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The war of the flags: Conflicting national loyalties in a modern colonial situation

JUAN MANUEL CARRIÓN

The importance of myths, rituals, and symbols for the nation as a social group has been highlighted by different nationalism theorists. The rituals that deal with the national flag have a special place among rituals of power. In Puerto Rico people's national loyalties are divided, and that is expressed in the predilection of one flag being favored over the other among different political opponents. U.S. statehood advocates have recently expressed alarm about what they have felt as a growth in Puerto Rican nationalism. This has led to different incidents of mass political confrontation that the press has called the "War of the Flags." I examine this so-called war as a case of ritual combat, a struggle on the symbolic plane. Puerto Rico provides the opportunity to observe symbolic struggles for power concerning the national flag in a stateless nation that belongs to the United States of America.
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ABSTRACT

I want to address a special type of nationalist conflict in a very special kind of environment. A conflict about national loyalties that takes place mainly around the display and use of the flag as a national symbol. A conflict that without reaching a level of military combat assumes the flag as a symbol of collective confrontation. The flag as symbol of national identity is used in a struggle for collective definition in a most unusual colonial situation. The case study is Puerto Rico, one of the few remaining cases of “classic” colonialism in the world. But not so classic because Puerto Rico is a colony of the United States of America, “the world’s only superpower.” At the beginnings of the twenty-first century Puerto Rico is a modern society that retains an archaic relationship to the most modern power in the world. In Puerto Rico national identities are in flux, and this is particularly evident if we examine the way people in Puerto Rico relate to the two flags that are presented to them as national flags: the Puerto Rican and the American flag.

The importance of the flag as a symbol of the nation
Symbol and ritual are basic for the formation of nations. The nation is a social construction, the same as the ethnic group or the ethnie. The differences between nation and ethnie are differences of degree and not of kind. The social construction of ethnicity is the “social organization of culture differences.” It is not the “objective” ethnies and nations is a dynamic process that can be encapsulated in the concept of the social boundary that Frederick Barth has helped to popularize (Barth 1969). For Barth, the social construction of the nation and ethnie are differences of degree and not of kind. The social construction of identity. Boundaries are relational in character; they mark the group in relationship to other groups. The markers that help to define the boundary are charged with meanings, to these cultural differences. The boundary takes shape in the context of people socially to these cultural differences. The metaphor of the boundary serves to indicate the location of the identity-forming process. The construction of the social boundary is fundamental in the formation of collective identities.
Through the use of symbols and the carrying out of rituals the nation as an imagined community is socially constructed. Different symbols are used to make the nation perceivable. Among the possible symbols one could point out to manmade or natural landmarks, to a set of ideas about the group identity, such as liberty or the group's moral superiority, to different icons of identity, such as the features of the country in a map or the face of an important "patriot," and many other possible sources of symbolization. But among all these symbols the flag has had a special place in the symbolic evocation of the nation.

The use of flags has a long history. The Chinese were the first to use flags. But in Europe and in other parts of the world a proto-flag, the vexilloid, had been in use since remote times. The vexilloid is basically a big stick (it can be a staff, a rod or a spear) decorated with some form of emblem. Flags proved more versatile, easier to produce and use than vexilloids, but their social context and the way they were used were similar. Early flags were, on the one hand, marks of office or personal status, and on the other hand, instruments used as signs to indicate directions to follow in the movement of large groups of people, specially under combat conditions (Znamierowski 2002). By the late middle ages some flags in Europe started to be identified with particular rulers and their domains. But still these were regional and heraldic flags, not national flags. The first national flags come later and are part of a revolutionary new understanding of the political community. Fundamental changes occur in the ideological and political messages that the flag will try to convey. The flag will no longer represent dynastic or aristocratic power but serves instead to invoke the nation as the sovereign people. The Dutch Prinsenvlag, born in their struggle for independence, is the first modern flag. Other early national flags, such as the American and the French flags, were also created during periods of revolutionary fervor.

The distinction once made by Raymond Firth between flags as signs and as symbols is still convenient. As signs, flags can be used in many different and complex ways to offer information. As symbols, flags convey a more abstract form of information and establish a more emotionally complex relationship with the people involved. As symbols flags are used to make it possible for people to express particular sets of ideas and emotions. The national flag has been a particularly effective symbol. It is so strong that in many cases the identification between flag and the nation it representsthat the flag acquires a "sacred" quality. The United States is one of the countries where the sacralization of the national flag has reached its most intense manifestation. As clearly expressed by Firth, “the Durkheimian sociological viewpoint” is that flags help to channel emotions that intensify group solidarity (Firth 1973: 341). The national flag is also a very important symbol because it represents the modern state. To attack the flag is also an attack against the state it represents. The “desecration” of flags then presents a challenge, in which the very
Colonial hegemony and banal nationalism

In a colony it might seem more difficult to achieve hegemony, but it is not necessarily impossible. The case of Puerto Rico points to the possibility of colonial hegemony, something without importance; trivial. Neo-or banal nationalism is the result of an emasculation, but strangely this type of nationalism is still dangerous because of hallucination so fond to postmodernist lucubrations.

Gellner’s recent movie exaggerating about religion being tamed because the beast seems to have still much of its former strength. But Gellner is clearly not really taming religion, but he also points out that this is really a pretense that members of the dominant cultural group indulge in because they are secure in their cultural dominance. The culture of the dominant group is assumed by other groups as a general ideology of the “metamorphosis” of nationalism and the “mutation” of the national question.

After ELA came to be, nationalism in Puerto Rico became banal. Banal nationalism is that which is ignored or decreased by the society itself. Their alienation is evident because they worry about something that does not really exist; the nation is a specter, a living death. The dangers of neonationalism were particularly disturbing in the last years of the twentieth century because governor Sila María Calderón had carried out a propaganda offensive to take advantage of the anti-American sentiment that existed in the country.

The combination of alarmist rhetoric, together with scornful attitudes toward the relatively greater amount of self-government now enjoyed result in Pabón’s analysis, of the “mutation” of nationalism in Puerto Rico. Neonationalists are those that would like to return to the same as the emasculation of nationalism in Puerto Rico. Neonationalists are those that would like to return to an earlier time, when the country was independent and the people knew their place in the world.

What a Puerto Rican nationalist really wants, deep down, is to kill a Dominican. He wants to be rid of all the problems that come with being a member of a lower class. The members of the working class, on the other hand, are basically alienated intellectuals that think the fatherland (la patria) is in danger when this country becomes a democracy. The combination of alarmist rhetoric, together with scornful attitudes toward democratic system, a highly commercialized economy, a relatively high standard of living for the region. Postmodernist thinking in Puerto Rico has some points to consider, but it is not necessarily the answer to all the problems that exist in the country.

Postmodernist thinking in Puerto Rico has some points to consider, but it is not necessarily the answer to all the problems that exist in the country. The combination of alarmist rhetoric, together with scornful attitudes toward democratic system, a highly commercialized economy, a relatively high standard of living for the region. Postmodernist thinking in Puerto Rico has some points to consider, but it is not necessarily the answer to all the problems that exist in the country.

It is possible to move a person’s ethnicity from the public sphere to the private sphere of their own will, but this is not necessarily the case in every society. People can be bicultural, but the nondominant culture is privatized and in practice restricted mainly to domestic use. The combination of alarmist rhetoric, together with scornful attitudes toward democratic system, a highly commercialized economy, a relatively high standard of living for the region. Postmodernist thinking in Puerto Rico has some points to consider, but it is not necessarily the answer to all the problems that exist in the country.

The combination of alarmist rhetoric, together with scornful attitudes toward democratic system, a highly commercialized economy, a relatively high standard of living for the region. Postmodernist thinking in Puerto Rico has some points to consider, but it is not necessarily the answer to all the problems that exist in the country.
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newspaper Patria, had been present with José Martí in the founding of the CRP. The similarities between the Cuban and Puerto Rican movements, which led to the creation of the CRP, are evident. Puerto Ricans such as Sotero Figueroa, editor of the Carrión, were involved in these events.

Revolutionary Party (CRP). Puerto Ricans such as Sotero Figueroa, editor of the Carrión, were present at the founding meeting of the Puerto Rican section of the Cuban Revolutionary Party.

The borders between ethnic affirmation and nationalism have always been quite ambiguous. The Puerto Rican flag, together with the American flag, reinforces the ambiguous character of the colonial regime, but alone it still can represent a challenge to colonial normality. The Puerto Rican flag's display was a deliberate act. It was a way of affirming common links in the passing of special laws popularity known as the gag law and the definition of unincorporated territory. Puerto Rico belongs to but the United States. The term colony has never been officially used for Puerto Rico, and the United States was still seen by many as the promise of future economic security and individual liberties. Early in the twentieth century the American flag was prominently displayed in all public activities by two of the main political parties in Puerto Rico. For the Republican party, the founding party of the U.S. statehood movement in the Island, the American flag represented the nation of their cherished dreams. This party came to be closely related to the sugar interests of the new plantation economy. But it was not only the bourgeoisie that felt an attraction to the American W ar. Puerto Ricans became inhabitants of an unincorporated territory of the United States. The term colony has never been officially used for Puerto Rico, and the United States was still seen by many as the promise of future economic security and individual liberties. Early in the twentieth century the American flag was prominently displayed in all public activities by two of the main political parties in Puerto Rico. For the Republican party, the founding party of the U.S. statehood movement in the Island, the American flag represented the nation of their cherished dreams. This party came to be closely related to the sugar interests of the new plantation economy. But it was not only the bourgeoisie that felt an attraction to the American flag. Puerto Ricans in New York City and Chicago proudly display the Puerto Rican flag.

For stateholders, affirmations of Puerto Rican identity are always looked with concern because they might offend what for them is the source of economic and psychological security. An angry U.S. might force independence on “us,” and that’s very disturbing because without the U.S. “we” are nothing. In spite of the countless problems with Pabón’s analysis he deals with a series of issues that are fundamental for the understanding of nationalism in Puerto Rico. The establishment of ELA really marked a rupture with the way American colonialism had exerted its influence up to that moment. It was after ELA that the colonial system was able to achieve the hegemonic normalcy that to a certain extent it has enjoyed up to the present. If name should be given to the routine reproduction of ELA it is not banal nationalism, a more appropriate term could be banal colonialism. Or a colonialism that becomes invisible in the context of relative economic abundance and democratic paraphernalia.

**National flags in Puerto Rico**

ELA or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was ceremoniously established in 1952. Luis Muñoz Marín, who in 1948 became the first elected governor of Puerto Rico, personally raised the Puerto Rican flag during the public ceremonies marking the establishment of the new colonial arrangement with the United States. Ironically, this happened just two years after the Puerto Rican flag was exhibited by soldiers of the National Guard, who showed it as war booty after the nationalist rebellion, inspired by Pedro Albizu Campos, had been crushed. Puerto Rico has two national flags, and it is necessary to give a short account of the historical relationship between these two flags.

The American flag arrived in Puerto Rico in July 25, 1898, with the invading troops. After that Puerto Rico became spoils of war for the United States. After the Spanish American War Puerto Ricans became inhabitants of an unincorporated territory of the United States. The term colony has never been officially used for Puerto Rico, but the definition of unincorporated territory is clear: Puerto Rico belongs to but does not form part of the United States. The American flag had been since the beginning the flag of the new colonial masters, but it was also for many the flag of modernity and progress. In spite of the authoritarian character of the early colonial regime, the United States was still seen by many as the promise of future economic security and individual liberties. Early in the twentieth century the American flag was prominently displayed in all public activities by two of the main political parties in Puerto Rico. For the Republican party, the founding party of the U.S. statehood movement in the Island, the American flag represented the nation of their cherished dreams. This party came to be closely related to the sugar interests of the new plantation economy. But it was not only the bourgeoisie that felt an attraction to the American flag. Puerto Ricans in New York City and Chicago proudly display the Puerto Rican flag.
at different moments in the last century around the relative value of the Puerto Rican and American flag. To illustrate this I will describe several incidents in two different historical periods, in which public confrontations took place where the flag was a central issue. The first two incidents occurred in the 1930s, when Pedro Albizu Campos' Nationalist Party was carrying out a militant campaign in the midst of the Great Depression, struggling against an authoritarian colonial regime and acute poverty and its corresponding social tensions. In the 1930s the colonial regime was controlled by a coalition of parties made up of the bourgeois Republican Party and the proletarian Socialist Party. This contra natura alliance was cemented in their U.S. statehood aspirations. At the same time the largest political party, the Liberal Party, had independence as its goal. The cultural elite was also pro independence. And a new radical anticolonial party had made itself present in the political scene, led by a mulatto lawyer educated at Harvard University.

The other two incidents I am describing are very recent, at the beginnings of the twenty-first century. A different Puerto Rico now exists. Although by American standards Puerto Rico is poor, in comparison to other areas in the Caribbean it seems quite prosperous. Puerto Rico is now a new type of colony, in some ways related to other nonindependent territories in the Caribbean such as Martinique and Curaçao. Today Puerto Rico is a modern subsidized colony, where SUVs are quite common, overflowing the parking lots of the many commercial malls that dot the Island, to the envy of other more consumer-starved places in the region. In the Puerto Rico of the first years of the twenty-first century, the Island society finds itself more economically and socially integrated within the U.S. A certain type of Americanization has taken place, that is without doubt, but at the same time there's a stronger sense of collective identity that could be classified as an ethnonational taking into account that we are dealing with an unstable mix of cultural and political elements.

A strong Puerto Rican ethnic identity has taken shape but politically the U.S. statehood movement has come to almost dominate the political scene since the last decades of the twentieth century. Since its first electoral participation the New Progressive Party (PNP) has won half of the elections in Puerto Rico. One of the curiosities of the Puerto Rican political colonial scene is that in spite of the electoral strength of the pro-U.S. statehood party, the U.S. statehood option has lost three plebiscites, in 1967, 1993, and 1998. The big obstacle that impedes the further advance of the U.S. statehood movement is the strength of Puerto Rican ethnonational sentiment and identification. The two incidents I will shortly describe, which took place in 2001 and 2002, developed within the perception of growth in Puerto Rican national identification. One of the elements that created this perception was the popular appeal resulting from the movement to get the American Navy out of the Island municipality of Vieques.
'Shootout for the Puerto Rican Flag' read the front page headline of the newspaper *El Imparcial* in January 27, 1936 (Aponte Vázquez 2002:103). In the mountain town of Utuado a young nationalist named Luis Baldoni exchanged gun shots with the police, being wounded in the process but not before gravelly wounding the local head of police and another policeman. The article in *El Imparcial* pointed out that it was believed that Baldoni acted "in defense of his flag." It was a Sunday afternoon, and two different political meetings had taken place in Utuado; one involved the moderate and pro-American Socialist Party, and the other was run by the officially pro-independence Liberal Party. Baldoni snatched a Puerto Rican flag from the hands of someone who had just recently participated in the Liberal Party meeting. He took this action because of what he considered was disrespect for the national flag. According to one account Liberal Party followers were allowing the flag to scrape the ground. Baldoni’s action had started a fist fight just before the police intervention. According to the newspaper account, Baldoni shot at the police while holding aloft the Puerto Rican flag. This sharp response did not come out from the blue. By that time the relationship between the Nationalist Party and the police was quite antagonistic; a few from both sides had died violently, and things would become even worse. For example, in March 1937, while Pedro Albizu Campos, the main leader of the Nationalist Party, was in jail, waiting for transportation to the Federal Penitentiary in Atlanta, Georgia, the police in the city of Ponce stopped a Nationalist Party march with machine guns, killing 19 persons and wounding more than a hundred in what is remembered as the Ponce Massacre (Moraza Ortiz 2001).

**TWO EPISODES FROM THE 2000s**

At 2 a.m. on June 28, 2001, a small group of pro-U.S. statehood university students climbed a small hill across the street from the Capitol building in San Juan, raising the U.S. flag on a flagpole that had been flying the flag of the Vieques municipality. This action led to a political confrontation of several days, during which it sometimes seemed that a full-scale riot was going to take place. In the first day of the confrontation, for example, several people were injured from rocks and other thrown objects. The leaders of the statehood New Progressive Party (PNP) applauded the act of raising the U.S. flag on this hill as if it were an action of epic proportions. The Vieques flag that went missing had hung in front of a wooden chapel, recently made as a replica of the one that had stood for months in the U.S. Navy bombing range in the
the U.S. The struggle against the Navy in Vieques was one of the alarming things that he pointed out (Rodríguez Cotto 1999: 39). The freeing of some Puerto Rican pro-independence political prisoners by president Clinton in 1999 and their joyful reception in the Island contributed to this alarming feeling of a nationalist wave threatening U.S. presence in Puerto Rico. Different public commentators at this moment pointed out to indications of Puerto Rican national affirmation (Palau 1999: 134). The next year was an election year, and at that time according to newspaper columnist Juan Manuel García Passalacqua the “nationalist tide” had continued to rise “unabated” (García Passalacqua 2000: 26). The party in opposition, the Popular Democratic Party (PPD), won the elections of 2000 with messages appealing to Puerto Rican ethnic-national sentiments (Bauzá 2000: 6).

To the annoyance of statehooders there were signs that the “nationalist tide”
struggle through violence (Ghigliotty 2001: 36). It is perhaps testimony of political maturity that the whole thing did not end in wholesale bloodshed. On June 30th, the American and Puerto Rican flags raised by the statehooders were given in separate boxes to two different organization representatives. The U.S. flag was given to Charlie Rodríguez, former PNP senate president, and the Puerto Rican flag was given to Heriberto Martínez of the Ecumenical Council. PNP leaders were at that moment claiming to the press that what was happening was the awakening of the “sleeping giant” of the U.S. statehood struggle. Statehooders celebrated what for them was a victory shouting: “Puerto Rico, USA!” (Roldán Soto 2001: 38–9). In the next few days the presence of the U.S. flag throughout Puerto Rico increased. Let’s keep in mind that all this is happening before 9/11. The increase in the showing of the U.S. flag in Puerto Rico after 9/11 was not greater than it is now, and it would never be as strong as in the U.S. mainland. In the first two weeks of July, American flags were placed in specially selected places associated with Puerto Rican cultural values. On the 4th of July PNP militants placed an American flag in the monument to the jíbaro (the Puerto Rican peasant) in a mountainous part of the highway from San Juan to Ponce. A few days latter another American flag was placed in the monument to the Three Reyes Magos (the three Magi) in the town of Juana Díaz, another traditional symbol of Puerto Rican culture. The PPD mayor of that town called what happened a “vandal’s act,” but for statehooders it was an act of free expression under the U.S. flag. On July 27th, statehooders celebrated the birthday of José Celso Barbosa, the founder of the U.S. statehood movement. The U.S. flag that had flown in front of the Ecumenical Chapel was again raised this time in Bayamón, Barbosa’s hometown. The newspaper reporter was into something when he pointed to the semi-sacred fashion in which this flag was treated in its transportation to Bayamón, where it was treated as a “historical symbol” (Rodríguez Sánchez 2001: 36).

One of the most interesting things about this whole event was pointed out in the press. According to pro-state rhetoric, the massive political machinery of the U.S. statehood movement became invisible, and statehooders were victims of persecution. The confrontation in the hill seemed finally to end on the 29th of June, after an accord was reached where the Vieques flag would again fly where it was originally flying. Puerto Rican and American flags would fly nearby, atop new flagpoles placed by the statehooder protesters. The flags would remain under police protection in the meantime. The Ecumenical Council had obtained a court order for the immediate restitution of control over the site, but they preferred finding a more accommodating solution (García 2001: 32). What took place in the hill was defended by Jorge Santini, the PNP Mayor of San Juan, as evidence “that people where rising up in defense of American citizenship” (Mulero 2001: 35). The president of the Bar Association, Jaime Ruberté, was of the contrary opinion that what happened in the hill was an act of provocation by pro-Navy groups looking to discredit the Vieques
by the independentistas, the originally persecuted. This whole question of claiming to having been abused is a smokescreen, and it is absurd. It was a smokescreen because they were responding to the corruption scandals that had lead to the arrest by federal authorities of some top ranking members of the PNP government. It is absurd because these are the people closest to what in Puerto Rican parlance are called the “Americanos.” Nilka Estrada Resto pointed out the irony of the “light” guerrilla tactics employed by the PNP members, who were acting as if they were a small group outside of the mainstream. This “minority mentality” was according to Estrada very strange and perhaps dangerous (Estrada Resto 2001: 91).

[1.]

June 20, 2002

It became news on mid-June 2002, through a radio talk show, that the U.S. flag was not displayed in the main lobby of the offices of a local state agency, the Women’s Advocate Office. For stateholders in the PNP this was a grave offense and new evidence that there was a “separatist” hidden agenda in the government of the PPD. The governor of Puerto Rico, by most accounts the very conservative Sila María Calderón, was asked in a news conference her opinion about this and she answered that the U.S. flag had to be displayed together with the Puerto Rican flag in all state offices. It was a question of protocol, she argued. The head of the Women’s Advocate Office, María Dolores Fernós, stated that she had removed the U.S. flag from the lobby because, according to the law that established the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in 1952, the official Commonwealth flag is the flag of Puerto Rico and none other (Fernós 2004: 51). This interesting legal interpretation had not been made before, and it unmistakenly showed Puerto Rican nationalist sympathies. While arguing that she had acted within the law, Fernós declared that in deference to the governor she was going to place the U.S. flag in the lobby the next day. That was not soon enough for some people in the PNP.

Fernós is a capable lawyer and a feminist with vast experience in her field. She also comes from a family historically associated with the PPD. Her father, Antonio Fernós Isern, was one of the founders of the party and of the Commonwealth, serving for many years as Resident Commissioner in Washington, Puerto Rico’s nonvoting representative in the U.S. Congress. Her appointment to the Women’s Advocate Office was never to the taste of stateholders, especially because she was once married to Jorge Farinacci, a pro-independence socialist who spent some time in jail, accused of belonging to the Macheteros, a clandestine organization that was seriously disrupted by the FBI in the 1980s. For stateholders and some university professors Fernós represented authentic evidence of the “neonationalist” conspiracy that linked the PPD government to “separatist” groups.
Schatz, one of the accused and PNP representative in the State Electoral Board, had carried out an “operative” that used the electoral lists to identify possible jurors looking for candidates favorable to their cause (Bauzá 2004a: 20). The jury had its mind made-up before the trial had began, and it was in favor of the accused. That’s why they made their decision so quickly. When the jury entered the hall, the verdict was evident in the ample smile one of the jurors gave to the accused (Bauzá 2004b: 16). From the start Pesquera and the others had judges who played along with the delaying tactics of the defense. Judge Rubén Torres Dávila’s partiality toward the accused is an example — in his comments to the jury at the conclusion of the trial, he called them “patriots” who had discharged “in an excellent manner their citizenship and civil responsibility” (Martínez 2004: 46).

**Conclusion**

Banal nationalism becomes hot when a threat is perceived. In the 1930s Puerto Rican nationalism felt that the fate of the nation was in peril and a militant anticolonial response was necessary. Nationalist resistance required the rescue and revalorization of basic symbols of national affirmation. Among these symbols the flag was paramount, and in its defense some people were willing to risk their lives. In the context of an authoritarian colonial regime that pursued a policy of Americanization, nationalist resistance became increasingly more radical and, confronted with government repression, soon became engulfed in a growing spiral of violence. Now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, an ironic situation exists. Currently it is the partisans of U.S. presence in Puerto Rico who feel threatened. This is ironic because after more than a century under U.S. colonialism, Puerto Rico is in many respects a much more Americanized society than before and the proindependence movement is significantly weaker.

Why then this feeling of threat from U.S. statehooders? The independence movement is weak, but Puerto Rican culture remains a bulwark against the possibility of Puerto Rico becoming a U.S. state just like any other. Evidence of strong ethnonational sentiments in Puerto Rico, although conjoined with a weak political nationalism, is strong enough to alarm local American patriots. The successful struggle against the U.S. Navy in Vieques and other signs of a distinct Puerto Rican collective affirmation have led among many followers of U.S. statehood to the belief in a conspiracy theory where a “separatist” PPD leadership is confabulated with U.S. federal authorities to bring independence to Puerto Rico. A paranoiac style of politics then ensues, where U.S. citizenship is felt in danger of being lost. This is especially problematic because U.S. citizenship is seen as a guarantee of material and psychological security. In response to this perceived threat...
NOTES
1 “... el hecho de haberse tomado ese símbolo para hacer de él una ley encaminada a desvirtuarlo en un símbolo colonial ...” (Pagán 1972: 32).
2 “... aquellos mismos que en todos los tiempos ultrajaron y menospreciaron ese símbolo.” (Pagán 1972: 32).
3 “… el único propósito que guía a los que han defendido aquí este proyecto es arrebatarle a ese símbolo su fuerza ideológica y convertirlo en una miserable matrícula de barco...” (Pagán 1972: 32).
4 “Cala hondo el recuerdo de Albizu” and “Se hace sentir el legado de Albizu.” (El Nuevo Día 2000, 12 June: 4–5).
5 “Lo hice porque sí. Yo voy a ser pitiyanki sin miedo ...” (Rodríguez Cotto 2001: 44).
6 “Este relajo de los independentistas hay que acabarlo ya ...” (Garzón Fernández 2001: 5).
7 “Se acabó el abuso,” gritaban enardecidos militantes estadistas que rehusaban a abandonar la colina donde ubicaron la bandera estadounidense.” (García and Sosa Pascual 2001: 34).
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