

DISCUSSION WITH DON JUAN ANTONIO CORRETJER ON PUERTO RICO AND WORLD SITUATION

Position of LSP on rev'y govt of Cuba on PR question thru decolonization committee and after: Alarcon (Cuban UN ambassador) had been in touch with Colon PPD and Sanches Villella since late 1976. LSP doesn't agree; resolution has revived PPD and autonomists, who have actually been a leading anti-independence force since the 1870's. Cuba pushed the PSP into a practical alliance with the PPD-- Cuba has gone beyond its natural right to intervene in the Antillean revolutionary process by backing a counter-revolutionary force in PR.

Q: Does it mark a change in its stance towards a revolution in Latin America?

A: Any change towards PR affects all Latin America, especially by a revy govt such as Cuba.

Kampuchea, as seen from PR: The complicity of the chinese was delivering Kampuchea to US imperialism; LSP dislikes, resents, and condemns that stance.

Q: Developments in Iran?

A: They see it as the ideal of revolution, a cohesion between revolutionary leadership and masses in rebellion. The overthrow of the Shah is only the beginning of revolutionary upheaval. LSP sees that US might even move to direct armed intervention in Iran. They will move to oppose a challenge to their interests if a real and not merely formal change occurs; it could be a spark to WWII, given Iran's long border with the Soviet Union.

Dev. of NLF in PR: We are not actually near the creation of such; still far from its actual development. But they believe that the prerequisite of the NLF is the transfer of independence mvmt ldrshp from legal to illegal and clandestine orgs. To achieve that there must be a larger scale war, while they are still at the stage of armed propoganda.

Q: Why do they refer to the FALN as the mother of the present struggle?

A: Its the progenitor of the new underground movement; at the moment the FALN began operations the armed mvmt was practically non-existent.

Motivation of the Cubans: To back PR ind w/in a legal framework in PR and internationally; but they have transcended principle. Q: To improve their relationship with the US? A: Uh-hm.

There was a major uproar over the question of flags and anthems at the Pan Am games. The PR Olympic Comm resigned; they have now reached some kind of compromise, but its made the people very conscious of the contradiction between the PR nationality and US imp.

Vieques Currently: The US Navy got an injunction against the Fishermen's Assoc; they have been violating it and no one is sure what will happen next.

The US has always wanted to have the Dem and Rep parties functioning directly in PR; they have had to settle for the colonial parties, but they dislike them because they still represent a certain degree of resistance and national identity of PR. The primaries are an attempt to take space and definition for DEMO Party of US in PR. This primary is statehood/annexation in action (in deeds). Republicans will probably make a similar move. This establishes a precedent for statehood. (The numbers who have actually voted in these primaries has reflected the people who are dependant on US colonial bureaucracy.)

THE PPD has threatened to introduce a resolution calling for a plebiscite in 1979 in the legislature, theoretically on the grounds that they would be challenging Barcelo, that he doesn't want the plebiscite because he fears the results; PNP now says that will call the PPD bluff and introduce a similar piece of legislation. Actually this is all in response to the wishes of the US, which has been pressuring Barcelo to have the plebiscite in 1979, rather than 1981. Barcelo is resisting because of the sociological pattern that a government which wins a plebi-

scite in the year before a general election, loses

scite in the year before a general election, loses the general election, which Barcelo does not want to risk. However, the US is aiming to begin extraction of petroleum (the non-renewable resource around which resistance is lowest)--some independentists and ecologists have supported exploration of petroleum, proposing that the colonial govt do it rather than private companies--what an absurdity. The question of status affects US plans because of maritime jurisdiction. The Soviet Union has supported the right of colonial entities to control the sea surrounding their territory, and International law would therefore forbid the exploitation of maritime resources by the colonizing power. The US wants to impose statehood this year prior to extracting oil, to cover international condemnation. It wants a 1979 plebiscite.

LSP suspects there are certain motivations behind this. The US has manipulated PR status historically whenever it foresees likely participation in a war. In 1916-17, when they decided to intervene in WWI, they imposed citizenship, to 'liberalize' the colonial regime, and move forward the juridical assimilation of PR. In place of the Foraker Act, which allowed PR citizenship and a PR regiment, the Jones Act was adopted, liquidating the PR regiment and reincorporating it into the US Army. It imposed compulsory military service.

In 1934 when Hitler took power, they resumed maneuvers on PR status; insinuating autonomist reforms that served to integrate PR and seeking to destroy the ind mvmt. They had almost accomplished that end previously, in the 1920's; but in the 1930's they were faced with armed resistance, led by the Nationalist Party and prolonged til 1938, when the Ponce massacre took place against the background of the beginning of WWII in Spain and Poland. They couldn't manipulate things with the desired speed but they began with the PPD, which allied with FDR would be the war party in Puerto Rico. This helped to suffocate the ind mvmt. By 1947, in the Cold War, the US Senate was having hearings on ELA/Commonwealth, which was eventually imposed despite NP resistance as the US took advantage of post WWII world prominence. 49 and 50, Moa took power, the Korean war, required imposition of ELA which remained unchanged til Cuban revn and the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Kennedy began to manipulate status again using Munoz Marin as showplace of democracy for US in LA. But JFK was shot down, and in '65 came intervention in Santo Domingo, and rev'n throughout Latin America. there began a resurgence of the ind mvmt with an ML tendency and an i.d. with Cuba; the two most important manifestations were a spread of Marxism and a resistance to the compulsory draft. This forced them to hold off their manipulation til the wave ebbed in PR and LA; and they have been successful so that even Cuba now gives them an outlet. The LSP has its suspicions: til now the US Navy has always opposed both ind and statehood, because they could best keep total control thru the commonwealth; now however, it looks like they might be changing their position over the past few years; not verified but Culebra and Vieques point to something being up. It looks as if the Navy may be trying to provoke unrest through its handling of these situations in order to prove to Wall Street and the Pentagon that PR absorption into the federal union is the only way to protect their interests; that the situation is too unstable to allow a neo-colonial type independence. They've been consciously provocative in Vieques, even tho Naval operations require a pacified population. They're using it to convince that any degree of sovereignty would lead to increased unrest.

Some evidence around this is that the PIP has not gone to Vieques; it is curious that Berrios hasn't gone there since they are the independentistas who would make concessions of continuing US Naval bases. the local PIP comm is part of the anti-naval coal, tho not active. Even the PNP is part of the coal; the PNP mayor's agitation indicates that he is in complicity with the Navy to promote appearance of instability and support imperialist plans. We think this may be more than fantasy (based on prospects of a possible war). 40% of nickel available to the US, strategically important to the armed forces esp the Navy, is in PR. On top of the petroleum, this could be influencing the Navy to take a position opposed to even a neo-colonial republic. This takes place in the context of a threatening US-USSR war.

The December Scientific American has an essay "New Strategy for Mil Investment" analyzing how to change overall production plans with military efficiency in mind. The November Fortune has an article that raises a war cry--shockingly unlike what usually in Fortune--pointing to the Soviet military threat. The economist of Aug 16 calls on US to rearm and promote the eco/mil development of the NATO countries, which are all underproducing. Symptoms that they're thinking of a possible war. Marked also by the change in Chinese policy, around Kampuchea and in other areas. Especially noteworthy is the Guadeloupe western summit conference; it primarily made plans to carve up China, with change in US relations; and to deal

with the situation in Africa and the colonial world.. Carter is seeking a change in respect to the Soviet Union. Kissenger's plan was to try to maintain a balance of power, giving the USSR a share in the exploitation of the TW by the west. Carter, as the man of the trilateral commission in this period is trying to stop the USSR at the door of the TW. This is how wars start. To what extent is the manipulation of PR within that whole picture-- remembering the first Trilateral conference in Dorado, where Ford met with NATO, etc; following which Ford made his statehood proposal-- reach your own conclusions.

A US Admiral True published an important wessay, which they reprinted in PR, and which was ultimately widely circulated in the Southern Cone. He was the retired meteorological chief of US Navy, expressed options and views around China. Felt that military invasion or Naval blockade of China as attempt to bring it back into imperialist camp were impossible and that atomic attack also was useless because of dispersion of population and industry, since fallout would call too much damage to Europe and US. They therefore decided on a policy of fomenting USSR-China contradictions, and intervening in internal pol devs in China to 'open up the hungry Chinese market' These are the politics which the US has pushed successfully. The Change of China in regards to the US is of tremendous magnitude, it weakened the USSR militarily, having to face a possible two front war. Chinese diplomatic positions in regards to the TW are a triumph for the US, a sacrifice of principles; giving China the benefit of the doubt, the best that they could be thinking is that they're concerned primarily with fortifying their own position and power, no matter who pays the price, the USSR or the whole third world. Maybe they are imitating the historical strategy of the US, to wait for the great powers to weaken and destroy each other and then move in (like US after WWI & II). they could enter the war to defeat whoever it would be most to their benefit to do so; they would be setting the US on the USSR, and then step in to administer the coup de grace-- that's criminal and bankrupt; it means that they are no longer Red.