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Introduction

Puerto Rico has not been an sovereign nation since Christopher Columbus discovered it in the name of the Spanish Crown in 1493. After more than 400 years of Spanish rule, Puerto Rico then passed into United States’ hands. Throughout its history, Puerto Rico has struggled to make sense of its relationship with its colonizer. On September 23, 1868, nearly 1,000 men rose against the colonial government to demand independence. They took over the municipal seat of government, deposed the Spanish officials, arrested Spanish merchants, and sent them to jail. They declared Puerto Rico independent and installed a provisional government. The next day, Spanish militia defeated the Puerto Rican revolutionaries. The Grito de Lares had ended (Denis 2015).

The Grito de Lares in 1868 marked the highpoint of Puerto Rico’s fledgling independence movement. Today, this independent movement is very small. In the early half of the 19th century, as wars of independence spread throughout Latin America, Puerto Rico remained practically moved towards such aspirations. Other than the Grito de Lares and the efforts of some political parties, the Puerto Rican people were not interested in being an independent nation. Today, the Partido Independentista Puertorriqueño (the Puerto Rican Independent Party, or PIP) garners a little above two percent of the votes in general elections. Once an idea that at least provoked strong nationalist sentiments has now fallen in the periphery of the political arena. Why is there so little support for Puerto Rican independence?

Historically, Puerto Rico had a strong independence movement at the beginning of the 20th century. Once Puerto Rico started to consider its current status, the Estado Libre Asociado (Free Associated State, or ELA) as an option in the late 1940s, support for
independence sharply declined. Despite similar class and economic dynamics in Puerto Rico as in the rest of colonial Latin America, Puerto Rico’s pro-independence movements did not succeed. After the United States invaded Puerto Rico in 1898, there was a strong presence of pro-independence movements in the island. However, these groups were not successful in attaining a goal that would seem to be the most natural course of action of any colony: independence.

The debate about Puerto Rican status has been present on and off the island since Puerto Rico was a Spanish colony. Scholars have explored the status question through varying angles. Presently, there exists a generous amount of historical studies as well as legal studies regarding the status. Nonetheless, no study has tackled the question through a political science perspective focused on the independence movement itself. Such a complex debate has not been looked at through the different components such as public opinion, election results, and voting behavior. I hypothesize that if history affects how people vote in referendums on Puerto Rico’s status, it has to do so through information available to voters, which is generally provided through education. In other words, I am interested in seeing how specific information about the independence movement in Puerto Rico affects voting behavior.

In this study I put this hypothesis to the test and demonstrate that presenting voters with historical information about the leader of the Partido Nacionalista de Puerto Rico (Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, or PNPR), Pedro Albizu Campos, boosts support for independence by about one third.

To answer this question, I used several methods of investigation. First, I conducted historical research on Puerto Rico under the United States’ rule. I focused on the available
historical accounts of the political efforts, as well as socio-economic context of the island. I used legal works that attempt to define the current political status by expanding upon the steps taken by the U.S. Congress since taking Puerto Rico as a possession and the reactions it received from the Puerto Rican people. I focus mainly on the 20th century due to the unique relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Second, I complemented this historical research with interviews of political leaders, scholars, and journalists from the island. These interviews were conducted in San Juan, Puerto Rico in December 2015-January 2016 and were dialogues both about the history of the status question as well as its current standing and future implications. Many of these interviews were used to complement historical accounts, but they also informed the creation and word choice of the third component, a novel survey experiment.

The survey experiment, held for one week in February 2016, was advertised through Facebook and attracted more than 2,000 respondents. The survey featured four experimental questions with historical information and one control group who received no treatment. Each respondent was part of one of the five groups. After the treatment, each respondent was asked two questions regarding the status question: 1) which non-territorial status option do you prefer and 2) if you were to choose only between statehood and independence, which would you choose? Out of the four treatments, those who received information about Pedro Albizu Campos delivered significant results, showing an increase of support for independence. These three research methods provide a comprehensive and quantitative view of why support for independence is currently almost nonexistent.

This thesis is divided into five sections. The first describes the limited support for Puerto Rican independence by taking a look at the modern debate and the results from the
last election and the referendum, both in 2012. The second considers various explanations for the weak independence that can be derived from existing historical and legal scholarship. The third details the experimental survey conducted in Puerto Rico. The fourth section expands upon descriptive statistics and the demographic of the sample, compared to the population. Finally, the fifth section is the final conclusion and analysis of this thesis.
I. A Modern Question

Benedict Anderson proposed an interesting theory on nationalism in his work, *Imagined Communities*. Anderson suggests that nationalism formed through the imagination of a sense of community as a result of the printing press and a new conception of time. In Venezuela, Mexico, and Peru, the drive for independence from Madrid was to prevent lower-class mobilization (Anderson 2006, 48). Thus, the leaders of national independence movements were mostly land-owning *criollos*. This sense of nationalism was a result of two factors: a) Madrid’s tightening control and b) the spread of liberalizing ideas of the Enlightenment (Anderson 2006, 50). However, as the movements broke throughout the continent, Spain maintained tight control of its strategic Caribbean possessions. Soon after, these possessions—Puerto Rico and Cuba—began their own efforts towards achieving independence. Unlike Cuba, however, Puerto Rico’s efforts towards independence were smaller and quenched quickly. The Grito de Lares remains the most significant of these efforts of independence against the Spanish crown.

Puerto Rico has been a U.S. territory for more than a hundred years. The Insular Cases in 1901 declared that Puerto Rico “belongs but is not part of the United States. It is foreign in a domestic sense.” Puerto Rico’s status within the United States can be found as in the Territorial Clause, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states that “The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.” Throughout the century, Puerto Ricans have struggled to define the status of the island, a question that is pervasive in today’s politics. The three major political parties in Puerto Rico—the Partido Nuevo Progresista (New Progressive Party, or PNP), the Partido Popular
Democático (Popular Democratic Party, or PPD), and the Partido Independentista Puertorriqueño (Puerto Rican Independence Party, or PIP)—distinguish themselves by the different status options they favor.

Over the last sixty years, two of the parties, the PNP and the PPD have alternated in power, garnering around 95 percent of the total votes in the last elections in 2012, with little variation throughout past elections. The candidates for governor for the PPD, Alejandro García Padilla, and PNP, Luis Fortuño, received 47.7 and 47.1 percent of the votes, respectively, with the PIP candidate, Juan Dalmau, receiving 2.5 percent of the votes while three other minor parties received less than one percent (Alvarez-Rivera, n.d.).

The general elections in 2012 had an additional phenomenon. For the first time in history, Puerto Rico held a non-binding status plebiscite on the same day of the general elections. Criticized by some as a decision of political ulterior motives, the plebiscite had interesting results. It asked two questions: “Do you agree that Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of territorial status?” (YES or NO) and “Regardless of your selection in the first question, please mark which of the following non-territorial options would you prefer.” The options for the second question were statehood, independence, and a form of free sovereign association in which Puerto Rico would be out of the Territorial Clause yet would participate in a voluntary bilateral agreement in which the two nations would be associated in one way or another (see Appendix for full ballot).

There were several controversial aspects to this plebiscite. For one, it was held the same day as the general elections. Many think that this was done as an attempt of the PNP candidate for re-election, Luis Fortuño, to ensure that statehood would get a majority. Second, the term “Commonwealth” or “Estado Libre Asociado” was not used to describe the
current territorial status. Third, Aníbal Acevedo Vilá (author’s interview), former governor for the PPD, argued that the enhanced ELA, which many favor, was not presented as an option, leaving those who vote YES on the first question forced to leave the second question blank or choose an option that they did not truly favor.

Previously, status plebiscites have included different options in the ballots. The first status plebiscite held in 1967 included three options: Commonwealth (60.4%), Statehood (49.0%), and Independence (0.6%). In the 1993 plebiscite, the same three options received 48.6 percent, 46.3 percent, and 4.4 percent, respectively. The last plebiscite was held in 1998 and featured a different ballot with the options of Statehood, Independence, Free Association, “Territorial” Commonwealth, and None of the Above. The results were 46.5 percent for statehood, 2.5 percent for independence, 0.3 percent for Free Association, 0.1 percent for Territorial Commonwealth, and 50.3 percent for none of the above. If anything, these plebiscites have shown that Puerto Ricans have been consistently divided about the status question and in fact, as shown from the plebiscite in 1998, many are undecided.

The third point I made above is particularly significant in the plebiscite of 2012. In the first question, which asked “Do you agree that Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of territorial status?” Puerto Ricans voted NO with 54.0 percent and YES with 46.0 percent. According to the US Senate hearings regarding the plebiscite, this was a clear rejection of the current territorial status of Puerto Rico. The results for the second question, however, were less clear. Statehood garnered 61.2 percent of the votes; Independence garnered 5.5 percent; and Sovereign Free Associated State garnered 33.3 percent. However, it is argued that since many of the PPD, unsatisfied with the options presented, voted YES to the first question, the 26.6 percent of blank ballots has a particular
significance. Having in mind these blank ballots, the results would have been: 44.61 percent for Statehood, 4.04 for Independence, and 24.32 for Sovereign Free Associated State. This means that the claim that a majority of Puerto Ricans favored statehood was not true. Although these results encompass the status question, one thing is absolutely clear: only a small percentage favors independence. No matter what other options are given, independence falls far behind in support. In my experimental survey, I wanted to force respondents to choose between the two contrary options—statehood and independence—thus, eliminating the hard-to-define middle-ground status option.
II. Explanations

The following section considers explanations for the low levels of support that might be derived from the existing historical and legal scholarship. I focus on several points that were both reiterated through my research, as well as explicitly stated in various interviews. I examine the economic implications of independence, Americanization, the persecution of the independence movement, the creation of the Estado Libre Asociado, and media and education.

The Economic Implications of Independence

A common idea regarding independence today among Puerto Ricans is the idea that Puerto Rico does not have a sustainable economy. Many say the phrase that, “if Puerto Rico were to be independent, we would die of hunger,” meaning that Puerto Rico does not have the capacity to sustain its population of 3.5 million people. The pervasive idea in Puerto Rico is that, if Puerto Rico becomes independent, they would be completely economically isolated. There is a fear that Puerto Rico would return to the times of dirt roads and wooden houses. These ideas are grounded in the history of economic dependence of the island on the United States. In this section I want to expand upon historical policies taken by the U.S., the economic implications these had on the island, and how they negatively affected the support for independence.

Soon after the Treaty of Paris, between September 1898 and April 1900, the partidas, well-organized mobs, fought in the mountains of Puerto Rico. This guerilla-style warfare was mainly the poor against the Spaniards and the wealthy criollos. The United States instituted order and gained the allegiance of the Puerto Rican elite (Malavet 2004).
On April 12, 1900, the Foraker Act authorized a U.S.-appointed civilian government to be established on the island. This statute established a U.S.-appointed governor, an eleven-man executive council consisting of mostly non-Puerto Ricans, a thirty-five person assembly (House of Delegates), and an elected resident commissioner who would speak for Puerto Rico in the U.S. House of Representatives (Rezvani 2007). In addition, this act included what Puerto Ricans know as leyes de cabotaje (or cabotage laws), which limit shipping between the United States, including its territories and possessions, to ships built and registered in the United States. This law is still present today and greatly affects the Puerto Rican economy as it limits Puerto Rico to use exclusively the merchant navy of the United States.

The Jones Act, signed by Woodrow Wilson, replaced the Foraker Act on March 1917. This act changed the local government and gave Puerto Ricans U.S. citizenship. The president of the United States would still appoint the local governor but he was given the right to appoint his own cabinet with the advice and consent from the newly created Puerto Rican Senate (Malavet 2008, 40). Furthermore, Puerto Ricans could elect a non-voting member to United States House of Representatives, the Resident Commissioner, who previously had been appointed by the President. Critics of the bill pointed out that a) the US Congress could ignore any Puerto Rican bill of rights, b) it could override any ‘laws’ passed by the Puerto Rican legislature, c) the Resident Commissioner had no vote in the US Congress and d) US citizenship was a vehicle for drafting Puerto Rican men into the US military (Denis 2015, 139). In an author’s interview with attorney and 2012 candidate for governor for the Movimiento Unión Soberanista (Sovereign Union Movement, or MUS),
Arturo Hernández said that "the lower house delegates from Puerto Rico opposed the citizenship and still, it was imposed."

The Great Depression hit Puerto Rico the hardest. Price of sugar went from 5.24 cents per pound in 1923 to 2 cents per pound in 1929 to 0.93 cents per pound in 1932. However, the big sugar companies were able to prosper due to increase in sugar production, adoption of protectionist measures, and dramatic decline of workers’ salaries (Pantojas-Garcia 1989). In 1934, the Jones-Costigan Act was approved, which established a quota on production and exports of sugar to the United States. This quota served as a catalyst in the collapse of the single-crop economy (Pantojas Garcia 1989). Although Franklin Roosevelt’s “New Deal” government took power in 1933 and provided some relief and public works projects, these were only small solutions to a bigger problem. However, compared to its Latin American neighbors, Puerto Rico flourished economically and the island became highly industrialized.

The PPD won the support of jíbaros (peasants), workers, and the middle class. As president of the senate, Luis Muñoz Marín, helped push forward legislation for agrarian reform, economic recovery, and industrialization (Tartakoff 2014). In a policy known as “Operation Bootstrap,” Muñoz Marín granted a 10-16 year tax exemption to American companies who came to Puerto Rico to invest and open branches. This resulted in increasing employment rates and urban development. Puerto Rico attracted in particular many pharmaceutical companies.

It is because of this growth and this progress that Puerto Ricans saw Luis Muñoz Marín and the U.S. as saviors from the economic depressions and authoritarian governments that the rest of Latin America seemed to be falling into. This blurred
perception allowed Puerto Ricans to ignore the message of the independentistas. Former Puerto Rican Senator for the PIP, Fernando Martín, offered an analogy:

“It’s as if I showed you two photo albums. One of the photo albums features a humble house that needs a lot of work and reconstruction. The other house is grand and beautiful, with amenities and the best technologies. Puerto Ricans chose the second house. This house, however, eventually started crumbling while the humble house slowly and gradually became better and better.”

(author’s interview)

It was too late, however, because Puerto Ricans had already been conditioned to love that first, beautiful house.

For the early half of the 20th century, the US Congress passed several acts that greatly hindered the organization of strong independence movements in the island through legal channels. In the early 20th century, U.S. congress passed two acts that lay the foundation of the relationship between the United States and the island. The Foraker and then Jones act arguably created an economy of dependence on the United States. Given this, Puerto Ricans today fear independence because, as the President of the MUS, Marilú Guzmán, puts it, Puerto Ricans believe that “if we were to be independent, we would starve to death, people would leave the island, and they would lose their homes” (author’s interview). Today, this half way economic status has directly impacted Puerto Rico’s economic success. However, the roots of this dependency have been buried so deep that many Puerto Ricans cannot imagine a life without it, preventing and discouraging them from the idea of independence.
Americanization

A second potential explanation as to why independence does not have much support is that there is a legacy of decades of Americanization attempts on the island. Although Puerto Rican identity and culture is strong on and off the island, decades of Americanization changed the way Puerto Ricans perceive both themselves and their colonizer.

Within ten years of the occupation, every subject, in every class, in every public school was being taught in English. However, very few teachers were able to understand it. This move towards Americanization directly confronted the 400 years of cultural legacy left by the Spanish. Currently, both Spanish and English are the official languages of Puerto Rico.

In 1902, the Official Language Act declared that all Puerto Rican governmental departments, courts, and public offices would use English as the official language. At the beginning of the school day, all children must salute the American flag, declare the Pledge of Allegiance, and sing the national anthem in English. In 1909, the commissioner declared that speaking Spanish was forbidden in all public schools (Denis 2015, 22).

English and Spanish were established as coequal official languages. Former governor Rafael Hernandez-Colón (PPD) tried to repeal this law in 1991 and in 1993, his successor, Pedro Roselló (PNP), reinstated it. However, although official business and public schooling was conducted in English, both the privileged and the disenfranchised classes rejected the abandonment of Spanish as their mother tongue. Despite the efforts to Americanize the Puerto Rican people, Puerto Rico was and has been more attuned to
Spanish and Latin American cultures. Whereas under Spanish colonial rule it was harder to create boundaries of distinct identities, under U.S. rule, Spanish became an important marker of distinctiveness.

Matienzo Cintrón, who first advocated for statehood and then independence, believed in Americanization as a transformation for Puerto Rico into a modern and progressive nation not unlike the United States. Indeed, despite the controversy, the U.S. education initiative provided education to more than 150,000 students, five times more than before.

Some of the newer generation of students, who had not experienced Spanish rule, openly opposed English as the official language of instruction. The Department of Education responded by repressing and suspending those who criticized the U.S. policies. Supporters organized a special school for those who had been suspended, The Instituto José de Diego. The Commissioner of Education, Paul Miller requested the names of the teachers and students who signed a petition in favor of independence, claiming that he would not “appoint or approve the nomination” of those whose loyalty to the U.S. is in doubt (Ayala and Bernabe 2007). In 1922, young protesters of these U.S. policies formed the Partido Nacionalista after the Partido Unión removed independence from its program.

The United States attempted to import US holidays and traditions into the island—for example, by replacing the Tres Reyes Magos, the Three Wise Men, with Santa Claus. One of the best short stories in Puerto Rican literature, “Santa Claus a la Cuchilla” by Avelardo Diaz-Alfaro depicts how Santa Claus visits a small public school in a barrio in a town in the central mountains of the island. All the children and their parents react in horror at the sight of a white, fat, red-nosed Santa Claus (Malavet 2008).
Public displays of patriotism, such as displaying the American flag and National Anthem were required. The only flag allowed to be flown in Puerto Rico from 1898 to 1952 was the American flag (Tartakoff 2014). To this day, the United States flag flies alongside the Puerto Rican flag and the U.S. National Anthem is sung right after the Puerto Rican anthem at all public events. Holidays such as Thanksgiving and the 4th of July are also celebrated throughout the island.

Most importantly, strong opposition to independence accompanied these processes of assimilation. Students and teachers who were involved in what was seen as anti-American activities were expelled and shunned by the society. The PNP governor from 1969-1973, Luis A. Ferré, suggested the estadidad jíbara. Former candidate for governor for the MUS, Arturo Hernandez, described it as “a form of statehood where Puerto Rico would be annexed into the Union without losing its cultural identity, traditions, or language...” (author’s interview). However, although in many ways the Puerto Rican culture has assimilated the American culture, there is a strong resistance to it. After more than a century of Americanization, less than twenty percent of Puerto Ricans speak English and Puerto Rican culture persists alongside rather than instead of the American culture.

Puerto Ricans in the island, upon seeing the progressiveness of the U.S., believed that becoming more American was the path to success. The different policies made it difficult for pro-independence sentiments to plant strong roots and spreading. I argue that the imposition of American culture was strongly rejected; however, the importation of the ideals that come along with Americanization, such as progress and democracy positively affected perception of the United States and negatively affected support for independence. In addition, education, the means used for Americanization, is an important area in which
history and information can be manipulated. This has a strong effect on my hypothesis, given that an Americanized education system would seek to discourage pro-independence sentiments.

*Persecution of the Independence Movement*

It is impossible to determine a single catalyst that caused support for independence to decline during the 20th century. At the beginning of the century, a strong pro-independence sentiment was felt throughout the island. However, during the thirties and forties, particularly, independence started to become something that many feared, both for its economic, as well as its personal implications, due to the intense persecution from the United States as well as from the governing administrations within Puerto Rico.

Pedro Albizu Campos grew up poor in Puerto Rico and in 1921 graduated Valedictorian of his Harvard Law School class. Although he received many job offers, he returned to his hometown of Ponce to fight for the independence of Puerto Rico. After extensive legal study, he concluded that the Treaty of Paris was a violation of international law with regards to Puerto Rico. He became active in other countries’ efforts for independence such as in Ireland and India. He worked with the Indian nationalist leader under Gandhi, Sudas Ghandra Gose and also helped draft the constitution for the Irish Free State (Villanueva 2009).

Albizu and the Nationalists created the *Cadetes de la República*, a youth branch of the PNPR. On Palm Sunday, March 31, 1937, the PNPR peacefully marched through the streets in Ponce. The mayor had initially given permission for the march to occur but tried to rescind it at the last minute after Governor Blanton Winship ordered the chief of police to
do so. The parade had already begun. There was suddenly an increased police presence and hostility—the police were carrying Thompson submachine guns, rifles, pistols, and tear gas. There was a moment’s argument but the leader of the Cadetes ordered the band to play the Puerto Rican national anthem, “La Borinqueña” and everyone in the surrounding area began to march.

It is unclear who fired the first shot, but as soon as it happened, chaos overtook. Nineteen civilians, including a child, and two policemen were killed. In the panic, the police kept firing everywhere: corpses, buildings, trees, and telephone poles. They shot a young girl in the back as she tried to flee, a man on his way home, a fruit vendor, and a 53 year old woman was clubbed in the head. There was no discrimination once the gun was fired. Cadet Bolivar Márquez Telechea managed to write “Long live the Republic. Down with the Murderers” in his own blood before he died in a corner (Denis 2015, 47).

Subsequently, the scene of the crime was rearranged to make it seem as if it had been a shooting started by the Nationalists and that the police was acting in self-defense. Photos and news reports were staged and manipulated, however, some newspapers such as El Imparcial and El Mundo that had been present at the demonstration, were not easily swayed. Their front pages repeated and spread the words of Márquez Telechea. Elsewhere, in the U.S. mainland, this was simply described as an incident by Nationalist fanatics where they all shot and killed themselves.

After these events, Albizu Campos and other Nationalists were arrested on charges of sedition, among others. He was sentenced to ten years in a federal penitentiary. Controversy surrounds this sentencing, as the first jury failed to agree on a verdict and the second group composed of ten Americans and two Puerto Ricans with American business
interests found Albizu Campos guilty (Ayala and Bernabe 2007). On June 7, 1937, he and other prisoners were transported to Atlanta, Georgia, where he stayed until his release in June 1943. He then resided in New York until his return to the island in December of 1947. On the day of his arrival, students at the University of Puerto Rico raised the Puerto Rican flag. This resulted in the expulsion of several students, including future independentistas Juan Mari Brás, Jorge Luis Landing, and José Gil de la Madrid. Soon after there was a strike after the students were denied permission for a talk by Albizu Campos. As a result, the PPD-controlled legislature enacted Law 53, also known as the Ley de Mordaza or Gag law, modeled after the Smith Act. It outlawed any mention of independence, including the performance of the national anthem, and any ownership of the Puerto Rican flag. Five months after the Gag Law, Luis Muñoz Marín became the first elected governor of Puerto Rico.

Repression was the only way to prevent a Nationalist-led anti-imperialist popular movement (Pantojas-Garcia 1989). In an effort to control the island and its subversives, the FBI opened what came to be known as las carpetas (surveillance files). This program, led by J. Edgar Hoover, sought to gather all information on thousands of Puerto Ricans that may be deemed as dangerous to the United States (in other words, independence movement sympathizers). The FBI followed the Cadets and other Nationalist and independence sympathizers for twenty years and created hundreds of carpetas that sum up more than a million pages of information. On Albizu Campos they had more than 4,700 pages alone (Denis 2015). These dossiers provided names, family names, schools attended, to whom the people talked, and more detailed and intimate information about each person. Some reports even suggest that the Cadets of the Republic had been infiltrated at the highest
levels and that the FBI knew of every plan and move the Nationalists would make (Denis 2015).

Former senator and candidate for governor for the PIP, Ferndando Martín said that “the legacy of the persecution was an enormous institutional weakening of independentismo, as well as a sense of humiliation and complicity in part of the PDP for their participation in 30 years of persecution” (author’s interview). He recalls that when he saw his carpetas, he was surprised to know all the neighbors and friends who informed on him. “They didn’t want to but they had to for fear of being labeled a sympathizer and then risk their lives...the number of people who had to say ‘Hello’ to me, humiliated and embarrassed that they were simultaneously informing on me...that's the human dimension of this political tragedy,” he said.

The carpetas were used to imprison people, get them fired, or ruin their careers, terminate their educations, and permanently discredit them, even if they weren’t members of the Nationalist Party (Denis 2015, 76). The carpetas allowed the FBI to have surveillance on Puerto Ricans at every level, including Luis Muñoz Marín.

A few weeks after Muñoz Marín won the elections as president of the Puerto Rican Senate, Hoover commanded the FBI to gather all possible information on Muñoz Marín. On April 1, 1943, Hoover received information that Muñoz Marín was a narcotics addict. He was also known as El Moto de Isla Verde (the Junkie of Isla Verde). After gathering all the information that was needed, the FBI closed the case. This was what they needed in order to ensure that Muñoz Marín, the romantic, literary independentista would be kept tightly under the United States’ control. The case was filed on April 1, 1943. The next day, Senator Tydings of Maryland, chairman of the Territories and Insular Affairs Committee (Gatell,
1958), introduced the independence bill to Congress. This bill was modeled after the Tydings-McDuffie Bill of 1934 and included better provisions for Puerto Rico than the previous bill presented. However, to everyone’s shock, Muñoz Marín refused to support it (Denis 2015).

On October 1950, the Nationalists carried out what came to be known as the October Revolution, led by Pedro Albizu Campos. The revolt began on October 20, 1950 in Peñuelas, a town near Ponce in the southern part of the island. Seven other cities took part in the revolution. Around noon that day, the governor’s mansion in Old San Juan was attacked (Malavet 2008). The original plan was to create insurrection throughout the island and then move towards Utuado and Jayuya, in the center mountainous range of the island to wait out for the international community to notice the revolution. Albizu knew that he couldn’t fight the U.S. armed forces but he knew that he needed to get the message out. On November 1st, several Nationalists attempted to assassinate President Truman at Blair House in Washington. On November 2, Albizu was arrested and the revolution had been quenched with nearly no international press. This was passed off as another minor incident in the United States press.

Muñoz Marín condemned political nationalism—based on ideological partisanship—because it could lead to war, terrorism, hatred, and death. Although Muñoz Marín was committed to right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for his own island, he considered advocates of independence enemies of Puerto Rico and used the Gag Law, which was repressive and violated the First Amendment, to repress and destroy the independence movement in the island.
Muñoz Marín pardoned Albizu Campos in 1953. However, in 1954, Albizu was again jailed when four Nationalists attacked the U.S. House of Representatives. Although this was not an attack Albizu Campos planned or ordered, he was again jailed for the events (Tartakoff 2014).

The infamous historic prison, located in Old San Juan by the walkway of the same name, La Princesa, was where Pedro Albizu Campos served time after the October revolution. During this time, Albizu was imprisoned with no external visitors. While he was there, Albizu repeatedly claimed that he was the target of radiation experiments. Although the U.S. and Puerto Rican press dismissed such claims, the physical evidence suggested otherwise: his skin was severely swollen and cracking. There was never any concrete proof that Albizu was being tortured. However, in 1955 the U.S. Department of Energy disclosed that human radiation experimentation had been conducted on prisoners without their consent from the 1950s through the 1970s. Albizu Campos was partially paralyzed and suffered a stroke in 1964. At this time, Governor Luis Muñoz Marín pardoned Albizu for a second time. The next year, on April 21, 1965, Albizu Campos died (Villanueva 2009).

Creation of the Estado Libre Asociado

The creation of the Estado Libre Asociado (Free Associated State, or ELA) was probably the final direct blow against the PNPR and therefore the pro-independence movement. The ELA would be a relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico similar to that of New Zealand, Australia, or Canada with Great Britain. Muñoz Marín expressed this status as an autonomous state within American sovereignty (Tartakoff 2014). Ironically, the ELA was modeled after the 1931 Statute of Westminster, which
codified many of the preexisting unwritten constitutional rules governing relations between the British central government and the British dominions (Rezvani 2007). The creation of Law 600, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, was the biggest success of the PPD and the biggest grievance of the PNPR. Albizu Campos insisted that the law was a sham since the U.S. Congress could overturn any statute passed by the Puerto Rican legislature (Tartakoff 2014).

President Truman signed Law 600 on July 4, 1950 (the October Revolution in protest of this law occurred that same year). This law was introduced as an amendment to the Jones Act. The law did not extend all constitutional guarantees to Puerto Ricans but it permitted them to write their own constitution. On a referendum on June 4, 1951, Puerto Ricans voted by 76.4 percent in favor of the law. This resulted in the Constitutional Assembly and the Constitution of 1952, passed in a referendum. In spite of this, under the Territorial Clause of the United States Constitution, Puerto Rico lacks legal sovereignty—the US has complete authority over the island and can overturn any decisions made by the Puerto Rican government. Puerto Rico was still a colony. In 1953, the United States went to the United Nations to remove Puerto Rico from the list of non-self-governing territories. Thus, in the eyes of the international community, Puerto Rico was a self-governing territory.

The creation of the ELA put the legal question of the status to rest. In theory, the status question was solved in 1952. However, the legal interpretation of the Territorial Clause in the Constitution and the ELA itself is still very much debated today.
When asked about their biggest obstacle as a party, the PIP leaders Adrián González, candidate for mayor in San Juan, and Juan Dalmau, former candidate for governor for the PIP (author’s interviews), pointed out the problem with the media in Puerto Rico. Juan Dalmau, explained:

“The media benefits and profits from the regime. Subsequently, the media blocks anything that threatens the regime, not only in an independentista perspective, but also in a social perspective. Our PIP senator, María de Lourdes Santiago has been the head proponent of policies regarding education, the environment, the economy...yet when another of the two parties proposes the same things, they are given the media coverage.”

He went on to point out that the last front page news that the PIP received was more than fifteen years ago when the then-candidate for governor Ruben Berríos was doing civil disobedience against the navy in Vieques. Currently, most polls depicting the current governmental candidates for the elections in 2016 show only those from the PPD and PNP.

Given the huge influence that the media has in Puerto Rican politics and political education, it is evident that the amount of coverage the PIP receives has influenced the perception of the party as well as the ideology that it represents.

In the interviews conducted, one of the main reasons for the fall of support for independence that many of the interviewees pointed out was the lack of education of “true” Puerto Rican history. Indeed, through my personal experience, I remember learning basic history: there were Taínos who mixed with Spaniards and Africans and that created the Puerto Rican; then there was the first elected governor Luis Muñoz Marín and the governor
Luis Ferré who built the highway from Ponce, in the south to San Juan, in the north. In tenth grade I had a teacher who went deeper into Puerto Rican history. With her I learned about Pedro Albizu Campos, as well as prominent figures in politics, academia, and arts. However, this history touched upon the very basics of who Albizu was and what he did. "We do not learn the true and complete Puerto Rican history," Hernandez said.

Leaders of the PIP suggested that there is no "real study that looks at how Puerto Ricans learn history in the island." According to most of the interviewees, the public education system in Puerto Rico maintains the current status quo. The points discussed previously as explanations to the lack of support for independence—economic development, Americanization, and persecution—all hinge on education and information. In other words, if the U.S.’s efforts to undermine the independence movement were well known, it might provoke a rejection of U.S. intervention on the island and stimulate greater support for the independence movement. In addition, because of the sociopolitical changes that occurred during the era, Puerto Ricans created a sense of dependency on the United States, which has been passed on through the generations. In the next section, I put this hypothesis to the test. Having acquired this information from my historical research and interviews, I asked the interviewees what information might change support for independence if voters had it. With this in mind, I created the experimental public opinion survey, explained and analyzed in the following section.
III. Survey

When asked to identify what new information, not already well known by Puerto Ricans, might boost support for independence, Fernando Martín responded that “If Puerto Ricans knew the real and complete truth” (author’s interview) they would be independence supporters. Repeatedly during the interviews, the subjects remarked that education and political information was lacking for Puerto Ricans to have informed opinions and make decisions about the status.

In order to test this hypothesis, I designed a survey to try to measure the effect of providing information about Puerto Rican history and the implications of different status options on Puerto Ricans’ preferences with respect to political status.

Apart from standard demographic and descriptive questions, the survey included four experimental conditions where respondents were provided with different informational treatments, as well as a control group in which no information was provided. Respondents were randomly assigned one out of the five conditions. Subsequently, all subjects were asked several questions used to measure the outcomes of interest. The first two were adapted from the 2012 plebiscite (see Appendix):

T15x. Do you agree with maintaining the current territorial political condition?
YES or NO

T16x. Regardless of your answer to the first question, which of the following non-territorial options do you prefer? STATEHOOD, INDEPENDENCE, FREE SOVEREIGN ASSOCIATION or NONE OF THE ABOVE.

T17x. And if you were to consider only between the following options for Puerto Rico, which would you prefer? STATEHOOD or INDEPENDENCE
Four of the conditions conveyed information (reproduced below) that I found through research and interviews that might not be well known amongst Puerto Ricans. One question regarded Pedro Albizu Campo’s pro-independence actions and his persecution by the FBI, another regarded Luis Muñoz Marín’s narcotics addiction, the third regarded the benefits that Puerto Rico would get if it were to become a fifty-first state, and finally, the last question regarded Tyding’s Bill for independence. The first two conditions focus primarily on historical political characters, where I’m trying to appeal to the emotion of the respondent. On the other hand, the final two treatments deal with the legal side of the status in order to examine those legal implications. There were a total of 2,894 respondents and each received either one of the treatments or the control.

The survey was advertised through Facebook (see Appendix for ad) to voting Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rico for one week in February 2016. In exchange for successfully completing the survey, the respondents were given the option to enter a raffle for an iPad Air 2. Before publishing the survey, I ran a pre-test with several friends and family members where they suggested several changes and adjustments.

As a sample of convenience, the survey is not entirely representative of the population. Its advertisement through social media as well as using the image of the Puerto Rican flag inside the outline of Puerto Rico might have attracted a certain demographic more than others. However, the sample is diverse enough to draw several conclusions. Although the survey attracted a larger share of pro-independence sympathizers than in the general population, I was surprised to find a larger number of those who support statehood, as well.
First Treatment Condition

The following passage is the first treatment condition

_Pedro Albizu Campos was an important historical character in Puerto Rico. The attorney Albizu Campos was the leader of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, a pro-independence and anti-colonial party. Albizu Campos also believed in the betterment of workers’ conditions and the lower class. Nicknamed ‘The Teacher,’ Pedro Albizu Campos was imprisoned for twenty-six years. Because of his leadership in armed revolutions in Puerto Rico, the United States and the FBI spied on his actions for decades. He was then imprisoned again, allegedly tortured with radioactivity. He died in 1965._

The respondents were then asked how much of this information did they know before taking the survey—A LOT, SOME, A LITTLE, or NOTHING. A total of 40.11 percent answered A LOT, 41.86 percent answered SOME, 10.33 percent answered A LITTLE, and 7.71 percent answered NOTHING.

Next, I created dummy variables for questions T16a (treatment) and T16e (control). I selected the dummy variable for independence, where the option for independence T16adum2 equals 1 and anything else equals 0 and T16edum2 equals 1 and anything else equals 0. I then ran a difference of means test against the control dummy variable for independence for the same question, T16edum2. In the following graph, we can observe the effects of this treatment, as well as the others.
Figure 3.1 The dependent variable is support for statehood for the State treatment and support for independence in the other three. The dots give point estimates and the lines give 95% confidence intervals.

In this difference of means test, the null hypothesis is that there is no difference between those who chose independence after the treatment and those who chose independence without a treatment. I observed that $t = 2.538$ and, given $\alpha = 0.05$, we are able to reject the null hypothesis (see Appendix for detailed table). These numbers reveal with a 95% confidence interval that there is a significant difference between both means. In other words, after being given the treatment, more respondents chose independence than those who were not given any treatments at all. This treatment increases support for independence by 6.3 percentage points. Given that the baseline level of support is 20
percent, this effect amounts to a 32 percent increase in support for independence. In other words, this treatment increases support for independence by almost one third.

From this treatment option, I conclude that Pedro Albizu Campos, regardless of his history, which many respondents knew, is a well known and, according to historians I interviewed, beloved character in Puerto Rican history. However, giving respondents explicit information about his efforts for the Nationalist Party and the persecution he faced from the FBI, did affect respondents’ support for independence. It seems that respondents were more likely to choose independence when they knew the struggles that Albizu Campos faced in search for it.

Second Treatment Condition

The following passage is the second treatment condition

*Luis Muñoz Marín was the first governor of Puerto Rico that was democratically elected. Originally, Luis Muñoz Marín was pro-independence but then he separated himself from the pro-independence parties and formed his own party, the Popular Democratic Party, which united the jíbaros to promote a minimum wage, food and water necessities, agricultural cooperatives, and the expansion of the industrial sector. There is evidence that the FBI had information about Muñoz Marín’s opium addiction. The FBI used this information to blackmail Muñoz Marín into condemning the Nationalist Party and all pro-independence efforts.*

Similarly, the respondents were asked how much of this information they knew prior to taking the survey—33.28% answered A LOT, 37.20 percent answered SOME, 13.31 percent answered A LITTLE, and 16.21 percent answered NOTHING.
To analyze the results of this treatment, I followed the same steps as the first question, creating the dummy variable T16bdum2 where those who chose independence equals 1 and those who chose anything else equals 0. Next, I ran a difference of means test between T16bdum2 (treatment) and T16edum2 (control).

Similarly, for this treatment, the null hypothesis would be that there is no difference between those who chose independence with the treatment and those who chose independence without the treatment. However, with $t = 1.305$ at $\alpha = 0.05$, we can observe in Figure 3.1 that we are unable to reject the null hypothesis (see Appendix for detailed table). This means that at $\alpha = 0.05$, there is no difference between those who chose independence with the treatment and those who chose independence without the treatment. For question T16b, 47.68 percent of respondents chose that they would prefer STATEHOOD, 23.16 percent chose INDEPENDENCE, 22.98 percent chose FREE SOVEREIGN ASSOCIATION, and 6.17 percent chose NONE OF THE ABOVE. In comparison, for the control group, 48.00 percent chose STATEHOOD, 20.00 percent chose INDEPENDENCE, 27.48 percent chose FREE SOVEREIGN ASSOCIATION, and 4.52 percent chose NONE OF THE ABOVE.

What I can conclude from this treatment is that, although fewer people knew this information about Luis Muñoz Marín, this information did not affect people’s preference for independence. I suspect there are several reasons for this. First, Luis Muñoz Marín was the first governor of Puerto Rico, an admirable and historical moment for all Puerto Ricans in the island. Therefore, it is harder to change respondents’ prior opinions about him. Second, Luis Muñoz Marín spearheaded the efforts for the creation of the Estado Libre Asociado, the Free Associated State, or ELA, which provided at the time an option for Puerto Ricans to be
tied to the United States yet also granted the freedom of the creation of a Puerto Rican constitution. Given that Muñoz Marín is perceived, in a sense, as a national hero, and that he is best known for supporting the ELA, the results do not necessarily show an increased support for the ELA. Rather, people have fairly strong prior opinions associating Muñoz Marín with this political option and it is harder to convince them to associate him with support for independence.

*Third Treatment Condition*

I decided to include a treatment condition regarding different benefits that Puerto Rico would receive if it were to become the 51st state to test the effect of information on the contrary status option. I hypothesized that because education and information have a strong effect on deciding territorial status, those respondents who received this treatment would be more likely to support statehood. In other words, I wanted to test if information about statehood has the same effect on supporting statehood as it does on supporting independence.

The third treatment condition reads as follows

*If Puerto Rico were state number 51 of the United States, it would receive several benefits that it currently does not qualify for. These include the right to vote for president of the US, participation in the American economy, participation in the Congress, and more responsibility in Puerto Rican issues from the federal government.*
When asked how much of this information the respondents knew prior to taking the survey, 91.86 percent responded that they knew about the benefits and 8.94 percent responded that they did not.

Unlike the previous two treatments, because this treatment deals with statehood rather than independence, I created a dummy variable where statehood, $T16cdum1$, equals 1 and anything else equals 0. I then compared this to the same option in the control group, where $T16edum1$ equals 1 and anything else equals 0. I was then able to run a difference of means test between the variables. You can see this effect shown in Figure 3.1 above.

The null hypothesis for this treatment is that there is no difference between those who chose statehood with the treatment and those who chose statehood without the treatment. The purpose of this specific treatment was to see if pro-statehood information would sway the opinion towards selecting this option. However, the results show that at $\alpha = 0.05$, there is no significant difference between those who received treatment and those who did not (see Appendix for detailed table). I conclude that many are aware of what benefits Puerto Rico would receive with statehood and there is little difference when making this information explicit.

*Fourth Treatment Condition*

Finally, the fourth treatment condition states

*In 1936, Senator Millard Tydings introduced to the United States Congress a bill that would grant Puerto Rico independence after a transition period. Luis Muñoz Marín rejected this bill while many Puerto Ricans were in favor of it. This bill was not approved in the end.*
The treatment was followed with a question that asked whether the respondent knew that the ELA was created as a step in transition towards either statehood or independence. Of the respondents, 65.56 percent responded YES and 34.44 percent responded NO.

As with the first two treatments, the independence dummy variable T16ddum2 was compared to the control independence dummy variable T16edum2. Figure 3.1 shows the effects of this treatment.

With \( t = 1.303 \) at \( \alpha = 0.05 \), I must retain the null hypothesis (see Appendix for detailed table). In other words, there is indeed no difference between the two populations. From this result, I conclude that the treatment had no effect in respondents choosing independence. Unlike the first two treatments, the last two treatments dealt with the legal side of the status issue rather than trying to appeal to the emotion of the respondent. Because of this, I believe that the treatment had a lot less effect than what was seen in the first treatment, specifically. In addition, I believe that Puerto Ricans might be less affected by Congressional actions taken in the mainland than those coming from within the island.

Statehood and Independence as the only options

As part of my interview, I asked the PIP leaders explicitly what sort of questions I should be asking in my survey in order to answer my main question: why is there such low support for independence. The interviewees suggested that perhaps the way the status options have been framed in the past has reduced overall support for independence. Juan Dalmau said that Puerto Ricans should be allowed to “choose between a status option that is neither territorial nor colonial” (author’s interview). Furthermore, Adrián Gonzalez
(author’s interview) suggested that it would be interesting to force people to choose between statehood and independence, suspecting that many within the PPD or those who support the Commonwealth lean more one way or another. In order to test that hypothesis and the effect of being offered fewer choices in an alternate type of referendum, I compared in the control group the results of those who chose independence when given all the options in question T16 to those who chose independence when only given the option between statehood and independence in question T17. First, however, let's examine each variable individually. When given all options, respondents voted as such

![Figure 3.2 Percentage of votes when given all status options. For a detailed table, please see Appendix.](image)

Then, respondents were asked to choose between only statehood and independence.
Before fully analyzing the results comparing the means between the variables, we can observe the difference between the increase in both options. Significantly, we can note how support for statehood increases by around eleven percentage points and support for independence more than doubles. This suggests that there might be increasing growth towards pro-independence sentiments. Now, to compare, I ran a difference of means test between the dummy variable for independence in question T16, T16edum2 and the dummy variable for independence in question T17, T17edum2.
In putting to the test the prediction that resulted from analyzing the variables independently, one can see with $t = 7.88$ at $\alpha = 0.05$ that we can safely reject the null hypothesis. In other words, there is a significant difference between the population that chose independence in question T16 and the population that chose independence in T17. I conclude that many of the respondents who chose Free Sovereign Association or None of the Above in the first question leaned more towards independence when given the opportunity to choose between the two. This result is important in many aspects.

As we have seen, support for independence has declined historically. However, when given an alternate form of the plebiscite in which respondents are forced to choose between the two most historically debated options—annexation or independence—there is a significant increase for support of independence. This can be for many reasons. First, as Luis A. Ferré proposed, the ideal form of statehood would be an *estadidad jíbara* (peasant statehood) in which Puerto Rican culture would not be affected. I can hypothesize that this is a big reason why people see the ELA as an ideal status option. However, when the ELA option is taken off the table, the competition between statehood and independence is much closer. Having in mind that this group received no treatment, the opinions regarding status were not affected by any additional information provided. In this sense, the comparison of
support for independence given different sets of alternatives is similar to the choices that people face in the real world. One then can ask the question, “What would Puerto Ricans be sacrificing if they become part of the Union?” The answer to this question may then prompt Puerto Ricans to choose independence.

Secondly, the ELA is tightly associated with one of the most important parties in the island, the PPD. Through personal experience, I have met political candidates who chose to run for the PPD, despite themselves being pro-independence, because it provides the clearest path of success than if they were to run for the PIP. Keeping this in mind, I believe that some of those who belong to the PPD or favor the ELA are people who believe these are the clearest paths to economic success and safety, despite holding pro-independence ideals.
IV. Descriptive Statistics

The sample, although not completely representative as stated above, was diverse.

The following tables demonstrate the information.

**Table 3.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>IndexMundi¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44.16</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.77</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked whether or not they identified with a Puerto Rican party—49.79 percent answered YES and 50.21 percent answered NO. The following table depicts the results for Puerto Rican party identification.

**Table 3.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>ENDI Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPD</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPT</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Other/None: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not identify with a Party</td>
<td>50.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>PEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>43.37</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preference</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>Other/Don't Know: 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there was a big amount of respondents who had no preference in Table 3.8, these statistics resemble Puerto Rican party identification in the United States.²

---

¹ These numbers were taken from http://www.indexmundi.com/puerto_rico/demographics_profile.html
² These numbers were compared to the information provided in
It is important to note that Puerto Rican parties are not strictly split by ideology. Although the PNP is considered conservative and the PPD is considered liberal, in practice both parties differ little in ideology. Party organization in Puerto Rico is relatively weak and most have populist characteristics and differ only in status preference. Kenneth R. Farr argues that “the status issue is clearly the issue which most characteristically divides the principal political parties, despite the parties’ lack of consistency on status” (Farr 1973). In addition, Puerto Ricans and many Latin American countries tend to describe the Conservative-Liberal divide as Right-Left.

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Left</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>13.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Left</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>50.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Right</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Right</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Census.gov, “in Puerto Rico, 23.2 percent of the population 25 and older had a bachelor’s degree or higher.” One of the highest rates was in Guaynabo, part of the metro area, where 43.7 percent of the population had a bachelor’s degree or higher. I can conclude that the survey attracted respondents that at least received a university degree at a higher rate than the national average.

---

2 These numbers were compared to the information provided in http://www.pewhispanic.org/2007/04/25/ix-party-identification-and-ideology/
Table 3.10
Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Technical School</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>30.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>18.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Graduate Degree</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate Degree</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median household income in Puerto Rico, according to Census.gov\(^3\) is $19,515, with Guaynabo having one of the highest rates at $33,848 and Lares having the lowest median at $11,353. The median income for the respondents in the survey was between $20,001 and $30,000. This suggests that, again, this survey attracted a higher-earning sample than the national average, but not terribly so.

Table 3.11
Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20k</td>
<td>45.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$30,000</td>
<td>17.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001-$40,000</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001-$50,000</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$60,000</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$70,000</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001-$80,000</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$90,000</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,001-$100,000</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001-$125,000</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,001-$150,000</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $150,000</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) This information was gathered from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2014/cb14-17.html
In addition, respondents were asked which candidate for governor did they vote for in the last elections. Below, I compare the results to the numbers reported by the Comisión Estatal de Elecciones (State Elections Commission). The numbers reported by the Comission closely match the numbers obtained in the survey. In particular, the vote between the PPD and the PNP was pretty evenly split in my survey, as it was in the actual 2012 election. The results of the survey deviate from the results of the actual survey in that there is somewhat greater support for the PIP candidate and other minor candidates, at the expense of the leading candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Percent in Survey</th>
<th>Percent in Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luis Fortuño (PNP)</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td>47.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandro García Padilla (PPD)</td>
<td>42.19</td>
<td>47.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Dalmau Rodriguez (PIP)</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Hernández (MUS)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogelio Figueroa (PPR)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Bernabe (PPT)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Conclusion

Throughout Puerto Rico’s history, there have been many attempts to define and redefine the relationship between the island and its colonizer. Puerto Rican culture has greatly influenced the status debate, made more acute by the “fear of losing the culture,” as former governor Aníbal Acevedo Vilá (PPD) said in an author’s interview. However, according to all interviewees, Puerto Rico’s status debate means little until the United States proposes the options it is willing to accept.

Under United States rule, the Insular Cases and their constitutional implications defined this relationship and are still relevant today. At the time of this writing, there are two cases being heard in the Supreme Court, which have put the status question into the front pages again.

Puerto Rico is $73 billion in debt. These are a combination of bonds and mismanagement of funds in part of the different administrations. Acevedo Vilá suggests that Puerto Rico “needs a new economic relationship with the United States.” This idea resonates with those who support an improved ELA, an option, to reiterate, that was not included in the last status plebiscite. The former governor argues that the status debate has fallen into emotional and legal arguments rather than economical ones. The Supreme Court is currently hearing a case on whether or not Puerto Rico can declare bankruptcy under Chapter 9 of the Federal Bankruptcy law, much like Detroit did in 2013.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court will be hearing Puerto Rico v Sanchez Valle, where the issue is whether the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the federal government are separate sovereigns for purposes of the Double Jeopardy Clause of the United States
Constitution. This case has become, much as the case regarding the bankruptcy laws, an issue about redefining Puerto Rico’s status.

When asked about how the PIP perceived these cases, all three leaders with whom I spoke agreed that this was, in fact, an important opportunity to discuss the status issue which has not been presented in more than a decade. These two opportunities, they say, “are showing that in terms of status, this time around, the United States government is in fact on our side, to our advantage.” In other words, the treatment of these two cases has revealed weaknesses of the current status and the United States’ response has been that of a colonizer with absolute final powers. According to the PIP, the next steps are to create a political revolution. Jay Fonseca, a political analyst proposed in the interview that Puerto Rico should ask the United States for statehood. Because this plan would be rejected, in his views, Puerto Ricans would then be forced to choose a different non-territorial option.

Regardless of the current debate and the proposed plans of actions, it is hard to deny that support for independence has dwindled dramatically over the last half of the 20th century. Although the PIP suggests that the youth vote is becoming increasingly important in favor of independence, there is the issue of mass migrations to the United States of young, talented professionals.

In this thesis I tried to explore and pinpoint the answer to my main question: why did support for independence virtually disappear? The analysis suggests that there are many answers as to why this occurred. Through the historical research, there are many points that have shaped and influenced Puerto Rican politics and political parties, as well as status ideologies. Puerto Rico has been a geographically strategic possession of the colonizer, their strong hold perhaps influencing the ability of proper pro-independence
movement organization. More importantly, however, are the combination of the different factors: the early Foraker and Jones Acts, which set the foundations of a dependent economy; the decades and decades of attempts to Americanize the Puerto Rican people; the decades of political persecution and repression for those who showed pro-independence sentiments; the economic growth during a time where many neighboring countries were drowning in poverty and political crises; the creation of the Estado Libre Asociado, which seemed to lay the status issue to rest; and the undeniable influence of education and the media in Puerto Rico.

With the experimental survey, I was able to further test my hypothesis that if people were taught Puerto Rican history differently, they would be more informed about the U.S. efforts to undermine pro-independence efforts and therefore, there would be more support for the independence movement. The survey was designed to provide different types of information that might not be widely known: information about Pedro Albizu Campos, a pro-independence revolutionary; about Luis Muñoz Marín, Puerto Rico’s first elected governor; about the benefits that Puerto Rico would gain under statehood; and about the Millard Tydings's Bill, which was a bill to put Puerto Rico towards the path of independence. The results are statistically significant in support for independence when respondents were given information about Albizu Campos, a character that through my own experience is not talked about in detail in Puerto Rican history education. This is the most interesting and effective treatment, for it shows the United States’ and Puerto Rican government’s repressive actions against the independence movement. This shocking and impactful new information and the results it yields suggest that elaborating on this portion of Puerto Rican history would increase support for independence.
I conclude that Puerto Ricans, subjected to 400 years of colonized rule cannot be properly separated from the colonized condition that they are in in order to answer such questions in a free, sovereign form. As many scholars have suggested, in order for Puerto Ricans to consciously and freely choose the best status option for them, they must do so as a sovereign entity. I conclude that support of independence has declined to virtual disappearance due to the combination of external, as well as internal factors. If political education in Puerto Rico were designed to portray the different factors and implications of independence, more Puerto Ricans would be more inclined to choose it.
Appendix: 2012 Plebiscite Ballot

CONSULTA SOBRE EL ESTATUS POLÍTICO DE PUERTO RICO
PLEBISCITE ON PUERTO RICO POLITICAL STATUS

Instrucciones: Marque la opción de su preferencia. La papeleta con más de una (1) opción marcada en esta sección no será contabilizada.

Instructions: Mark your option of preference. Those ballots with more than one (1) mark in this section shall not be tallied.

¿Está usted de acuerdo con mantener la condición política territorial actual?
Do you agree that Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of territorial status?

Sí / Yes  |  No / No

Instrucciones: Irrespectivamente de su contestación a la primera pregunta, conteste cuál de las siguientes opciones no territoriales usted prefiere.

Instructions: Regardless of your selection in the first question, please mark which of the following non-territorial options would you prefer.

La consulta con más de una (1) opción marcada en esta sección no será contabilizada.
These ballots with more than one (1) mark in this Section shall not be tallied.

Estadidad:
Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea un estado de Estados Unidos de América, para que todos los ciudadanos americanos residentes en Puerto Rico tengan iguales derechos, beneficios y responsabilidades que los demás ciudadanos de los estados de la Unión, incluyendo derecho a la plena representación en el Congreso y participación en las elecciones presidenciales, y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la estadidad. Si estás de acuerdo marque aquí:

Independencia:
Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea una nación soberana y totalmente independiente de Estados Unidos y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la nación independiente de Puerto Rico. Si estás de acuerdo marque aquí:

Estado Libre Asociado Soberano:
Pretendo que Puerto Rico adopte un estatus fuera de la Cédula Territorial de la Constitución de Estados Unidos, que reconozca la soberanía del Pueblo de Puerto Rico. El Estado Libre Asociado Soberano se basaría en una asociación política libre y voluntaria, cuyos términos específicos se acordarían entre Estados Unidos y Puerto Rico como naciones soberanas. Dicho acuerdo dispondría el alcance de los poderes jurisdiccionales que el pueblo de Puerto Rico autónomo dejaría en manos de Estados Unidos; retendrá los restantes poderes o autoridades jurisdiccionales. Si estás de acuerdo, marque aquí:

Sovereign Free Associated State
Puerto Rico should adopt a status outside of the Territory Clause of the Constitution of the United States that recognizes the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico. The Sovereign Free Associated State would be based on a free and voluntary political association, the specific terms of which shall be agreed upon between the United States and Puerto Rico as sovereign nations. Such agreement would provide the scope of the jurisdicational powers that the People of Puerto Rico agree to confer to the United States and retain all other jurisdictional powers and authorities. If you agree, mark here:
Appendix: Image used for Facebook advertisement for experimental survey.

Appendix: Survey

1. ¿Vive usted en Puerto Rico?
   a. Sí
   b. No

2. ¿Está usted inscrito/a para votar en Puerto Rico?
   a. Sí
   b. No

3. ¿Cuál es su edad? (dropdown)

4. ¿Se identifica usted con un partido puertorriqueño?
   a. Sí
   b. No

5. (if yes) ¿Con cual partido político actual se identifica?
   a. Partido Nuevo Progresista (PNP)
   b. Partido Popular Democrático (PPD)
   c. Partido Independentista de Puerto Rico (PIP)
   d. Partido del Pueblo Trabajador (PPT)
   e. Ninguno

6. Como recordará, en el año 2012 los candidatos a la gubernación de Puerto Rico eran Luis Fortuño (PNP), Alejandro García Padilla (PPD), Juan Dalmau Rodríguez (PIP), Lcdo. Arturo Hernandez (MUS), Rogelio Figueroa (PPR) y Rafael Bernabe (PPT).

   ¿Recuerda con seguridad si votó o no en esas elecciones?
   a. Voté
   b. No voté
   c. No era elegible

7. (If Yes) ¿Por qué candidato votó?
   a. Luis Fortuño (PNP)
   b. Alejandro García Padilla (PPD)
   c. Juan Dalmau Rodríguez (PIP)
   d. Lcdo. Arturo Hernandez (MUS)
   e. Rogelio Figueroa (PPR)
   f. Rafael Bernabe (PPT)

8. ¿Con qué partido político estadounidense usted se identifica?
   a. Republicano
   b. Demócrata
   c. Independiente
   d. Sin Preferencia
   e. No Sabe

9. (if Democrat/Republican) ¿Diría que es profundamente (Democrat/Republican) o no tan profundamente (Democrat/Republican)?
   a. Profundamente
   b. No tan profundamente
   c. No sabe

10. (if Independent) ¿Se considera más cercano al partido Republicano o al Demócrata?
a. Republicano
b. Demócrata
c. Ninguno
d. No sabe

11. Hablando en general, diría usted que la mayoría de su familia (padres, abuelos, bisabuelos, etc.) se identifica(ba) con el mismo partido como usted?
a. Sí
b. No

12. (if no) ¿Con qué partido se identifica(ba) su familia?
   a. Partido Nuevo Progresista (PNP)
   b. Partido Popular Democrático (PPD)
   c. Partido Independentista de Puerto Rico (PIP)
   d. Partido del Pueblo Trabajador (PPT)
   e. Ninguno

13. De estos problemas a los que se enfrenta Puerto Rico, ¿cuáles diría que son los tres (3) más importante para usted? (check box)
   a. Desempleo
   b. Crimen y seguridad en las calles
   c. Uso de drogas
   d. Abuso de bebidas alcohólicas
   e. Confiabilidad del servicio de agua
   f. Corrupción en el Gobierno
   g. Estatus político y relaciones con los Estados Unidos
   h. Estado de calles y carreteras
   i. El sida
   j. Calidad del medio ambiente
   k. Situación económica
   l. Falta de vivienda
   m. Calidad de educación pública
   n. Transportación pública
   o. Costo de luz y agua
   p. Acceso a los servicios de la salud
   q. Pobreza en Puerto Rico
   r. Costo de gasolina
   s. Degradación de crédito de Puerto Rico

14. En estos días se escucha mucho hablar de la izquierda y la derecha. Aquí hay una escala de siete puntos en la que las opiniones políticas que las personas pueden tener que van de extremadamente a la izquierda (1) a extremadamente a la derecha (7). ¿Dónde en esta escala se pondría usted o no ha pensado mucho al respecto?
   1. Extremadamente a la izquierda
   2. Izquierda
   3. Un poco a la izquierda
   4. Moderado(a), en el medio
   5. Un poco a la derecha
   6. Derecha
   7. Extremadamente a la derecha

Antes de participar en esta encuesta, ¿cuánto sabía usted de las actividades pro-independentistas de Pedro Albizu Campos?
   a. Mucho
   b. Algo
   c. Poco
   d. Nada

Ahora vamos a hablar de sus preferencias y opiniones.

15. ¿Está usted de acuerdo con mantener la condición política territorial actual?
   a. Sí
   b. No

16. Irrespectivamente de su contestación a la primera pregunta, ¿cuál de las siguientes opciones no territoriales usted prefiere?
   a. Estadidad: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea un estado de Estados Unidos de América, para que todos los ciudadanos americanos residentes en Puerto Rico tengan iguales derechos, beneficios y responsabilidades que los demás ciudadanos de los estados de la Unión.
   b. Independencia: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea una nación soberana y totalmente independiente de Estados Unidos y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la nación independiente de Puerto Rico
   c. Libre Asociación Soberano: Prefiero que Puerto Rico adopte un estatus fuera de la Cláusula Territorial de la Constitución de Estados Unidos, que reconozca la soberanía del Pueblo de Puerto Rico.
   d. Ninguna de las anteriores (específique)

17. Y si fuese a considerar solamente entre las siguientes opciones para Puerto Rico, ¿cuál preferiría?
   a. Estadidad
   b. Independencia

18. ¿Cuánta importancia le da usted al estatus político de Puerto Rico?
   a. Mucho importancia
   b. Alguna importancia
   c. Poca importancia
   d. Ninguna importancia
[EXPERIMENTAL QUESTION 2] Luis Muñoz Marín fue el primer gobernador de Puerto Rico electo democráticamente. Originalmente, Luis Muñoz Marín era pro-independencia pero luego se separó de los partidos pro-independencia y formó su propio partido, el Partido Popular Democrático, lo cual unió a los jíbaros para promover salario mínimo, necesidades de alimentos y agua, cooperativas con agricultura y la expansión del sector industrial. Hay evidencia que el FBI tenía información de la adicción de Muñoz Marín al opio. El FBI usó esta información para chantajear a Muñoz Marín en contra del movimiento independentista y a promover el Estado Libre Asociado. Esta información fue usada para que Luis Muñoz Marín condenara el Partido Nacionalista y cualquier esfuerzo pro-independencia.

Antes de participar de esta encuesta, ¿cuánto sabía usted de las actividades pro-independentistas de Luis Muñoz Marín?
   a. Mucho
   b. Algo
   c. Poco
   d. Nada

Ahora vamos a hablar de sus preferencias y opiniones.

15. ¿Está usted de acuerdo con mantener la condición política territorial actual?
   a. Sí
   b. No

16. Irrespetivamente de su contestación a la primera pregunta, ¿cuál de las siguientes opciones no territoriales usted prefiere?
   a. Estadidad: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea un estado de Estados Unidos de América, para que todos los ciudadanos americanos residentes en Puerto Rico tengan iguales derechos, beneficios y responsabilidades que los demás ciudadanos de los estados de la Unión.
   b. Independencia: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea una nación soberana y totalmente independiente de Estados Unidos y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la nación independiente de Puerto Rico.
   c. Libre Asociación Soberano: Prefiero que Puerto Rico adopte un estatus fuera de la Cláusula Territorial de la Constitución de Estados Unidos, que reconozca la soberanía del Pueblo de Puerto Rico.
   d. Ninguna de las anteriores (especifique)

17. Y si fuese a considerar solamente entre las siguientes opciones para Puerto Rico, ¿cuál preferiría?
   a. Estadidad
   b. Independencia

18. ¿Cuánta importancia le da usted al estatus político de Puerto Rico?
   a. Mucha importancia
   b. Alguna importancia
   c. Poca importancia
   d. Ninguna importancia
[EXPERIMENTAL QUESTION 3] Si Puerto Rico fuese estado número 51 de los Estados Unidos, recibiría algunos beneficios que actualmente no cualifica. Entre ellos está el derecho a votar por el presidente de EEUU, participación en la economía estadounidense, participación en Congreso de EEUU y mayor responsabilidad en los asuntos de Puerto Rico a cargo del gobierno federal.

Antes de participar de esta encuesta, ¿sabía usted de estos beneficios que ganaría Puerto Rico si fuese estado?
   a. Sí
   b. No

Ahora vamos a hablar de sus preferencias y opiniones.

15. ¿Está usted de acuerdo con mantener la condición política territorial actual?
   a. Sí
   b. No

16. Irrespectivamente de su contestación a la primera pregunta, ¿cuál de las siguientes opciones no territoriales usted prefiere?
   a. Estadidad: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea un estado de Estados Unidos de América, para que todos los ciudadanos americanos residentes en Puerto Rico tengan iguales derechos, beneficios y responsabilidades que los demás ciudadanos de los estados de la Unión.
   b. Independencia: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea una nación soberana y totalmente independiente de Estados Unidos y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la nación independiente de Puerto Rico.
   c. Libre Asociación Soberana: Prefiero que Puerto Rico adopte un estatus fuera de la Cláusula Territorial de la Constitución de Estados Unidos, que reconozca la soberanía del Pueblo de Puerto Rico.
   d. Ninguna de las anteriores (especifique)

17. Y si fuese a considerar solamente entre las siguientes opciones para Puerto Rico, ¿cuál preferiría?
   a. Estadidad
   b. Independencia

18. ¿Cuánta importancia le da usted al estatus político de Puerto Rico?
   a. Mucha importancia
   b. Alguna importancia
   c. Poca importancia
   d. Ninguna importancia

[EXPERIMENTAL QUESTION 4] En 1936, el senador Millard Tydings introdujo al Congreso de EEUU un proyecto de ley que le otorgaría a Puerto Rico la independencia luego de un
periodo de transición. Luis Muñoz Marín rechazó el proyecto de ley mientras que muchos puertorriqueños estaban de acuerdo. Este proyecto de ley no fue aprobado.

Antes de participar de esta encuesta, ¿sabía usted que el ELA originalmente fue formado para transición a estado o nación independiente?
   a. Si
   b. No

Ahora vamos a hablar de sus preferencias y opiniones.

15. ¿Está usted de acuerdo con mantener la condición política territorial actual?
   a. Si
   b. No

16. Irrespectivamente de su contestación a la primera pregunta, ¿cuál de las siguientes opciones no territoriales usted prefiere?
   a. Estadidad: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea un estado de Estados Unidos de América, para que todos los ciudadanos americanos residentes en Puerto Rico tengan iguales derechos, beneficios y responsabilidades que los demás ciudadanos de los estados de la Unión.
   b. Independencia: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea una nación soberana y totalmente independiente de Estados Unidos y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la nación independiente de Puerto Rico.
   c. Libre Asociación Soberano: Prefiero que Puerto Rico adopte un estatus fuera de la Cláusula Territorial de la Constitución de Estados Unidos, que reconozca la soberanía del Pueblo de Puerto Rico.
   d. Ninguna de las anteriores (especifique)

17. Y si fuese a considerar solamente entre las siguientes opciones para Puerto Rico, ¿cuál preferiría?
   a. Estadidad
   b. Independencia

18. ¿Cuánta importancia le da usted al estatus político de Puerto Rico?
   a. Mucha importancia
   b. Alguna importancia
   c. Poca importancia
   d. Ninguna importancia

[CONTROL – NO TREATMENT]

Ahora vamos a hablar de sus preferencias y opiniones.

15. ¿Está usted de acuerdo con mantener la condición política territorial actual?
   a. Si
   b. No

16. Irrespectivamente de su contestación a la primera pregunta, ¿cuál de las siguientes opciones no territoriales usted prefiere?
a. Estadidad: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea un estado de Estados Unidos de América, para que todos los ciudadanos americanos residentes en Puerto Rico tengan iguales derechos, beneficios y responsabilidades que los demás ciudadanos de los estados de la Unión.

b. Independencia: Prefiero que Puerto Rico sea una nación soberana y totalmente independiente de Estados Unidos y que se requiera al Congreso Federal que promulgue la legislación necesaria para iniciar la transición hacia la nación independiente de Puerto Rico.

c. Libre Asociación Soberano: Prefiero que Puerto Rico adopte un estatus fuera de la Cláusula Territorial de la Constitución de Estados Unidos, que reconozca la soberanía del Pueblo de Puerto Rico.

d. Ninguna de las anteriores (especifique)

17. Y si fuese a considerar solamente entre las siguientes opciones para Puerto Rico, ¿cuál preferiría?
   a. Estadidad
   b. Independencia

18. ¿Cuánta importancia le da usted al estatus político de Puerto Rico?
   a. Mucha importancia
   b. Alguna importancia
   c. Poca importancia
   d. Ninguna importancia

Finalmente, nos gustaría preguntarle acerca de su detalles demográficos. Recuerde que las contestaciones a las preguntas son completamente anónimas y no podrán identificarlo(a) a usted.

19. ¿Cuál es su sexo?
   a. Masculino
   b. Femenino

20. ¿Cuál es el nivel más alto de educación que usted recibió?
   a. Algo de escuela superior
   b. Graduado de escuela superior
   c. Algo de estudios universitarios
   d. Escuela técnica/vocacional
   e. Grado universitario
   f. Algo de estudios postgraduados
   g. Grado postgraduado

21. ¿Cuál es su preferencia religiosa?
   a. Mormón
   b. Adventista del Séptimo Día
   c. Católico – Romano
   d. Judío
   e. Iglesia ortodoxa tal como griega o rusa
   f. Musulmán
   g. Protestante
   h. Evangélico
i. Iglesia de Cristo, Científico
j. Alguno otro (especifique)

22. ¿Es usted de origen hispano, latino o español?
   a. No, no soy de origen hispano, latino o español
   b. Sí, mexicano, mexicano-americano, o chicano
   c. Sí, puertorriqueño
   d. Sí, cubano
   e. Sí, de otro origen hispano, latino o español

23. ¿Cuál es su raza?
   a. Blanca
   b. Negra o africana americana
   c. India americana o nativa de Alaska
   d. Asiática
   e. Otra raza

24. ¿Está usted actualmente empleado tiempo completo, medio tiempo, desempleado o retirado?
   a. Tiempo completo
   b. Medio tiempo
   c. Desempleado
   d. Retirado

25. ¿Cuál es su estatus marital?
   a. Soltero, nunca casado
   b. Casado
   c. Separado
   d. Divorciado
   e. Enviudado

26. ¿Cuál es su ingreso anual total antes de impuestos?
   a. Menos de $20,000
   b. $20,001-$30,000
   c. $30,001-$40,000
   d. $40,001-$50,000
   e. $50,001-$60,000
   f. $60,001-$70,000
   g. $70,001-$80,000
   h. $80,001-$90,000
   i. $90,001-$100,000
   j. $100,001-$125,000
   k. $125,001-$150,000
   l. Más de $150,000
Appendix: Survey – English Translation

1. Do you live in Puerto Rico?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Are you registered to vote in Puerto Rico?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. How old are you? (dropdown)

4. Do you identify with any Puerto Rican political party?
   a. Yes
   b. No

5. (if yes) With which political party do you identify with?
   a. New Progressive Party (PNP)
   b. Popular Democratic Party (PPD)
   c. Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP)
   d. Movement towards Sovereignty (MUS)
   e. Puerto Ricans for Puerto Rico (PPR)
   f. Working People’s Party (PPT)
   g. None

6. As you might remember, in the year 2012, the candidates for governor of Puerto Rico were Luis Fortuño (PNP), Alejandro García Padilla (PPD), Juan Dalmau Rodriguez (PIP), Arturo Hernandez (MUS), Rogelio Figueroa (PPR), and Rafael Bernabe (PPT). Do you remember for sure whether you voted or not in these elections?
   a. Voted
   b. Didn’t vote
   c. Wasn’t eligible

7. (If Yes) Which candidate did you vote for?
   a. Luis Fortuño (PNP)
   b. Alejandro García Padilla (PPD)
   c. Juan Dalmau Rodriguez (PIP)
   d. Arturo Hernandez (MUS)
   e. Rogelio Figueroa (PPR)
   f. Rafael Bernabe (PPT)

8. Which United States political party do you identify with?
   a. Republican
   b. Democrat
   c. Independent
   d. No Preference
   e. Don’t know

9. (If Democrat/Republican) Would you say that you identify as a strong (Democrat/Republican) or a weak (Democrat/Republican)?
   a. Strong
   b. Weak
   c. Don’t know
10. (if Independent) Do you consider yourself leaning more towards the Republican or Democratic Party?
   a. Republican
   b. Democratic
   c. None
   d. Don’t know
11. Generally speaking, would you say that the majority of your family (parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, etc.) identifies or identified with the same political party as you?
   a. Yes
   b. No
12. (If No) With which party does (did) your family identify?
   a. New Progressive Party (PNP)
   b. Popular Democratic Party (PPD)
   c. Puerto Rican Independence Party (PIP)
   d. Movement towards Sovereignty (MUS)
   e. Puerto Ricans for Puerto Rico (PPR)
   f. Working People’s Party (PPT)
   g. None
13. From these problems that Puerto Rico faces today, which ones would you say are the three (3) most important for you? (check box)
   a. Unemployment
   b. Crime and safety in the streets
   c. Drug use
   d. Alcohol abuse
   e. Trust in water services
   f. Corruption in the government
   g. Puerto Rico’s political status with the United States
   h. Maintenance of streets and avenues
   i. AIDS
   j. Quality of the environment
   k. Economic status
   l. Quality of public education
   m. Public transportation
   n. Cost of water and electricity
   o. Access to healthcare
   p. Poverty in Puerto Rico
   q. Cost of gas
   r. Downgrade of Puerto Rico’s credit
14. These days we hear a lot about the left and the right. Here is a scale of seven points in which political opinions of the people go from far left (1) to far right (7). In what part of the scale would you fall on or have you not thought much about this?
   a. Far left
   b. Left
   c. A little to the left
   d. Moderate, in the middle
[EXPERIMENTAL QUESTION] Pedro Albizu Campos was an important historical figure in Puerto Rico. The attorney Albizu Campos was the leader of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party, a pro-independence and anti-colonist party. Albizu Campos also believed in the betterment of working conditions for the workers and the poor. Nicknamed ‘El Maestro’ (The Teacher), Pedro Albizu Campos was incarcerated for twenty-six (26) years. Because of his leadership in the armed revolutions in Puerto Rico, the United States and the FBI spied on his actions for decades. Then, he was incarcerated again and allegedly tortured with radioactive procedures. He died in 1965.

Before participating in this survey, how much did you know about Pedro Albizu Campos’s pro-independence activities?
   a. A lot
   b. Some
   c. A little
   d. Nothing

Now let’s talk about your preferences and your opinions.

15. Are you in favor of maintaining the current political status?
   a. Yes
   b. No

16. Regardless of your answer in the previous question, which one of the following non-territorial options do you prefer?
   a. Statehood: Puerto Rico should be admitted as a state of the United States of America, so that all the United States citizens residing in Puerto Rico have the rights, benefits, and responsibilities equal to those enjoyed by all other citizens of the states of the Union.
   b. Independence: Puerto Rico should become a sovereign nation, fully independent from the United States and the United States Congress would be required to pass any necessary legislation to begin the transition into independent nation of Puerto Rico.
   c. Sovereign Free Associated State: Puerto Rico should adopt a status outside of the Territory Clause of the Constitution of the United States that recognizes the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico.
   d. None of the above (specify)

17. If you were to consider only between the following options for Puerto Rico, which would you prefer?
   a. Statehood
   b. Independence

18. How important is Puerto Rico’s political status for you?
   a. Very important
   b. Somewhat important
c. Little important  
   d. Not important

[EXPERIMENTAL QUESTION 2] Luis Muñoz Marín was the first democratically elected governor of Puerto Rico. Originally, Luis Muñoz Marín was pro-independence but he separated himself from the pro-independence parties to form his own political party, the Popular Democratic Party, which unified the jíbaros (peasants) to promote minimum wage, water and food necessities, cooperatives with agriculture, and the expansion of the industrial sector. There is evidence that the FBI had information about Muñoz Marín’s opium addiction. The FBI used this information to blackmail Muñoz Marín against the independence movement and to promote the Free Associated State. This information was used so that Luis Muñoz Marín could condemn the Nationalist Party and any other pro-independence efforts.

Before participating in this survey, how much did you know about Luis Muñoz Marín’s pro-independence activities?
   a. A lot  
   b. Some  
   c. A little  
   d. Nothing

Now let’s talk about your preferences and your opinions.

15. Are you in favor of maintaining the current political status?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No

16. Regardless of your answer in the previous question, which one of the following non-territorial options do you prefer?
   a. Statehood: Puerto Rico should be admitted as a state of the United States of America, so that all the United States citizens residing in Puerto Rico have the rights, benefits, and responsibilities equal to those enjoyed by all other citizens of the states of the Union.
   b. Independence: Puerto Rico should become a sovereign nation, fully independent from the United States and the United States Congress would be required to pass any necessary legislation to begin the transition into independent nation of Puerto Rico.
   c. Sovereign Free Associated State: Puerto Rico should adopt a status outside of the Territory Clause of the Constitution of the United States that recognizes the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico.
   d. None of the above (specify)

17. If you were to consider only between the following options for Puerto Rico, which would you prefer?  
   a. Statehood  
   b. Independence

18. How important is Puerto Rico’s political status for you?  
   a. Very important
b. Somewhat important  
c. Little important  
d. Not important

[EXPERIMENTAL QUESTION 3] If Puerto Rico were the fifty-first (51) state of the United States, it would receive some benefits that it does not currently qualify for. Among these is the right to vote for President of the United States, participation in the United States economy, participation in the United States Congress, and bigger responsibilities in Puerto Rican affairs will fall to the federal government.

Before participating in this survey, did you know that Puerto Rico would gain these benefits if it were a state?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No

Now let’s talk about your preferences and your opinions.

15. Are you in favor of maintaining the current political status?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No

16. Regardless of your answer in the previous question, which one of the following non-territorial options do you prefer?  
   a. Statehood: Puerto Rico should be admitted as a state of the United States of America, so that all the United States citizens residing in Puerto Rico have the rights, benefits, and responsibilities equal to those enjoyed by all other citizens of the states of the Union.  
   b. Independence: Puerto Rico should become a sovereign nation, fully independent from the United States and the United States Congress would be required to pass any necessary legislation to begin the transition into independent nation of Puerto Rico.  
   c. Sovereign Free Associated State: Puerto Rico should adopt a status outside of the Territory Clause of the Constitution of the United States that recognizes the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico  
   d. None of the above (specify)

17. If you were to consider only between the following options for Puerto Rico, which would you prefer?  
   a. Statehood  
   b. Independence

18. How important is Puerto Rico’s political status for you?  
   a. Very important  
   b. Somewhat important  
   c. Little important  
   d. Not important
In 1936, the United States Senator Millard Tydings introduced to Congress a bill that would grant independence for Puerto Rico after a certain transition period. Luis Muñoz Marín did not support the bill while many Puerto Ricans were in support. This bill was not passed.

Before participating in this survey, did you know that the Free Associated States was originally formed as a transition into statehood or independence?
  a. Yes
  b. No

Now let’s talk about your preferences and your opinions.

15. Are you in favor of maintaining the current political status?
   a. Yes
   b. No

16. Regardless of your answer in the previous question, which one of the following non-territorial options do you prefer?
   a. Statehood: Puerto Rico should be admitted as a state of the United States of America, so that all the United States citizens residing in Puerto Rico have the rights, benefits, and responsibilities equal to those enjoyed by all other citizens of the states of the Union.
   b. Independence: Puerto Rico should become a sovereign nation, fully independent from the United States and the United States Congress would be required to pass any necessary legislation to begin the transition into independent nation of Puerto Rico.
   c. Sovereign Free Associated State: Puerto Rico should adopt a status outside of the Territory Clause of the Constitution of the United States that recognizes the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico
   d. None of the above (specify)

17. If you were to consider only between the following options for Puerto Rico, which would you prefer?
   a. Statehood
   b. Independence

18. How important is Puerto Rico’s political status for you?
   a. Very important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Little important
   d. Not important

Now let’s talk about your preferences and your opinions.

15. Are you in favor of maintaining the current political status?
   a. Yes
   b. No
16. Regardless of your answer in the previous question, which one of the following non-territorial options do you prefer?
   a. Statehood: Puerto Rico should be admitted as a state of the United States of America, so that all the United States citizens residing in Puerto Rico have the rights, benefits, and responsibilities equal to those enjoyed by all other citizens of the states of the Union.
   b. Independence: Puerto Rico should become a sovereign nation, fully independent from the United States and the United States Congress would be required to pass any necessary legislation to begin the transition into independent nation of Puerto Rico.
   c. Sovereign Free Associated State: Puerto Rico should adopt a status outside of the Territory Clause of the Constitution of the United States that recognizes the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico
   d. None of the above (specify)

17. If you were to consider only between the following options for Puerto Rico, which would you prefer?
   a. Statehood
   b. Independence

18. How important is Puerto Rico’s political status for you?
   a. Very important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Little important
   d. Not important

Finally, we would like to ask you several questions about your background. Please remember that your responses are completely anonymous and cannot be traced back to you.

19. What’s your sex?
   a. Male
   b. Female

20. What is the highest level of education you have received?
   a. Some high school
   b. Graduated from high school
   c. Some college/university studies
   d. Vocational or technical studies
   e. University degree
   f. Some post graduate studies
   g. Post graduate degree

21. What is your religious preference?
   a. Mormon
   b. Seventh Day Adventist
   c. Roman Catholic
   d. Jewish
   e. Orthodox Church such as Greek or Russian
   f. Muslim
g. Protestant  
h. Evangelical  
i. Church of Christ Scientist  
j. Another (please specify)  

22. Are you of Hispanic, Latin, or Spanish origin?  
   a. No, I’m not of Hispanic, Latin, or Spanish origin  
   b. Yes, Mexican, Mexican-American, or Chicano  
   c. Yes, Puerto Rican  
   d. Yes, Cuban,  
   e. Yes, other Hispanic, Latin, or Spanish origin  

23. What is your race?  
   a. White  
   b. Black or African-American  
   c. Native American or from Alaska  
   d. Asian  
   e. Other race  

24. Are you currently employed full-time, part-time, unemployed, or retired?  
   a. Full Time  
   b. Part Time  
   c. Unemployed  
   d. Retired  

25. What is your marital status?  
   a. Single, never married  
   b. Married  
   c. Separated  
   d. Divorced  
   e. Widowed  

26. What is your total annual income, before taxes?  
   a. Less than $20,000  
   b. $20,001-$30,000  
   c. $30,001-$40,000  
   d. $40,001-$50,000  
   e. $50,001-$60,000  
   f. $60,001-$70,000  
   g. $70,001-$80,000  
   h. $80,001-$90,000  
   i. $90,001-$100,000  
   j. $100,001-$125,000  
   k. $125,001-$150,000  
   l. More than $150,000
### Table 3.1
Pedro Albizu Campos, Chose Independence with treatment compared to Control, Chose Independence without treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Error (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (Percent)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Treatment</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>22.7 - 30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Treatment</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16.7 - 23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = \] \[ Pr(|T| > |t|) = 2.538 \]

### Table 3.2
Luis Muñoz Marín, Chose Independence with Treatment compared to Chose Independence without Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Error (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (Percent)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Treatment</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>19.7 - 26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Treatment</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16.7 - 23.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = \] \[ Pr(|T| > |t|) = 1.305 \]

### Table 3.3
Benefits of Statehood, Chose Statehood with Treatment compared to Chose Statehood without Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Error (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (Percent)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Treatment</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.0 - 56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Treatment</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>43.9 - 52.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = \] \[ Pr(|T| > |t|) = 1.380 \]
Table 3.4
Tydings’s Bill, Chose Independence with Treatment compared to Chose Independence without Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Error (Percent)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (Percent)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Treatment</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Treatment</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = \frac{\overline{x}_1 - \overline{x}_2}{s_p \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}} \]

\[ Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.193 \]

Table 3.5.1
Which of the following non-territorial options would you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statehood</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Sovereign Association</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>27.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5.2
If you were to consider only between the following two options, which would you prefer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statehood</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>59.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>40.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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