

WON'T YOU PLEASE COME BACK TO GUAM? MEDIA DISCOURSE, MILITARY BUILDUP, AND CHAMORROS IN THE SPACE BETWEEN

James Perez Viernes

*Eighth of December, 1941
People went crazy right here on Guam
Oh Mr. Sam, Sam, My Dear old Uncle Sam,
Won't you please come back to Guam!*

The above epigraph is a verse from a popular song that Chamorros sang—oftentimes among themselves in hiding—in resistance to the Japanese occupation of Guam from 1941 to 1944, during World War Two. Composed by Pedro Taitingfong Rosario (“Tun Pete Siboyas”) in collaboration with Hawaiian national Louie Futado, by 1942 it had grown in popularity and was being sung by Chamorros across the island, much to the dismay of Japanese occupying forces (Aguon 2002, 220; Sanchez 1998). Today, the Chamorros who survived the occupation recount memories of brutality, starvation, forced labor and marches, displacement, dispossession, and other atrocities carried out against them by Japanese forces. Indeed, when United States forces reclaimed Guam on 21 July 1944 and effectively ended Japanese oppression, Chamorros welcomed them. From that day on, every 21 July the people of Guam have celebrated Liberation Day to commemorate the event. Today, many Chamorros who experienced the war continue to express their enthusiasm and gratitude toward the United States for liberating the island. But to what extent has this enthusiasm held among subsequent generations, each one more removed from the occupation experience and each one calling into question the “liberation” they inherited? To what extent has the longing for “dear old Uncle Sam” stood the test of time?

On 30 October 2005, the headline for the leading article of the *Pacific Daily News* (PDN) read, “7,000 Marines: Pentagon Announces Shift to Guam.” The article discussed the United States Department of Defense decision to relocate up to 7,000 US Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam but remained vague as to the specifics of the plan. Despite not knowing precisely what impact such a move would have on Guam, local government and business leaders were swift to express their support. Lee Webber—who was at the time chairman of the Armed

Forces Committee of the Guam Chamber of Commerce, as well as the president and publisher of the *Pacific Daily News*—hailed the decision as “not only great news for our economy but also for Guam and our nation” (Park 2005). Webber’s sentiments were a prelude to the dominant discourse that was to develop over the next few years—discourse that was promulgated by Guam’s media outlets, by political and business leaders, and by both the United States and Japan to sell the military realignment to the people of Guam.

In this paper, I offer a historic framework for understanding the kind of discourse that has emerged in relation to US military presence in Guam. I also examine indigenous modes of resistance on the island, which have often been overshadowed by prevailing discourse that touts Guam’s indigenous people as being wholly accepting of the US colonial agenda. More generally, I explore how Chamorros navigate the space between their indigenous identity and the experience of living under US colonialism in the twenty-first century.

UNCLE SAM’S “PATRIOTS”

Guam’s relationship with the United States spans over a century and began in 1898 as a result of the peace agreement made to end the Spanish-American War, the Treaty of Paris. Guam had previously been a colony of Spain for over three hundred years before the treaty transferred all of Spain’s colonies—including Cuba, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Guam—to the United States. The US Navy took immediate control over Guam, establishing the Naval Government of Guam. A series of naval governors—who were appointed to carry out President William McKinley’s order of “benevolent assimilation” regarding the indigenous people of Guam—ruled the island with unrestrained authority (Hattori 2004, 22). The naval administration of Guam assumed the responsibility to “not only better the material circumstances . . . but to achieve a transformation in the bodies and minds of the people,” as well as to “transform the Chamorro populace into an ‘American’ society, a new people who would be productive, disciplined, educated, and sanitary” (Hattori 1995, 1).

The first era of US Navy rule over Guam lasted from 1898–1941. During that time, the US Navy represented Chamorros as happy, hospitable, and patriotic. Chamorro historian Anne Perez Hattori has stated that the “frequent and unequivocal representations of Chamorros as peace-loving and generous quite

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

naturally (de)generated into conceptualizations of loyal, grateful, patriotic Chamorros who were proud to be American, friendly to American rule, and satisfied with Naval rule on the Island" (1995, 13). The navy's perception that it was "responsible for the material and moral development of the Chamorro people" and President McKinley's policy of benevolent assimilation provided the impetus for the penetration of American ways and values into all areas of Chamorro life (Hattori 1995, 13). The fabrication of a welcoming and enthusiastic island people accepting of American military worked to position Chamorros as childlike, dependent, and feminine, justifying the need for a masculine and paternalistic American system to be established on Guam. As Hattori noted, "The Navy would view themselves as 'parents' of the 'child-like' islanders, and as their 'parents,' they were then responsible for the material and moral development of the Chamorro people" (1995, 13).

American fabrications of Chamorros as a naturally docile, law-abiding, and loyal people were central to the successful Americanization of Guam. However, while some Chamorros were compliant with the US project to colonize Guam, others were resistant. Chamorros engaged in various modes of resistance that were indirect in nature to thwart encroaching American rule. Such expressions of Chamorro resistance mirror those characterized by political scientist James C Scott in his theoretical formulation of peasant resistance. On an everyday basis, these included "foot dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, [and] sabotage" (Scott 1985, xvi). Hattori has noted that US efforts to assimilate Chamorros during the era of naval rule on Guam relied largely on "the goodwill of the Chamorro people," and their choosing to comply with only those policies they felt would benefit them (1995, 41).

By the turn of the twentieth century, Chamorros were engaging in more active and coordinated modes of resistance. As early as 1901, a petition drafted by thirty-two Chamorros was sent to the US Congress. The petition requested the establishment of a permanent civilian government, adding that "a military government at best is distasteful and highly repugnant to the fundamental principals of civilized government" (Hattori 1996, 58). A similar petition was drafted in 1933 and was signed by 1,965 Chamorros. This document outlined indigenous aspirations for US citizenship and demanded that the political status of the island be determined once and for all as mandated by the Treaty of Paris. Between 1933 and 1950, four more petitions making similar demands were

drafted, but they were opposed by the navy and later rejected outright by the US Congress (Hattori 1996, 58).

That Chamorros actively resisted American domination on Guam during the pre–World War Two era subverts in a critical way the conception that life on Guam was “unhurried, fairly routine and largely uneventful . . . peaceful and contented” and that Chamorros believed “Uncle Sam would take care of the island and her people” (Sanchez 1998, 169). Indeed, the active agency of Chamorros in demanding citizenship, a concrete political status, and freedom from military domination is in stark contrast to the view that Chamorros are weak and have complied with the US colonial project in Guam. Nevertheless, despite the high level of Chamorro resistance, there remains a deep sense of ambiguity among Chamorros toward the United States—an ambiguity that is largely born out of the US liberation of the island in 1941.

The experience of war, Japanese occupation, and liberation has nurtured sentiments of unwavering patriotism among Chamorros toward the United States. As Chamorro scholar Keith Lujan Camacho noted, “The return of American soldiers, as personable and symbolic representations of America, convinced Chamorros of the perceived humanitarian dimension of American military expansion into the Pacific” (2005, 111). Such perceptions of American military humanitarianism have extended to all facets of US activity on Guam, activity that World War Two survivors and the generations that immediately followed have embraced and eagerly accepted.

While it has been over sixty-five years since Guam’s liberation from Japan, Chamorro acceptance of US control over Guam and moves toward fulfilling American objectives on the island remain clouded by complexity. The announcement of the realignment of military forces from Okinawa to Guam has sparked controversy and poses a dilemma for many Chamorros. At one end of the spectrum, Guam’s main media outlets and political and business leaders support the plan on the basis that it will increase jobs, boost a struggling island economy, revamp Guam’s dilapidated infrastructure, improve security against terrorism, and open the potential for more fruitful relations with the United States. However, at the other extreme are those who resist allowing the military to increase its presence and control in Guam at the risk of Chamorros losing yet more of their autonomy. In the middle—indeed, in the space between—are Chamorros who remain ambivalent, grateful for the US forces ending Japan’s

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

wartime occupation, but wary of the unknowns that this new situation might bring.

“GUNG-HO FOR MARINES”

Owned by Gannett Co. Inc., the leading newspaper publishing company in the United States, the *Pacific Daily News* has served as a primary source of information regarding the current US plan to relocate troops to Guam. A cursory survey of *PDN* headlines between 2005 and 2006 in many ways hints at the newspaper's tacit endorsement of the proposed move:

7 November 2005: “Relocation of Marines to Guam Could Be a Good Thing”

15 August 2006: “Let's Follow Okinawa's Example and Flourish with Marine Buildup”

4 December 2006: “Military Buildup, Relocations Will Change Island, Hopefully for Better”

Those serving in the highest political offices of the Government of Guam have echoed the sentiments expressed in the *PDN* headlines. In a speech given to the Guam Chamber of Commerce, Guam's delegate to US Congress, Madeleine Z Bordallo, stated, “Guam is poised to receive a significant amount of federal investment to support an increased military presence. The increase in spending on Guam and the benefits associated with having more military personnel and their families promises to breathe new life and renewed strength into our economy” (Bordallo 2006). In his annual State of the Island Address in 2006, Governor Felix P Camacho stated that the military's proposed expansion in Guam was “set to bring about the greatest economic boom our island has yet seen” (Limtiaco 2006a). In a regional hearing of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) held in Los Angeles, Speaker Mark Forbes of I Mina' Bente Ocho Na Liheslaturan Guåhan (the Twenty-Eighth Guam Legislature) provided written testimony in support of continued and expanded military presence on Guam, writing, “Guam remains enthusiastic, as it always has been, to do its part to promote the National Defense and ensure the safety and security of all our people” (Limtiaco 2006a)

Congresswoman Bordallo's stance on the military buildup extended beyond the proposed economic and security benefits it was expected to bring.

Significantly, Bordallo linked the US military relocation to the US liberation of Guam in 1944: “The Expeditionary Force [to be moved to Guam] is the same that helped liberate Guam from Japanese forces during World War II. . . . We will now celebrate many Liberation Days in the future beside men and women that carried on the tradition of those that freed our people” (Park 2005). She continued to invoke Chamorro memories of the war in a separate publication, stating, “When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, they invaded Guam at the same time. . . . We were occupied by the Japanese for three and a half years. Now you’ve got South Korea-North Korea, Taiwan-China. There’s a lot of unrest. A lot of us remember the Japanese occupation and don’t want something like that to happen again” (quoted in Glantz 2006). In his written testimony to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, Speaker Forbes noted, “The local population of Guam contains large numbers of military veterans and retirees. We may have the largest per capita number of veterans of any American community. Indeed, military service is a broad local tradition. Guam is a recruiter’s paradise” (Limtiaco 2005). In a strategic way, both Bordallo and Forbes appealed to Chamorros’ sense of allegiance to the United States and—by alluding to their war experience with Japan—fostered the idea that the US military realignment would serve as a safeguard against possible future threats. It becomes evident that influential leaders such as the congresswoman, governor, and Speaker—who represent the people of Guam on the national and international stage—are producing a one-sided perspective that has had a direct impact on the decision-making process to relocate military personnel to Guam.

Support for the military buildup has been expressed not only on Guam, but also on neighboring islands whose leaders have worked to expedite the process. A June 2006 *PDN* issue reported the comments of various regional leaders attending the fourth Pacific Islands Leaders Meeting in Okinawa that included discussions about the planned relocation of troops. Foreign Affairs Minister Gerald M Zackios of the Republic of the Marshall Islands stated, “We are closely watching what is happening in Guam. I think we will benefit [from the military relocation], especially with tourism” (Crisostomo 2006). Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) President Joseph J Urusemal shared Zackios’s enthusiasm, stating, “We hope the FSM will be looked at us as a [rest-and-relaxation] destination [for military personnel]” (Crisostomo 2006). Urusemal also expressed his hope that the move would bolster employment opportunities for FSM citizens. Republic of Palau President Tommy E Remengesau, Jr, asserted that his

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

island nation would look at developing new forms of tourism, mainly ecotourism, to accommodate the influx of military visitors (Crisostomo 2006). Governor Camacho announced, "We are moving forward with plans to market a 'Magnificent Micronesia' to the world and to leverage federal dollars to build a strong regional work force" (Crisostomo 2006). Nearly one year after the decision to move troops to Guam was announced by the *Pacific Daily News*, the newspaper commissioned a survey to gauge the feelings of registered voters about the military relocation. According to the poll, 61 percent of those who participated in the survey agreed that the influx of military personnel and the resulting population boom would be a "good thing" for the island, while 15 percent viewed it as a "bad thing" (Dumot-ol Daleno 2006a).¹ The headline boasting these seemingly conclusive findings read, "Voters Gung-Ho for Marines."

Two months later, the newspaper commissioned another poll. Much like the one that preceded it, the poll asked Guam voters whether they thought the military buildup would have a positive or negative impact on Guam, or if they were undecided on the matter. This time, 69 percent of participants reported a positive view, while 10 percent felt the buildup would be a "bad thing" (Dumot-ol Daleno 2006b).² The headline for the article reporting voters' responses this time read: "Poll: Voters Salute Military."

It is interesting to note that the questions used in the polls failed to go beyond the simplistic binary of "good" and "bad." Further, the first poll included only 502 registered voters, and the second poll only 500. Using those figures, each poll included less than 1 percent of the 55,311 people registered to vote in 2006. There is no way to determine how the remaining 99 percent of Guam voters would have responded had they been included in the *PDN* polls. However, what *is* clear is the way the *Pacific Daily News* shaped people's perceptions of military expansion in Guam by using headlines that implied overwhelming support for the buildup based on a small sample of registered voters.

RETHINKING THE ECONOMICS OF MILITARY BUILDUP

As demonstrated thus far, the argument in support of the military buildup on Guam is primarily the promise that it will boost Guam's economy and thereby

improve the lives of its people. *PDN* articles have focused heavily on the positive aspects of increased military presence on Guam, citing a number of favorable outcomes, including economic gains through an increased number of jobs, growth of foreign investment, developments in technology; improved infrastructure through federal funding of upgrades, and expansions to water and power systems and roadways; continued “partnership” between the people of Guam and the United States; and improved national security against terrorism and the perceived threat of North Korea’s nuclear advancements.

Nevertheless, despite the perceived benefits of military expansion in Guam—benefits that have been touted by Guam’s political leaders and *Pacific Daily News*—many remain suspicious of such an optimistic outlook. A critical question to be considered is the extent to which the expected economic benefits and improvements to Guam’s infrastructure will trickle down to the ordinary people of Guam. While the influx of military personnel and their dependents will most certainly require the construction of new facilities and the improvement of Guam’s dilapidated infrastructure, local firms and local workers may not necessarily be hired to take on those projects. As Bordallo has admitted, “Some of these contracts will be so large that they exceed the capacity of local firms” (2006). Further, to what extent will the new jobs created by the influx of military personnel and their dependents be available to local workers? The very real possibility exists that such jobs, as has occurred in the past, will go to foreign labor from the Philippines, Korea, and other Asian countries whose laborers have the necessary skills and are willing to work for less pay on a limited-term basis. As for other types of jobs beyond construction and infrastructure projects, there are no guarantees that the US military will refrain from importing its own workforce to run its bases and provide services, as it has done numerous times previously. The jobs remaining after the importation of outside, skilled labor will undoubtedly be menial and in short supply.

While the US federal government has promised to provide the financial means necessary to upgrade Guam’s infrastructure, there remains the question of whether such improvements will be only used to benefit incoming military personnel and their dependents. On Guam, there has been a tendency for local residents to be denied basic services, while military personnel continue to receive them. A case in point comes from my own observations while on Guam in the aftermath of Super Typhoon Pongsona in December 2002. During that time,

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

many residents on the island were without power, or running water, or both, for up to two months. However, military bases and residential areas for military personnel and their dependents only had to endure one week without utility services and were compensated monetarily for their hardship. Many Guam residents—especially those living in the southern villages—wondered why *their* taps had been dry for weeks, while just over the fence in military housing they saw American children running through sprinklers and their fathers washing family cars with garden hoses. It is interesting to point out that the water used by villagers and military personnel came from the same source—Fena Reservoir—which was supposedly “running low.”

Finally, anxieties about the island's security have been fueled by the threat of terrorism and the possibility of North Korea developing nuclear weapons capable of reaching Guam, the American territory closest to Asia. But does the current state of Guam's security warrant such a massive influx of military personnel to the island? After all, two large and well-equipped military bases—US Naval Station Guam and Andersen Airforce Base—already exist on the island. In addition, at present, there is no evidence to suggest that either terrorists or North Korea plan to mount an attack on Guam. Justifying the major movement of military forces to Guam as a safeguard against such threats falls in line with what political commentators Greg Fry and Tarcisius Tara Kabutaulaka have identified as the wholesale use of “war on terror” rhetoric by world powers to justify military intervention in the Pacific (Fry and Kabutaulaka 2008, 18).

VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

While the dominant media discourse would have us believe that the majority of residents in Guam were in support of the military buildup, in reality, opposition to the plan was being expressed by a number of different groups, ranging from everyday grassroots communities to highly organized social movements. Critiques against military expansion have for the most part been marginalized—usually appearing at the tail end of articles or tucked away in the *PDN* opinion section—yet, they have nevertheless been a significant force in challenging the assumption that the military is a “good thing” for Guam (see, eg, Anderson 2006).

In the *PDN* section “Voice of the People,” which accepts letters from readers on current issues, former Marine Jess Cruz argued that the influx of military troops to Guam would only increase US paternalism and domination over the island, and pointed out that Guam would continue “to be considered a military depot and not be recognized for its rich culture and heritage” (Cruz 2005). Cruz went on to state that someone “has to tell big brother what he can and can’t do at times. . . . I’m not quite sure if [this move] is for the better” (Cruz 2005). In another letter published in “Voice of the People” under the heading “Don’t Count Marines’ Cash Before They Spend It,” David Godfrey warned the people of Guam against “counting [their] chickens before they are hatched” (2006). Godfrey suggested that people should consider more critically the assumption that large amounts of cash would be infused into the economy by military personnel and their dependents. He reminded readers that most military personnel would probably not be accompanied by their dependents (thus decreasing the number of people spending money), and tours of duty would likely be limited to a single year. Godfrey also asserted that many married military personnel tended to be “extraordinarily frugal” with their money. In a third letter to “Voice of the People,” Blaine Afaisen considered the strain on natural resources like water that an influx of military would present to the geographically small and resource-limited Guam. Afaisen posed a critical question: “To all who advocate the military relocation, our island lifestyles will be influenced immensely. Is this the price we who call Guam home are willing to pay?” (2006).

The feelings expressed in the “Voice of the People” extended beyond concerns held by individual residents. On 23 May 2006, when Governor Camacho met with Defense Department Undersecretary Richard Lawless to discuss the transfer of Marines to Guam, a large group of protestors gathered along Marine Corps Drive—Guam’s main thoroughfare—displaying signs that read, “Yankee go home!” and “No more Marines!” A central reason behind the demonstration stemmed from residents’ belief that “the indigenous people of Guam do not have enough of a voice in what happens” (Limtiaco 2006b). This organized and very public show of resistance illustrates the coordinated ways the people of Guam are beginning to speak out against the military buildup in particular and the much wider issue of colonization.

Three days after the Marine Corps Drive demonstration, a group of women concerned about the social impacts increased military presence would have on

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

the island met to discuss the issue and a proposed plan of action. Central to their discussions was the strain military personnel and their dependents would have on an already beleaguered social service system. Sarah Thomas-Nededog, executive director of Sanctuary, Inc.—a community-based organization that provides social services such as counseling, conflict resolution, and drug treatment for local youth and families—noted, “Sometimes people think military personnel don’t come to the private sector, and that’s not true. . . . They are in the system” (Limtiaco 2006c). Thomas Nededog added that the military currently does not offer certain support services on Guam for its personnel and their dependents. While they can access help off-island, she stated that they tend to seek help through local avenues.

Chamorro resistance to the military buildup has also extended to the World Wide Web as evidenced by the launching of the online Peace and Justice for Guam Petition in June 2006 by the Guåhan Indigenous Collective, a Chamorro rights group.³ Addressed to then United Nations Secretary General Koffi Annan and then President of the United States George W Bush, the petition implored the United Nations and the US federal government to address many concerns relating to the buildup. Citing the lack of consent by the Chamorro people during deliberations over military expansion on Guam and pointing out the potential negative impacts the move could have on Guam residents, the petition was circulated through e-mail networks and via online message boards, blogs, and Web sites. It soon garnered hundreds of signatures from the people of Guam as well as supporters in the United States and many other countries. The weight of the petition and its success in gaining support will be an interesting development to follow in the months ahead.

Chamorro resistance to military expansion has also been expressed at the highest levels of international discussions. On 4 October 2006, a group of young Chamorro leaders presented testimony to the UN Special Political and Decolonization Committee. Julian Aguon—a Chamorro rights activist and member of I Nasion CHamoru (Chamorro Nation)—urged the committee to “pass a resolution condemning [the] massive military transfer and buildup of Guam as a grave breach of duty on the part of the Administering Power, in no less explicit terms” (2006, 7). Hope Alvarez Cristobal of the Organization of People for Indigenous Rights echoed Aguon’s call for the cessation of US military expansion on Guam, noting that “the US holds its security interests above any other concerns present in Guam and thus the scope and breadth of military

activity on Guam are a result of a unilateral and arbitrary US policy rather than from mutual agreement” (2006, 9). Cristobal went on to comment on the threat that increased military presence poses to the political development of the island as it pertains to indigenous concerns, noting that “military personnel and their families are eligible to vote in local elections by virtue of their US citizenship and in spite of the transitory nature of their residency” (2006, 9).

Other Chamorro leaders from Guam representing organizations such as the Guåhan Indigenous Collective, the International Peoples’ Coalition Against Military Pollution, the National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum, and the CHamoru Cultural Development and Research Institute, joined Aguon and Cristobal at the United Nations to register their concerns over the negative impacts the military realignment would have on Guam’s economy, public safety, culture, environment, and land tenureship. In response, UN Undersecretary-General for Political Affairs Ibrahim Gambari said, “It is the goal of the United Nations to help the Chamoru people attain the basic right to self-determination, as part of its Charter and that it is also an ethical issue of great concern” (Hita Guåhan 2006, 17). In recognizing the urgency of the matter, Gambari arranged a second meeting between the Chamorro and Political Affairs Bureau representatives to discuss moving the decolonization process in Guam forward using a UN framework (Aguon 2006, 17). However, whether or not Chamorro aspirations toward decolonization can be realized through UN channels remains to be seen.

THE SPACE BETWEEN

The emergence of an overtly vocal, assertive, and visible Chamorro resistance is a recent development on Guam. While in the past Chamorros expressed resistance, they did so in ways that were indirect and therefore less likely to upset communal harmony. But times have changed. Younger generations of Chamorros who are disconnected from the occupation experience and who have been exposed to university courses where colonialism, globalization, and self-determination are common themes of critical discussion are increasingly ambivalent about their role as Uncle Sam’s patriots.

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

Today's generation has come to expect and demand the basic human rights guaranteed to them, and are armed with the tools and knowledge to assert those rights through more active and overt forms of resistance.

For far too long, the Chamorro people have been misunderstood as being a content island people who are uncritical of their history with the United States and their continued relationship with it in the present. Yet it is clear that, whether by indirect or active means, Chamorros have resisted and continue to resist US colonialism. Guam's colonial history has shaped a people that are in every sense occupying multiple spaces between being indigenous and American, patriotic and disaffected, content and enraged. It is an ambiguous space that requires careful negotiation on the part of Chamorros—it is a space in which their social consciousness shifts uneasily in an increasingly globalized world.

There has been much debate since the United States first announced its plans to expand its military presence on Guam. As I have demonstrated, there has been prominent support for the scheme, not the least of which is based on proposed economic benefits to the island. But Chamorro detractors have not been silent on the matter. While the modes of resistance they have employed to express their opposition may differ from those enacted during the earlier phase of Americanization on Guam, they nevertheless retain the core principles of indigenous pride and self-determination held by many Chamorros.

Violence, civil unrest, coups, and other forms of more visible conflict have not yet reached Guam's shores as they have in other islands in Oceania. But there remains a keen sense of unease among the people of Guam—an unease that has been concealed by various forms of propaganda and popular media representations that depict Chamorros as supporting the decisions being made on their behalf. While the United States has consistently turned a deaf ear to Chamorro opposition to the military buildup in particular and its colonial agenda in general, I wonder how long it will be before we finally cease to utter that historic and plaintiff request, "Dear old Uncle Sam, won't you please come back to Guam?"

This article was completed in April 2007, shortly after plans to relocate US military personnel to Guam were made public. The author recognizes that, since then, the situation regarding military realignment in Guam has developed in ways that are not discussed in this work.

Notes

1. The *PDN* article failed to disclose how the remaining 24 percent of the sample voted.
2. The *PDN* article failed to disclose how the remaining 21 percent of the sample voted.
3. Peace and Justice for Guam Petition at <http://www.petitiononline.com/hasso/petition.html> [accessed 22 December 2008]

References

- Afaisen, Blaine
2006 Military Increase Will Strain Water Supply. *Pacific Daily News*. 27 July.
- Aguon, Julian
2006 The Gravity of Militarization. Speech at the United Nations Special Political Decolonization Committee, New York, 4 October. Reproduced in Hita Guåhan! Chamoru Testimonies to the United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee at <http://www.geocities.com/minagahet/hita2006.pdf>
- Aguon, Katherine B, editor
2002 Pedro Taitingfong Rosario. In *I Manfåyi: Who's Who in Chamorro History*, 220–223. Hale'-ta (Our Roots) Series. Hagåtña: Political Status Education Coordination Commission.
- Anderson, Tommy
2006 Marines Welcomed Warily. *Pacific Daily News*. 31 October.
- Bordallo, Madeleine Z
2006 Remarks to the Guam Chamber of Commerce General Membership Meeting. Hagåtña, 31 May.
- Camacho, Keith Lujan
2005 Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory, and History in the Mariana Islands. PhD thesis. History. University of Hawai'i at Mānoa Crisostomo, David V
2006 Pacific Neighbors Watching Guam. *Pacific Daily News*. 2 June.
- Cristobal, Hope Alvarez
2006 Chamorro Self-Determination Pá'go! Speech at the United Nations Special Political Decolonization Committee, New York, 4 October.
- Cruz, Jess
2005 Thousands of Marines May Add Burden to Island. *Pacific Daily News*. 2 November.
- Dumat-ol Daleno, Gaynor
2006 Poll: Voters Salute Military. *Pacific Daily News*. 12 October.
- Dumat-ol Daleno, Gaynor
2006 Voters Gung-Ho for Marines. *Pacific Daily News*. 24 August.
- Fry, Greg, and Tarcisius Tara Kabutaulaka
2008 *Intervention and State-building in the Pacific: The Legitimacy of 'Cooperative Intervention.'* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Glantz, Aaron

Viernes • **Won't You Please Come Back to Guam?**

- 2006 Natives of Guam Decry US Expansion. AntiWar.com Web site at <http://www.antiwar.com/glantz/?articleid=10156>. 13 December 2006. [Accessed 1 April 2007]
- Godfrey, David H
2006 Don't Count Marines' Cash Before They Spend It. *Pacific Daily News*. 10 November.
- Hita Guåhan
2006 Chamoru Delegation to United Nations Well Received by Top Officials: Decolonization of Guam, Halt to US Military Build-up Prioritized. In Hita Guåhan! Chamoru Testimonies to the United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee at <http://www.geocities.com/minagahet/hita2006.pdf>
- Hattori, Anne Perez
1995 The Navy Blues: US Navy Policies on Guam, 1899–1941. Unpublished manuscript. Pacific Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
1996 Righting Civil Wrongs: Guam Congress Walkout of 1949. In *Kinalamten Pulitikåt: Siñenten I Chamorro (Issues in Guam's Political Development: The Chamorro Perspective)*, 57–69. Hale'-ta (Our Roots) Series. Agaña: Political Status Education Coordination Commission.
2004 *Colonial Dis-Ease: US Navy Health Policies and the Chamorros of Guam, 1898–1941*. Pacific Islands Monograph Series 19. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Center for Pacific Islands Studies and University of Hawai'i Press.
- Limtiaco, Steve
2005 Guam Officials Lay out Case for More Military. *Pacific Daily News*. 16 July.
2006a State of the Island Address: Speech Touts Progress, Falls Short of Details. *Pacific Daily News*. 23 February.
2006b Residents Protest along Marine Corps Drive. *Pacific Daily News*. 24 May.
2006c Women Question Military Influx. *Pacific Daily News*. 27 May.
- Park, Gene
2005 7,000 Marines: Pentagon Announces Shift to Guam. *Pacific Daily News*. 30 October.
- Sanchez, Pedro C
1998 *Guañan Guam: The History of Our Island*. Hagåtña: Sanchez Publishing House.
- Scott, James C
1985 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Abstract

In October 2005, Guam's major daily newspaper, the *Pacific Daily News* (PDN), reported on the United States Department of Defense decision to relocate over 7,000 US Marines and their dependents from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. Politicians and businessmen lauded the decision as a potential boon to the island's economy. Over the next few years, the *Pacific Daily News* served as the primary print medium through which a dominant discourse was promulgated in

support of military expansion. In this paper, I provide an historic framework for understanding the kinds of discourses that have emerged in Guam in relation to US military presence on the island. This paper also considers the various modes of indigenous resistance that have been enacted on Guam—in both the past and the present—as means of disrupting the prevailing assumption that Chamorros wholeheartedly accept the US colonial agenda. This analysis is also revealing of ways in which Chamorros navigate the space between their indigenous identity and the experience of living under US colonialism in the twenty-first century.

KEYWORDS: Guam, Chamorro, Micronesia, United States, military, media, US Marines