworkers have a

special task of balancing personal “identity” with “objectivity” to generate the right insight. They live with conflicting beliefs and seek to find the truth within them.

My identity with the Christian Scientists in Puerto Rico who felt the church did not belong in politics was in tension with my identity with socialist priests in Comerio who believed the church was already in politics and should become more so in the right way. The task of interpretation in such cases is to resonate with a truth on each side while observing what lay behind the contradictions. The process should lead the fieldworker toward a deeper truth about human reality. The findings then take account of the separate beliefs held by people in the field and may go beyond them in the final count.

The Journal of the fieldworker is important because it teaches about how such contradictions are faced and interpreted. The record should be open for review by critics. What happened in the field tells what led to conclusions. It is like a film for critics to evaluate on the basis of fieldwork rules. My own Journal should be evaluated against the rules but it should not be considered the only way to do fieldwork.\*

I believe in experimenting with different styles and approaches to improve the process. There is a need for variation while recognizing at the same time the ground rules that apply to all fieldwork.

One basic rule in all fieldwork is maintaining factual accuracy. It may wise for students in training to keep private feelings of events out of the record of facts. The main record consists of what can be observed through the five senses. Interpretations and personal feelings can then written as a postscript at the end of the day. The observer may then see the subject as an object of their senses without an investment of their own prejudices. Personal prejudices about the meaning of an event can then be examined separately and with more detachment.

After training, students acquire the skills of “direct discernment,” and can add their viewpoint immediately into the description of an event. The scene has then been appreciated first on empirical terms before adding a flow of thoughts from the observer.

---

\* The rules I followed are summarized on page 13-14, but they are more completely developed in my book, The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation (NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967). For the complexities of doing fieldwork, however, see the literature on participant observation.

The trained observer is then able to contribute creative insights to the “facts” in the description of events. This is where the art of fieldwork begins.

The art of fieldwork is to look behind the scenes and get closer to the truth. The observer may engage in looking for what is unconscious to people. The observer may see what may be called the “social unconscious,” that is, the back-stage forces that operate to affect the center-stage of decision-making. The social unconscious consists of the private patterns of activity and belief that eventually become a public force affecting the body politic.

People in their daily roles do not have the time to roam among different groups and learn what happens behind the scenes. So, fieldworkers can raise the awareness of people of their “roles” playing out in the larger society. They can reveal the creative power and conversely the self-destructiveness of people as citizens, clergy, workers, managers, etc. The roles people take in society have powers that need to be known. Good field reports tell people about them. They reveal the nature of the self in a society hidden to them.

The hidden society is that pattern of social life that is unknown to the individual self. It needs to be understood. For example, the private activities and beliefs of radical extremists and power elites are often hidden. They become misinterpreted in the twilight zone of public consciousness.

In Puerto Rico, for example, university students in the independence movement carried imperfect impressions of the beliefs of top government leaders. Top government leaders in turn stereotyped the students. Members of religious groups misconceived the beliefs of other religious groups. Half-truths about opposing groups can hang in the air like the mist on an English moor. The truth howls to be known. It must sooner or later come to light; citizens have to clear the mist and find the truth about themselves as a community.

This concept of the society as the “larger self” became clear to me in Puerto Rico. When I talked with Toño Gonzales (May 16), his self-concept had developed extensively. He had developed friendships both with socialists and with conservative aristocrats. He knew about their private beliefs and their non-public activities. His self-knowledge had grown far beyond the average islander. The conflict he felt between his friends on the radical left and the aristocracy was a conflict within himself. He said the conflict had to be resolved to maintain his own sanity. He would resolve it, he said, when he went down to

the city cemetery where everyone – right to left – was buried together. He made it a practice to visit the cemetery where he would stand before all their graves and sing. They were then together as the Puerto Rican community, an integral part of him.

#### The Self in Society: Conscious and Unconscious

A sense of self-identity develops among people growing up. That identity begins in the family, the neighborhood, the school, and ongoing through work and the mass media. Much of the history of Puerto Rico is missing in the standard texts on the island. I found that when that hidden history became conscious to the minds of young people in the university, they became furious at the United States.

There is a public consciousness that stands against what is unconscious. The private decisions of U.S. CEOs building factories in Puerto Rico that produce pollution are not part of public consciousness. They are invisible to the public. At the time of my observations, these private activities were being made public through the undercover work of concerned citizens. They helped bring public awareness of the consequences of decisions made privately in corporate self-interest (March 22).<sup>33</sup>

Fieldworkers are making documentaries. They reveal what is unconscious to the public. They are about the larger self, the latent self that is hidden from public view. They reveal the private parts of the body politic that should be part of a domestic self-identity.

My fieldwork began with investigations into the dark areas of island life. I had to find an explanation of institutional life that would provide the basis for a larger sense of Island governance. A theory is not the truth but it can be an important guide to reach a larger truth by orienting researchers who supply facts for social planning.

#### The Theory of Self-Governance

A theory of self-governance grows from the Field Notes. It is summarized here with interpretations added for societal planning and future development.

*Self-governance is the capacity of people to manage their affairs apart from outside supervision or control.* The capacity for self-governance applies to organizations as well as to individuals. In fact, it is the relationship between levels of organization and the capacity for individual self-governance that marks my emphasis of this theory. Its premises are as follows:

The capacity for self-governance among individuals is interdependent with the capacity for self-governance in the organizations where people play a role.

Each level of organization has self-governing powers of its own which contribute to developing (or retarding) the powers of self-governance among the individuals taking a role in those organizations.

These premises assert that the personal attributes of the individual “self” are written into the structure of society. A highly developed level of self-governance tends to generate self-governing individuals. In other words, the organization of society can be seen as in connection with the developing “self.”<sup>34</sup>

But now we suggest that the hidden dimensions of the self are linked with the hidden dimensions of society. The structure of society is very complex and offers different opportunities for self-development in various institutions and regions of a country. The main structure of the society cannot be the sole determinant of the individual self.<sup>35</sup>

Put another way, these premises assert that the levels of individual self-governance are interdependent with the types and levels of organizational self-governance in society. The formation of the self in the individual is helped or hindered by the role people take in the organizations of society, the family, the church, the factory, the government agency, etc.

The likelihood that people will become more self-reliant and self-directing in their personal life is closely related to their role in the everyday life of their organizations. The degree to which their member organizations encourage self-authority and self-direction, has much to do with how the organization develops. The probability that self-governance will develop among individuals is interdependent with the capacity for self-governance in their organizations.

In the churches of Puerto Rico I could hear the ministers speak of the spiritual qualities that they expected from their members but this was only one day of the week. Such high qualities of character, as humility, tenderness, gentleness, and fairness were not learned at work five days a week. What the churches were telling people to do altruistically was contradicted by their roles in business or government.

It follows that “personal development” for individuals is interdependent with “social development” in the society. The more a government is able to achieve its own

collective self-direction, the more its leaders are likely to acquire a capacity for self-direction through their role in it. The more a subsidiary of a multinational corporation develops autonomy, the more its employees are likely to develop autonomy through their role in it. The more a local church acquires the power of self-direction, the more those parishioners who are involved in its decisions will also be able to develop personal powers of self-direction.

Compared to past forms of society, modern society has evolved to encourage free association and honor individuality. In contrast with earlier societies, the democratic society has sought on the whole to encourage autonomous organizations. The autonomous organizations, in turn, generally encourage degrees of independence and self-responsibility among their members. These are the marks of “modernization” which has been widely studied and praised by scholars.

But this stage of societal development is not finished. It shows its own seeds of self-destruction as well as signs of development toward the future. “Modernization” in colonial territories is only beginning to be understood for its meaning. When the logic of modernization is followed carefully, it shows a potential for a new direction in personal self-development. It points the way toward a future. These lines of development are important to recognize in research on societal governance.

#### Research on Societal Governance

The movement toward increasing self-governance in the lower units of large-scale organizations helps us chart a future. The evolutionary movement of political units from empires to federated states, for example, represents an increase in the power of lower unit-levels of a nation, e.g. in American society: state, city, county, town, and village. But the movement of society is more than the state.

The same principle applies to modern corporations. This phenomenon occurred early in this century when General Motors decentralized its divisions of auto manufacturing. It occurred when Sears and Roebuck increased the authority of its local stores in the powers of hiring, firing, setting wages, marketing, and purchasing goods. The lower unit was thus given more responsibility and authority through administrative policies in the interest of the larger organization. The ultimate result of this direction of social

policy is to increase the power of individuals who assume new roles in the direction of the organization.

Modern systems of governance function so that each higher unit of bureaucratic organization exists to, variously, *maintain, suppress, or augment* the level of self-governance among lower units of the bureaucracy. The emphasis on any one of these forms of governance varies according to different types of organizations. But for our purposes a potential exists for increasing self-governance at lower levels in all organizations with training and under certain conditions.

This process has yet to be studied but an increase in power for the lower unit might increase the value of the whole organization as it contributes to societal development and the general welfare. Managers welcomed an increase in the power of workers to control their assembly line when it increased productivity for the corporation. An increase in the power of parishioners over their local parish would be welcomed if it increases membership and the spiritual well being of the church.

We are talking about changing the character of bureaucracy. Max Weber's ideal bureaucracy is characterized by "hierarchical organization, delineated lines of authority in a fixed area of activity, action taken on the basis of and recorded in written rules, bureaucratic officials need expert training, rules are implemented by neutral officials, career advancement depends on technical qualifications judged by organization, not individuals."<sup>36</sup> What is the future of modern bureaucracy?

Leaders in each organization can take independent actions toward increased self-governance within its system of command governance. Puerto Rico could become more decentralized with effective planning with government on the mainland. The corporate economy and the church are mutually governed and could be more decentralized through planning from above and below. The right to decentralize these organizations is sometimes written into their charters.

The society is not the state. Under conditions of negotiation in the spirit of self-development, islanders can examine their corporate charters (as well as their constitution) as the basis for taking legal steps toward increasing the level of self-governance of their organizations. The potential for decentralizing authority exists within the structure of modern bureaucracies and the key to the direction of societal development.

### The Direction of Societal Development

Each societal organization shows its potential for development. In the political sphere, for example, one purpose of development in the United States has been to increase the resources and power of self-governance among its federated states; in turn, one purpose of each state has been to increase the resources and powers of its cities; one purpose of cities has been to increase the resources and self-direction of its neighborhoods; one purpose of neighborhoods has been to increase power of individual residents.

In the sphere of the economy, this potential for decentralized development has occurred among non-profit corporations and profit corporations. Nonprofit corporations like trade unions, Kiwanis Clubs, community development corporations. Boy Scouts, YWCAs, Chambers of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturing, and other business associations are (relatively) democratically organized. Trade associations are confederations.<sup>37</sup>

What do these principles of modern organization mean for a theory of societal development? They suggest that societal development has a purpose in building self-determination, self-direction, and self-authority at every level of institutional life. They indicate that a path is laid out potentially for self-direction within each organization and that people can plan for social development within their role in this framework.

A social theory of self-development is important to consider here for of its implications for social planning. If national leaders take the lead to help decentralize authority and cultivate local resources, the whole process can be done peacefully and on a human scale.

### Key Issues of Social Planning

Social development refers to the cultivation of human resources through the key institutions and organizations of society. It means bringing the basic resources of the economy closer to the power of people in the locality. It means bringing the cultural resources of education, art, science, and technology to the community where more people can have access to them. It implies a connection to individual development through the cultivation of personal qualities among people who assume new responsibilities in the process. It means the cultivation of imagination, self-confidence, authority, sensitivity, intuition, and in new skills of leadership.

The key issue is how to decentralize economic resources and political authority without introducing unnecessary conflict, violence, or fears of anarchy. The answer in part involves introducing community self-studies that allow people to direct the changes themselves. People need to study the effects of increasing local resources and power on themselves and their local organization. An increase in a town's power to tax or expand its debt limit, for example, is a serious matter for citizens to evaluate. Similarly, an increase in the power of hiring and firing through a workers' council in a corporate subsidiary could in some cases be preceded by an organizational self-study. Likewise, an increase in the control of a local church by parishioners would be carefully considered by the top hierarchy to determine how it may affect the larger church. The steps taken along these lines in the continental United States has important implications for the development of countries like Puerto Rico under its sphere of influence.

#### Planning for a Post-Bureaucratic Society

Alternatives to bureaucracy and hierarchy cannot be considered without the development of human resources among local groups that must assume responsibilities previously assumed higher levels. It cannot begin without people who have the skills to cope with the new problems that become transferred to them from the top levels of organization hierarchy. The political, economic, and religious orders are important for us to examine further to see what this means.

In the political order, it means planning for decentralization at each level of government hierarchy. It means that city governments must look more carefully at how neighborhoods can become self-reliant and in some cases relatively self-sufficient in production, distribution, and retail activities. It means encouraging more political power in the local precinct when it becomes open to a wide range of political viewpoints. A precinct dominated by one party or opposed in principle to the formation of other parties is less capable of self-governing powers.

The state, in turn, increases aid to cities that seek their own self-sufficiency and especially to cities that are seeking to augment neighborhood power and self-reliance. It means aid to schools which encourage ideals for self-development and which train students in the responsibilities of a decentralized society. It means attention to hospitals that develop educational programs for patient self-management, that is, self-care and the

prevention of disease through neighborhood programs. It means the reduction of state welfare costs through new investments in companies that provide constructive work for the handicapped, mothers with dependent children, the elderly, and the so-called indigent. It means the formation of new organization to encourage local development and also “reconciliation” as neighborhoods compete against neighborhoods for economic resources and development.

As local power increases, new cultural programs can be planned from the higher centers. The state and the metropolis can sponsor art centers whose staff travel among economically developing neighborhoods and outlying villages for self-managed programs in dance, theater, painting, sculpting, etc. The state can help the cities to increase their economic resources and the cities can help their neighborhoods do likewise while a new stage of cultural development begins. After localities acquire greater economic resources and political power, they can assume greater direction for their own cultural development.

The fifty states, in turn, are now encouraged by the federal government to develop stronger powers and resources. Again, the principle of decentralized development is followed in funding. The more a state is willing to provide leadership and planning for the development of resources in its cities and neighborhoods, the more the federal government can fund its programs for them.

This next step of state self-direction replicates the struggle in Puerto Rico. Indeed, it requires a new model of state autonomy paralleling the struggle at midcentury on the island to establish the model for a “free associated state.” Social planning at the state level means the development of a decentralized federation. It means moving from a type of state federation (which now exists) to a type of confederation appropriate to the new stage of decentralized responsibility. This seems feasible, however, only as the fifty states achieve a greater equity in resources and a national purpose for decentralized development. Such a step is dependent, in turn, upon an increase in military and national security. It waits the development of higher centers of international polity through a stronger United Nations or world government.

The next higher level of autonomous development has yet to happen. It involves national federations such as unions and business associations helping to increase the opportunities for employee-managed companies and wholly self-governing industries.

Trade associations have begun to take steps in this direction through trade fairs, joint research programs, and inter-corporate safety programs. But, through planning, self-governance in associated industries could become a national goal. National associations could then begin to function together to decentralize the economy in the public interest. The AFL-CIO and trade associations like the National Association for Manufacturing could take steps together to implement a self-regulated economy reducing the need for outside controls from the state or federal government.

In the religious order, the steps toward organizational self-governance are similar. In the middle-range centralized order of the Presbyterian Church, for example, it would mean cultivating new levels of authority and resources at the level of the Presbytery, the Synod, then, the local church, and, finally, in the life of each parishioner.

Each church, of course, has its own order of development. The Catholic Church would likely begin its planning through the National Council of Bishops. Democratic practices have already begun through their national deliberations. The development of authority then follows logically in the archdioceses, the dioceses, the local parish church, and, finally, among parishioners themselves. The local parish priest in the final count encourages independent thought about the meaning of their beliefs and church rituals.

Such steps have already begun in many areas of parish life. The recent change in the Church from speaking Latin to English (to Spanish in Puerto Rico) is an example of transferring power from the priest to the laity who can better understand what is happening in the services. Simple changes in the ritual can show an increase in parishioner authority over spiritual matters. The practice of communion in some Catholic churches, for example, now involve priests placing the wafer in the hands of the parishioner rather than directly on their tongues. The change in this sacred act involves a transfer of power to the laity and an increase in the level of self-determination. All these changes are initiated within the private sector outside the state.

In sum, a concept of social development is interdependent with a concept of personal development. Modern churches have emphasized the cultivation of the “inner life” but have not described its connections with the organization of the church. The social development of the church could be considered in direct association with the inner life. If

this is recognized as true, the historical mission of the church then moves in harmony with the purpose of societal development.

### An Interdisciplinary Concept of Development

The connection between societal and personal development is suggested in the metaphors of history. In the past, the “power” in society was located in the estates of emperors and kings. The structure of society allocated total power to the heads of state and granted them a special divinity. But this power and glory can be interpreted today as representing only what was hidden symbolically within the individual. The structure of society only prevented people from seeing that the awe-filled splendor of the king’s court was really a representation of what was reflected within them.

Through the evolution of society, the “totality” of this power granted to heads of state gradually shifted to include more people. More people gained a touch of this power and glory through their positions as officials in the development of bureaucratic and democratic systems. The special honors accorded only the king and others who were appointed or elected to high office could share his court to some extent.

The full power and resplendent beauty expressed outwardly in the King’s estate of course has yet to be understood for its meaning in the transformation of modern organization and the life of the individual. It is true that a greater equity of material wealth has become evident in the development of society but there is another shift in meaning of the power and the glory to the individual. It is found in religious thought and has yet to be associated with social thought. It is the call for seeing the inner splendor of the spirit, the cathedral of the self, as religious leaders and poets would say.

Societal development is not associated normally with personal development but it now should find its way through interdisciplinary studies. The question is how people in everyday life begin to realize their own extraordinary inner powers. The issue is how the assumption of the new power within the individual reduces the necessity for dependence upon the corporate state.

The connection between the secular and the sacred worlds of understanding are still unfolding. It would be difficult for a corporate president or a labor leader to see the connection right now. National leaders attend church and often express non-materialistic (“spiritual”) values on Sunday but the rest of the week they are concerned with making

higher incomes and corporate self-interest. Any steps toward social development must begin with a secular vocabulary. Seeking to increase worker authority in the management of a company could add to the inner life of the workers but the process is explained (defended) in terms of higher productivity, wages, and public relations.

The connections between the secular and sacred worlds begin through community self-studies that follow the method of Paulo Freire, called “cultural action.” Self-studies lead people to look carefully at the symbols by which they live. By examining documents and the speech of everyday life, employees in a business and parishioners in a church can begin to get outside their separate routines. They can become detached enough from their everyday world to see the larger picture. It is essentially a process of participant observation on a collective scale. People review the everyday roles they play and the beliefs they hold in terms with their contradictions, as in cooperation, giving, loving on Sunday and competition, taking, hating for the rest of the week. People need to find the words to describe the unity within the plurality, realize the truth that lies behind the masks given to them in society.

#### A Final Word

One aim of fieldwork is to reveal the hidden society, to find a larger truth about the individual in society and its cultural terrain. Its purpose is to reveal the subject in the object, the sacred in the secular, thus to disclose the full nature of the individual in society, to get at the larger truth even as it must do so within a limited framework.

Seeking to get at the larger truth in my research on the island led toward new fields of study. The field of social order in contrast to the cultural order was needed to make the critical interpretations of everyday life. These different “orders of thought” were important to interpret my field notes and they carried beyond the purposes of this study. They could help guide social policies that answer the questions of governance in other countries.

The central thesis of this book has been that the tasks of social development in Puerto Rico belong to people in all roles, not just as a citizen, but also as priest, minister, rabbi along with the laity, and to the laborer, the secretary along with the president of a corporation. The problems of governance on the island are intimately connected to the problems of societal governance.

This process of development will continue beyond our lifetimes but unless we study them in this new light, we cannot understand the best potential of the future. Understanding self-governance and mutual governance developing inside the larger command governance of organizations, we can take better action and make the policies that take us respectfully toward a new society. The concept of society should allow to study the best way to solve big problems ahead for nations around the world.

### **Appendix A**

#### Analysis of Industrial and Trade Areas in Puerto Rico

(Special reference to corporate ownership and export import statistics)

**In 1971 there were more than 2,641 industrial establishments in Puerto Rico. More than 1,730 of these are believed to be a direct result of the Government's industrialization program. There were some 190 additional firms being established.\***

**Let us examine each major area of industrialization to determine the extent of its growth, its dependence upon American corporations, export-import facts, and other pertinent data in the industry.<sup>38</sup>**

#### 1. The Petroleum Refining, Petrochemical and Allied Products Industries

The petroleum and petrochemical industries now constitute the fourth largest group of the manufacturing sector in Puerto Rico. As of September 1972, this group accounted for 7,700 out of 143,500 jobs in manufacturing or 5.4% of the total. It is surpassed only by the apparel, food, and electrical industries. From October 1960 to October 1971, employment in this group expanded at an annual rate of 12% compounded, increasing from 2.1% of 4.1% of total manufacturing. At present, over fifty chemicals and synthetic materials are produced on the Island.

There are 49 *Fomento* sponsored plants operating in these industries of which 39 are subsidiaries of U.S. firms, four are foreign and the balance is composed of locally owned companies. The following American firms have built multi-plant operations: Union Carbide, Caribe, Inc., CORCO, Pittsburg Plate Glass Industries, Phillips Petroleum Co., Royal Dutch Petroleum Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Occidental Petroleum Corporation. Two U.S. firms, Union Carbide and CORCO, own all or some part of 18 different plants on the Island. The majority of the plants in these industries are located on the coastal plain adjacent to port sites in the south of the Island. Half of the plants are located in the municipal areas of Penuelas and Guayanilla.

#### The Drug and Pharmaceutical Industry

---

\* Socioeconomic characteristics of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. General Economics Division, Economic Development Administration, GPO Box 2350, San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1971, P. 11.

The drug and pharmaceutical industry in 1973 is represented by 48 establishments employing 3,535 persons. Fomento promoted forty-four. Of this total number, 40 are subsidiaries of U.S. firms and five are of local origin while the remaining firm is foreign. These firms are engaged in biological products while the remaining firm is foreign. They are engaged in biological products (e.g. vaccines and serums), medical chemicals and botanical products, and pharmaceutical preparations. Eleven U.S. firms have more than one plant in operation. This list includes: Ely Lilly & Co. (Indianapolis, Indiana), Bristol Meyers Co. (New York City), Parke Davis & Co., (Detroit Michigan), Searle & Co.

The highest concentration of plants is the category qualifying for fifteen years exemption from taxes. The largest number of plants is located in the city of Carolina (10) followed by five plants located respectively in Mayaguez, San Juan, and Barceloneta. Employment has multiplied three times in the last five years in this industry. In 1973, shipments from Puerto Rico amounted to \$240 million. Since 1963 shipments from Puerto Rico to the mainland have grown more than 29 percent compounded. The rate of imports is well below the rate of exports. In 1973 imports from the United States amounted to \$52.4 million.

#### The Apparel and Related Products Industry

The Apparel and related products industry represents the largest manufacturing sector. Approximately 28 percent of the total manufacturing jobs are derived from it. Apparel production accounts for nearly 1/5 of the total manufacturing net income of Puerto Rico. The export share apparel production amounts to 25% that ranks it first among all Island industries.

Over fifty percent of the 485 plants in the Apparel Industry are located in the San Juan Metropolitan area. At present, 68 of Puerto Rico's 76 municipalities have at least one apparel manufacturing plant. Fifty two percent of the manufacturing plants in the industry are subsidiaries of U.S. firms. These firms handle suits, coats, work clothing, dresses, infant's garments, hats, millinery, and miscellaneous fabricated textile products. Among the apparel firms are Kayser-Roth, Maidenform, BVD, Exquisite Form, MKM Knitting Mills, Jantzen, and Lady Marlene.

The value of shipments to the U.S. in 1970 amounted to \$327,474,017 and to foreign countries, \$4,629,437. Many firms have been established on the Island that serve this industry including dyeing and finishing operations, silk screen printing, embroidering and embellishing garments. In 1968, net profits as a percentage of sales for plants averaged better than 11.1 percent, compared similar operations on the U.S. mainland.

#### The Knitting Mills Industry

The Knitting Mills industry is composed of the full process of knitwear and warp-knit fabric industries. A total of 29 mills are operating and U.S. firms own all but two plants. The mills are located principally in municipalities outside the San Juan area.

Virtually all knit goods produced in Puerto Rico are shipped to the U.S. In 1971 the shipments amounted to \$20,128,568. At the same time imports to Puerto Rico amounted to \$32,973,049. The U.S. based plants in Puerto Rico include Bobbie Knitwear, Inc. (sweaters), home office located in Cleveland, Ohio, Cayey Industries (Ladies' sweaters), home office located in Manchester, New Hampshire, and Beaufag Mfg., Inc. (knitted baby shirts) home offices located in Pelham Manor, New York.

#### The Textile Mill Products Industry

The textile mill products industry includes firms engaged in preparation of fiber and manufacturing of yarn, thread, braids, twine, carpets, dyeing and finishing fiber, felt goods, lace goods, and miscellaneous textiles. There are 83 operating establishments of which 70 are U.S. firms, 10 are Island firms, and 3 are now foreign firms. Many U.S. firms have more than one plant in operation. These firms include Hampshire Designer, Kayser Roth Hosiery, Burlington Industries, and Threads Textiles, Inc. The shipments to the U.S. in 1972 amounted to \$69,259,868 while approximately \$4 million was sent to foreign countries. The value of imports to Puerto Rico of products classified under the textile mill products in 1972 amounted to \$153,974,970 while imports from foreign countries amounted to approximately \$26 million.\*

#### Plastics Products Industry (technical)

The miscellaneous plastic products industry includes establishments primarily engaged in molding primary plastics of the trade or in fabricating finished plastic products. Excluded are synthetic fibres classified under apparel, furniture and fixtures, chemical and allied products, etc. This industry includes such American firms as Aguada Gloves, Inc. which manufacturing industrial plastic gloves (subsidiary of B.F. Goodrich, Akron, Ohio), Barnes-Hinds Int'l, Inc., which manufactures Plastic hydra kits for hydration of contact lenses (Barnes-Hinds Pharmaceutical, Inc., Sunnyvale, California). There are a total of 38 plants operating in Puerto Rico of which 14 are from the mainland and 24 are from the Island. The U.S. mainland is by far the largest market for these products. During the last five years shipments from the Island to the U.S. increased nearly 16%, rising from \$7.6 million in 1966 to \$9.1 million in 1971. During the same five years, shipments into Puerto Rico increased faster, rising from \$8.1 million in 1966 to \$16.8 million in 1971.

#### The Plastic Products Industry (Commercial)

This group includes a variety of plastic products such as bottles, containers, crown caps, shoe heels, bags, cameras, furniture, clothes, pharmaceutical products, records, electronic components, boats, and signs. The U.S. firms constitute 34 out of a total of 55 plants in the industry. The following firms have more than one plant in operation: Baxter Labs., Inc., Bourns, Inc., and Royal Bead Novelty Co., Inc.

---

\* This figure is overvalued because the U.S. Department of Commerce classified some items here, which are cross-classified under apparel, chemical, and miscellaneous products. They must be understood to overlap with categories of these other industries.

### The Food and Kindred Products Industry

This group includes establishments manufacturing foods and beverages and related products such as manufactured ice, chewing gum, vegetable and human fats and oils, and prepared feeds for animals and fowls. Excluded is livestock classified under agricultural production. Canned and preserved fruits and vegetables and sea foods is the first largest group here and bakery products are the second largest with meat and dairy products following in that order. Of the 181 plants operating in Puerto Rico, 49 are from the U.S. and 12 are foreign, and 120 (or two thirds) are of local origin. Among the U.S. companies having more than one plant in operation on the Island are: Coca Cola, Del Monte, Ford Gum & Machine Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby, Star Kist Food, Inc., and Seagram's Ltd. The largest concentration of plants is in the San Juan area. In 1971, imports from the United States in this category amounted to \$21 million while exports to the United States amounted to \$191 million. Imports from foreign countries amount to \$112 million while exports were \$21 million.

### Tuna Canning

The tuna canning in Puerto Rico began in Ponce in 1953 with the establishment of the National Packing Company, a subsidiary of the South Pacific Canning Co. of California. At present there are seven plants operating employing roughly \$4,900 persons. These plants are owned by Del Monte, IBEC, Van Camp Sea Food Co., Westgate-California Corp., Star Kist Foods – all U.S. firms. While the industry was packing 18 tons per day in 1953, today it is packing 233 tons per day. In 1969 exports of canned tuna displaced the traditional leader, raw and refined sugar, as the main foodstuff export of the Island. Tuna shipments to the U.S. amounted to \$75.5 million against \$68.5 million of sugar. In 1972, Puerto Rico was producing 38 percent of all tuna canned in the United States. Local consumption of tuna not shipped off the Island has tripled from \$2.9 million in 1967 to \$9.5 million in 1969 and in 1971 it had been estimated at \$12.3 million.

### The Paint Manufacturing Industry (Analysis Emphasizes Local Firms)

This industry began in 1944 when two small firms started producing water and oil paints. By 1951 there were four firms producing \$300,000 worth of paints and by 1960 production was valued at \$1.2 million or %15 of the local market. In 1963 local industry jumped to a production of \$2.8 or 30 percent of the market. In the next four years, production doubled reaching \$7.5 million in 1967. There are ten firms manufacturing paints in Puerto Rico. The two oldest firms – Superior Paints and American Paints (owned by the same stockholders) were established in 1952 and 1957 respectively. Three firms are large enough to share 75% of total production. The remaining plants share one to eight percent of production. Paint imports amount to \$8,076,619. As opposed to this figure, local production amounts to \$7.5 million with local industry's share of the local market increasing. Analysis of paint imports in 1967 shows that nearly %27 represented latex paints, 34 percent oil (house) paint and 12 percent automobile finishes. Of the total latex

paint imports, Gildden, Dupont, Pittsburgh and Mobile control about 80 percent. Most of the raw materials used by the local paint industry are imported from the United States.

### The Hosiery Industry

This industry includes the manufacture and processing of full-fashioned and seamless hosiery, includes the processes of knitting, seaming, looping, and dyeing but not the manufacture of yarn or thread. Of the 18 plants operating in Puerto Rico, 13 are affiliated with a U.S. company. Nearly all shipments from the Island are to the U.S. Shipments have increased from \$9.0 million in 1967 to \$56.3 million in 1971. While imports have thus increased by six times, the imports have increased only 1.8 times, rising from \$4.3 million in 1967 to \$7.9 million in 1971. These firms include Hatillo Hosiery Mills, Inc. (Panty Hose), which is a subsidiary of Kayser Roth Corp. (New York) and Boqueron Mfg. Corp. (Ladies seamless hosiery) a subsidiary of Burlington Ind. Co. Greensboro, Carolina).

### The Metal Industry

The metal industry includes establishments engaged in the smelting and refining of ferrous and non-ferrous metals from ore, pig, or scrap, in the rolling, drawing and alloying of ferrous and non-ferrous metals; in the manufacture of castings, forgings, nails, spikes, and insulated wire and cables. Forty seven percent of the manufacturing plants are subsidiaries of U.S. firms and about 51 percent are of local origin while two percent are foreign. In 1972 there were 366 metal plants on the Island covering such aspects of production as the making of metal cans, screw machine products, metal stampings, etc. Of this number, 82 plants were from the U.S. Mainland. Some of the U.S. firms having more than one plant in Puerto Rico are: American Can Co., National Can Corpo., and Phelps Dodge Industries, Inc. Of the \$103 million total production in 1967, the largest part was consumed locally with 21.1 percent being shipped off the Island. The rate of imports has grown but the rate is below that of exports. Exports in 1973 amounted to \$42.9 and imports amounted to \$266,402,340 of which almost \$197 million was from the U.S.

### The Lumber and Wood Products and Furniture and Fixtures Industries

Lumber and wood products includes logging camps engaged in cutting timber, merchant saw mills, etc. "Furniture" includes establishments engaged in manufacturing households, office, public building and restaurant furniture and fixings. There are 131 furniture establishments at 30 lumber establishments. Of this total number (161) there are 15 U.S. subsidiaries. That is, 88 percent of the industries are locally owned. Among the U.S. firms are Sealy Mattress Co. and Simmons Co. Imports of furniture; and fixtures have been growing in spite of the industry's growth on the Island. In 1971 shipments from the U.S. amounted to \$34,571,000 while shipments from foreign countries amounted to \$1,588,000.

### Professional, Scientific Instruments, Photographic and Optical Goods, Watches and Clocks

This industry includes establishments engaged in manufacturing mechanical measuring, engineering, laboratory instruments, optical lenses, surgical and dental instruments, photographic equipment and the watch industry.

Among the 42 operating plants in this industrial area, 39 are U.S. subsidiaries, one is a foreign-based company and the remaining two plants are locally owned. The U.S. firms having more than one plant in operation include: Timex (New York), Baxter Labs, Inc. (Illinois), American Hospital Supply Co. (Evanston, Illinois). The 42 plants are located in 25 of the 78 municipalities of the Island. In 1972 exports amounted to \$51,184,043 and imports amounted to \$57,883,834.

#### The Electrical and Electronics Industry

The industry includes establishments manufacturing equipments and supplies for the generation, storage, transmission, transformation and utilization of electrical energy. There are 150 plants of which 129 are U.S. subsidiaries while 18 are local and 3 are foreign plants. The U.S. firms include Bell & Howell Co., A.M.P. Inc., General Electric Co., General Telephone & Electronics, Instrument Systems, I.T.&T., Motorola, Inc., R.C.A., Union Carbide, and Westinghouse Electric Corp. In 1972 shipments from Puerto Rico amounted to \$190 million. Imports into Puerto Rico in 1972 amounted to \$197 million.

#### The Leather and Leather Products Industry

These groups include establishments in tanning, currying, and finishing hides and skins and manufacturing finished leather and artificial leather products. There are a total of 33 plants of which 29 are U.S. firms and four are local firms. The firms with more than one plant include Allied Mills (Chicago, Illinois) and Evans Aristocrat Industries (Elizabeth, New Jersey). The U.S. mainland is the largest market for these leather products. A recent decline in U.S. shipments reflects foreign completion. But exports have expanded nine times in the last five years, rising from \$114,309 in 1967 to \$998,759 in 1972. Imports for 1972 amounted to \$18,362,286 of which almost all is from the U.S.

#### The Footwear Industry

This group includes firms engaged in manufacturing shoes and boots whether of leather or other materials. The total number of operating firms is 43 of which 37 are U.S. subsidiaries and 6 are local firms. The firms with more than one plant in operation are Spencer Shoe Co., U.S. Shoe Corp., and Wellco Enterprises, Inc. The bulk of the shoe market is in the U.S. but a significant amount (10%) remains in Puerto Rico. Over 26 million pairs of shoes valued at \$70.7 million were exported in 1971. In 1972, 23 million pairs valued at \$52 million were shipped to the United States alone. In 1971, shipments of footwear into Puerto Rico amounted to \$42 million, which is equivalent to 60 percent of the shipments off the Island. In 1972, six million pairs were imported from the U.S. valued at nearly \$22 million.

#### The Foundation Garment Industry

The corsets and allied garments industry consists of firms engaged in manufacturing brassieres, corsets, corset accessories, girdles and allied garments. U.S. manufacturers own all but one of the 113 plants in the foundation garment industry. The one plant is locally owned. The U.S. firms that have more than one plant in operation include: Maidenform Bra Co., (11 plants), Bestform Foundations (5), Carnival Creation, Inc. (4). It is estimated that six out of ten foundation garments worn by American women are produced in Puerto Rico. The shipments to the U.S. in 1972 amounted to \$114,524,389. In 1972, shipments of foundation garments to Puerto Rico amounted to \$8.1 million that is seven percent of shipments to the U.S.

---

<sup>1</sup> \*Robert Merton, On Theoretical Sociology (N.Y. The Free Press, 1967) pp.

5-6.

<sup>2</sup> Those who follow the Puerto Rico Independence Party (PIP) and its ideology are called *independentistas*, *pipiolos*, or just *pro-independence activists*,

<sup>3</sup> I send my Journal notes to people who talked with me or experienced a major event. Alfonso sent me the following letter after he read my notes on our discussion.

Dear Severyn:

I had a quick view of your diary. You write well. I think we must talk page 6 and 7 over again (on the relation of the Church and Socialism). I think I did not make myself clear. Maybe the reason is that I am not clear enough myself. I am thinking about it very recently. So I need your help to find out the real answers.

As for page 8: I did not say that your studies are a luxury. I think that the luxury consists of applying metropolis-thinking (in this case non-violence) on colonist territory. In the metropolis you can do with some kind of non-violence, for it is more liberal permissive. In the colony the repression is very violent. Institutional violence and even more than that. Maybe that is the big mistake most continentals make. We did as Dutchmen the same thing for a time. Puerto Rico is no part of the U.S., it is occupied foreign country. We are Latin-Americans, not even Spicks or Chicanos. I know you know that and agree but there is a danger not to make it part of your mind.

Spirituality comes out of a way of seeing the world and working with it. It is not the other way around, I think. There is no need to get all upset if there is a little talk of the Spirit. The Spirit is behind it all. Even on Sundays. Sometimes I think that we want to affirm the Spirit so much for we are not really believers. If you really believe, have faith, then there is no need to persuade yourself of the Spirit every time.

Okay, go ahead, you are doing fine.

Alfonso.

<sup>4</sup> I kept thinking poetically and philosophically?

The “dot” at the end of each tiny stem of the flower was a new experience to me. I had never seen it before. There were no words to describe it. So I used the word “dot” because the flower-dot looked like a pencil point on a piece of paper. I have thus translated one sense reality to another in order to communicate an experience for which there are no words. The flower “dot” is not the same as a dot on a piece of paper. I have simply used a

---

metaphor to describe this new sense experience. Our language has this transcendental feature. I now know something in my mind that goes beyond the complexity of what I had known before. The new physical context allowed me to transcend my past with a new understanding of the world.

What am I saying? I have used this analogy of fireworks on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July to communicate something that this flower represented to me. I am thus transported from one world (fireworks display on a dark night) to another world (the flower in the daylight) to achieve a new understanding of what I observed. This power of language to transport me between “worlds” then could suggest something about how we grow each day. We are transcending reality each day by our metaphors. Spiritual growth is a process involving transcendent steps toward more complex levels of reality. We do this everyday; we grow in spite of ourselves. This process could be called the poetry of everyday life.

<sup>5</sup> [See pp. 182 – 185. It is important to note...]

<sup>6</sup> One of the most decisive shifts of modern thought took place in the German reformation when the concept of freedom and liberty became an “inner value.” During the rise of Protestantism, a concept of emancipation became associated with the concept of salvation for the individual apart from society. The individual could become free while still obedient to external authorities of church and state. There arose at this time a realm of freedom and morality apart from external controls, detached from external oppression, and rooted in the inner life of the individual. The philosophy of Georg Friedrich Hegel was an outgrowth of this shift in cultural outlook in which the inner life was the last refuge for reason and freedom. It is here, I believe, that the search for connections between the secular and sacred begins in modern thought. Georg Friedrich Hegel, Philosophy of History, trans. J. Sibree, (George Bell & Sons, London, 1905). Cf. Herbert Marcuse, Reason and Revolution (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960).

<sup>7</sup> Karl Marx, Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Vols. I-III, Ed. Frederick Engels (New York: International Publishers, 1967). Cf. Nicos Poulantzas, Classes in Contemporary Capitalism, Trans. David Fernback, (London; Verso, 1974); Bernard Edelman, Ownership of the Image (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979). Branco Horvat, et al., Self Governing Socialism, (N.Y.: International Arts and Science Press, Inc., 1975)

<sup>888</sup> Severyn T. Bruyn, “The Dialectical Society”, Cultural Hermeneutics, (D. Reidel Publs., Dordrecht, Holland), 1974, pp. 167-209.

---

9

10

11

12

<sup>13</sup> The economic dimensions of this fact – including the widening gap between the rich and the poor – were studied by Rafael Corrada. See his doctoral at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.”

<sup>14</sup> For more analysis among these lines, see “The Status of Puerto Rico,” American Friends Service Committee, unpublished paper, 1978.

<sup>15</sup> E.F. Schumacher, Small Is Beautiful; Economics as If People Mattered, (N.Y.: Harper Torchbooks, 1973); For a description of the process by which local self-development can

happen, see Severyn T. Bruyn Communities in Action: Pattern and Process (New Haven:

University Press, 1963).

---

<sup>16</sup> A more complete picture of what can happen through social planning in Puerto Rico can be obtained by reading my book, The Social Economy. The book was written after my visits to Puerto Rico.

<sup>17</sup> See the work of Fritz Kunkel in *How Character Develops*, and *In Search of Maturity*. This includes Western and Eastern religions, Christianity and Yoga, the Tibetan Vajrayana, Taoist meditation, Zen Buddhist, and the Kabbala. Western scientific approaches to religion have their narrow side. Ethnologists and ethnographers have become aware of the inadequacy of the Occidental approach to such phenomena as shamanic experiences, trance states, spiritual healing, aboriginal rituals, and the development of paranormal abilities by individuals and entire social groups. Physicists have been confronting the fact that their studies of light and the “quantum” are related to religious studies. Biologists are becoming aware that aspects of findings about “life-after-death” go beyond the scientific explanations. Other levels of reality are becoming discovered. The connections between the scientific world and the religious world are greatly needed in the language of academia.

<sup>18</sup> (Matthew 6:28-29). Spiritual meditation on the natural order of things can be a means for developing a great awareness of Christian selfhood. Like the Hindu tradition, it is possible through spiritual practices such as prayer and meditation to reach a point of greater personal governance.

<sup>19</sup> All fields of study help make connections between inner and outer worlds of reality. Physicists’ work with mathematical symbols known in their mind and connect them at the same time with the outer world of machines like the Betatron. Physicists can help us see

---

the link between what the symbols mean and what the Betatron does. Composers of music equally live in these inner and outer worlds. They can hear the sound of music with an inner ear and then create it for outer ears.

<sup>20</sup> Harvey Cox, The Seduction of the Spirit, (N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1973) pp. 146 -147.

<sup>21</sup> Severyn T. Bruyn, The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation. (N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966).

<sup>22</sup> Peter Berger, A Rumor of Angels (N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1970) p. 83.

<sup>23</sup> Paulo Freire, The Pedagogy of the Oppressed (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1970); Cultural Action for Freedom (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Educational Review and the Center for Development and Change, 1970).

<sup>24</sup> Peter Berger, A Rumor of Angels, op. cit., p. 52 ff. The meaning of transcendence has a social foundation. The experience of a whole group of people, for example, may be interpreted as transcending their former (individual) order of experience. A transcendent experience might be found in a church service or in a secular setting, as in the passing of critical legislation in a Congress. The concept of transcendence could be considered in the study of self-governance, as it has both individual and social meanings.

<sup>25</sup> Gutierrez calls especially for the “liberation” of people from the intolerable conditions of multinational capitalism. He argues that the goal of social change is freedom from tyranny..”Gustavo Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation (N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973). For further discussion of these issues, see: Peter Hebblethwaite, The Christian-Marxist Dialogue, (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1977).

---

<sup>26</sup> Josè Miguel Bonino, Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975) p. 88.

<sup>27</sup> Marjorie Hope and James Young, The Struggle for Humanity (Mary Knoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1977).

<sup>28</sup> Gene Sharp, The Politics of Nonviolent Action (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973).

<sup>29</sup> Some theologians have begun to examine the meaning of nonviolence expressed in the New Testament. Cf. Robert J. Daly, “The New Testament: Pacifism and Nonviolence,” The American Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. 168, No. 8, October 1974.

<sup>30</sup> The first academic study of nonviolent action was by sociologist Clarence Case in 1923. Gandhi used his book on Nonviolent Coercion. Indeed, sociologist Edward Ross said it was among the “most used” books in Gandhi’s library. A social scientific interpretation of nonviolent action was as important as a religious interpretation.

<sup>31</sup> E. Knath Easwaran, Gandhi the Man (Petaluma, Calif.,: The Blue Mountain Center of Meditation, 1978); Cf. Louise Fischer, (ed.) The Essential Gandhi, (N.Y.: Vintage Books, 1962).

<sup>32</sup> Eric Voegelin discusses some of the arguments in dialectical philosophy including Marx’s debate with Hegel that the prephilosophical world view of the average individual cannot be identified with that of the critical philosopher. Voegelin also points out that Marx inherited Hegel’s conviction that the movement of the intellect in the empirical self is the ultimate source of knowledge; faith and the life of the spirit are excluded as an independent source of order in the soul. These important ideas cannot be treated here but they are part of the historical background of social theology as a field of knowledge.

---

Eric Voegelin, From Enlightenment to Revolution, Ed. By John H. Hollowell, (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1975).

<sup>33</sup> Modern society has been developing mechanisms for discovering what is happening in its hidden areas. Social research is one of those “mechanisms.” The publication of a Middletown or a Kinsey Report, a public opinion poll, a journalist sleuthing for the truth, for example, provides information that affects self-identity.

The population census is another way to bring hidden facts to the public that would be hidden, unconscious to the public. Knowing about a high birth rate can help people avoid overpopulated schools and future unemployment in the later years of cohort growth. The consequences in society from what happens privately in bedrooms across the nation then becomes known through a public report on the rate of births. Social problems can be anticipated and treated through planning. Such information again adds to the capacity for a greater truth and the ability for self-governance in society.

Television on the island would at times bring hidden aspects of society to light so people could gain more about their sense of self-identity. A television documentary on black (African) history and Indian (Taino) history as part of Puerto Rican history has the potential of bring back painful facts that have been removed from history texts. It is not unlike the technique of hypnotism (or the psychiatrist’s couch) for the individual who probes back into earlier life to discover what was painful and kept unconscious. A TV investigative News team can penetrate the back-alley scenes of city life to reveal the reality of violent gangs. TV “specials” can go behind political facades to report on the private machinations of government. These hidden activities become public facts; they become part of everyone’s “self-consciousness.” Public realization of these facts can then help to improve the capacity of the country for adequate self-governance.

<sup>34</sup> Charles Cooley, *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, (original ed, 1902; revised edn 1922)

<sup>35</sup> The main structure may not even become fully known to every individual who also responds uniquely to every social situation. But the major dimensions of society do affect the individual at unconscious levels; they are the “hidden society” and must

---

eventually be confronted by socialized individuals as part of their “self.” Citizens who come to know the main lines of society come to identify with it to some degree.

<sup>36</sup> Max Weber, *Economy and Society* (Bedminster Press, NY: 1968).

<sup>37</sup> Business cooperatives are democratic in principle, and especially widespread in rural areas. In these corporations one function of the national organization is to increase the resources of regional units; one function of the regional unit is to increase the resources of local units; one function of local unit is to increase the power of their “work system” (e.g. office staff, assembly lines); one function of the work system is to increase the self-management of the workers on the job. These decentralizing principles are emphasized differently in various organizations but they generally exist as a latent ideal.

<sup>38</sup> The following facts about industrial and trade areas are drawn from the Industry Profile Series, Economic Development and Administration. This Series in turn draws information from the U.S. Census, the Puerto Rican Planning Board; External Trade Statistics and other sources. (Chicago, Illinois), Squibb Corp. (New York) and Abbot Laboratories (Chicago, Illinois).