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The community of Umatac with 775 inhabitants and 123 households on the island of Guam was studied to: (1) fill an existing gap in the knowledge of Micronesian societies by examining a Guamanian community which has not been studied and, (2) to describe and explain the changes in an island society where traditional elements are still present. Two periods, traditional (1850-1944) and modern (1944-1976) were established for the purposes of description and comparison. The study focused on social relations, the economy, and in particular on land tenure and land use. The social relations included are those connected with: (1) stages in the life cycle of an individual (birth, marriage and death); (2) land tenure and land use and (3) the yearly celebration of the fiesta. Subsistence and wage activities were examined within the framework of an island-wide economy. The historical development of the land tenure system has been considered within the framework of the Spanish and American colonial systems within which it has been operating from traditional to modern times. Basic components of land tenure included were those explaining the origin of title and access to allocation, exercise and conveyance of land titles and land rights, and both the symbolic and economic value of land.

The findings of this study indicate that most changes occurred in the economy and less changes in land tenure and land use, and in social relations respectively. Environmental conditions which limit the amount of land favorable for subsistence, habitation and development have
been a deterrent to massive economic development. The shift from a subsistence to a cash economy after World War II resulted in new occupations, the disappearance of certain crops and farming techniques, the laying idle of the best farming land, a decrease in the economic importance of land for subsistence activities, the use of money rather than barter as the medium of land exchange and the increased usage of land as collateral to secure loans. Small-scale subsistence activities have continued in 102 or 82.9 percent of the households.

Changes in both land tenure and land use have occurred mostly as a result of economic, political, administrative and demographic factors. The modern system of land tenure was found to be derived from concepts of land ownership introduced by the Spanish government between 1850 and 1899. The sudden shift in political power from Spain to the United States in 1898 left the question of private ownership and land boundaries of certain land parcels unsettled. This condition facilitated government claims to unsurveyed lands. After 1950, the codification of land registration procedures gave people specific ways to solve problems of land ownership in cases when the landowner had died without a will and often resulted in changes in the traditional manner of inheritance of divided land. As a result of the decreasing importance in agriculture for the economy, people admit changes in their perception of the value of land, the importance of a verbal agreement, the significance of keeping the land within the family.

Demographic growth caused changes in land use and actualization of rights to undivided land. Yet people's control of their ancestral landholdings within the family has been maintained in most cases due to:
(1) the predominance of a patrilineal pattern in land transfers within a flexible bilateral system; (2) the adherence to a flexible criteria followed in land transfers both during a person's lifetime (gift, deed, warranty deed) or after a landholder's death (inheritance or distribution) based, by decreasing order of importance, on: sex, amount of land available, age, marital status, residency and sequence of marriage; and (3) the adherence to the traditional system of undivided land.

The continuing importance of social relations within the Umatac community has been facilitated by the nuclear household, the increasing importance of the fiesta and the criteria followed for gradation of kindred obligations. Changes in marriage patterns can be attributed to increased communication between people from Umatac and those from outside the community, but the frequency of marriage to parientes has been continuously higher among landowning than among landless families.

In conclusion, the findings of this study indicate that the village of Umatac despite changes has retained more traditional elements than other villages in Guam.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Located in the western Pacific and within the Micronesian cultural area, the island of Guam is the most significant in size, population, economy, military installations among the fifteen islands included in the archipelago of the Marianas. Within Guam the smallest in population and yet the most distinct in its physical, historical and social setting is the community of Umatac, the subject of the present study. It is located in southern Guam in a land area of 1,576 hectares (6 square miles) and with a present population of 775 people (writer's census).

According to Haverlandt, the Chamorros of Guam have been forgotten by anthropologists and other social scientists (1975(VI):120) who have by-passed it in search of other Pacific island communities with less marked western influence. As a result of this lack of interest, ethnographic studies are limited to those of Safford (1905), Thompson (1947) and to the most recent one by McMakin (1975). The later focuses on the suruhanos (local healers) while Safford and Thompson had presented a general picture of Chamorro society, Safford at the turn of the century and Thompson in the 1930s. With this scarcity of systematic ethnographic studies it is logical that for the present study I concentrate first on a specific community, secondly in one which in the opinion of Chamorro people, the old ways are more visible than in any other village in Guam, and thirdly in problems of change in the community as they are related to those of the island as a whole.
In the selection of a functional framework for the present study, the criterion for choice is based in its potential to express inter-relationship: first among the different components of the social system, in this case the community of Umatac, and secondly between those in the social system and island-wide economic, political, and administrative factors.

The primary aim of this study is to fill an existing gap in the study of Micronesian societies by focusing on a Guamanian community which has not been studied. The secondary aim is to describe and explain change over time in an island society where traditional elements are still present.

In order to accomplish the aims stated above I have first established two periods--traditional and modern--for the purposes of description and comparison. In these two periods I have concentrated on four aspects of Umatac community: social relations especially kinship relations, the economy, land use and land tenure.

The first recorded contact between the indigenous inhabitants of the Marianas and Westerners occurred in the early sixteenth century. Prior to this time the Chamorros had a diversified economy based on agriculture, fishing, gathering and trade. After the initial contact in the sixteenth century, Spain claimed Guam and the other islands in the Marianas archipelago by right of discovery, a claim followed by establishment of military rule and of a mission post in 1668. Since this early date Guam became one of the farthest outposts in the vast Spanish colonial Empire linked to Mexico and to the Philippines through the annual galleon trade as the galleon stopped in Guam to get water and food supplies.
This was a period of intense disruption of the society as the result of colonial dominance.

The traditional period (1850-1944) includes the last years of Spanish colonial rule which ended with the shift of power from Spain to the U.S. government in 1898 as a result of the Spanish defeat during the Spanish-American War. Subsequently, the Department of the Navy administered the island from 1898 until 1950 when civilian rule was established. During World War II, Guam was invaded and occupied by the Japanese and subsequently re-occupied by the American forces. Within this period I emphasize the years 1850-1899 where there is documented evidence to prove that the institutionalization of the kindred, the formation of the present Chamorro (Neo-Chamorro) population, and the development of private ownership occurred.

The rationale for using the term "traditional" for the second period is based on Spoehr's statement regarding nineteenth century Chamorro culture: "this is the culture which the Chamorro today consider traditional and which they refer to when they speak of costumbren Chamorro" (1954:62). This statement has been substantiated by my own observations in Umatac and outside Umatac, e.g., people often refer to "long long time ago" or to "the time before the war" to convey or account for something that was customary in their father's father's generation.

Finally, the modern baseline (1944-1976) covers the period from the end of World War II through my fieldwork period (1975-76). The rationale for this distinction is based on the rapid transition the island experienced since the re-occupation of the island by American forces, a change affecting all areas of life in Guam. This postwar era brought, on
the one hand, economic development, reconstruction, education, and systematic teaching of the English language. It also brought dependence on outside forces, predominance of a cash economy, expansion of military facilities, decreasing usage of the vernacular (Chamorro) and the breakdown of traditional customs. All these elements brought Guam and its people to the threshold of modernization and gradually prepared the people for the rapid change of the sixties.

After 1962, natural disaster in the form of a typhoon and a political move by the U.S. administration in Washington acted as catalysts for accelerated change. Typhoon Karen swept over the island and destroyed 98 percent of the buildings, crops, and resources. A period of intensive reconstruction sponsored by the Federal government followed with the U.S. Congress appropriating $15,644.00 in the form of relief grants or loans to both the public and private sectors. Concurrently, military restrictions on the island were lifted in 1963. Guam, due to its proximity to the Orient (see Figure 1), became a favorite place for foreign investments. Changes in the sixties and early seventies included the following: (1) expansion of public facilities, especially those related to education and health; (2) importation of foreign labor from the Philippines to work in construction; (3) importation of technical and professional experts; (4) growth of foreign investments, especially Japanese and Taiwanese; (5) development of tourism; and (6) change in local attitudes towards land.

Guam today, more than six thousand miles away from the U.S. mainland (see Figure 1) is a U.S. unincorporated territory. Guamanians became American citizens with passage of the Organic Act in 1950, and
Figure 1. Distance from Guam in Statute Miles
(Source: U.S. Army Engineer Division Pacific Ocean, 1973, plate 1).
the judicial, legislative and executive branches of their government was patterned after those of the American system. The Guamanians elected their first governor in 1972, and since then have increasingly manifested a desire for more economic, political, and cultural self-determination. This feeling is counteracted by the island's economic dependence on the outside, and by the political control exercised by the Federal government through the large military installations on the island (see Figure 2). At present, there is a thriving interest in various aspects of the island's heritage: historical, cultural, and linguistic, which is interpreted as a felt need to re-define Chamorro ethnic identity in the midst of an increasingly multi-ethnic population.

Organization of the Study

Conceptually, the material in this monograph falls into three parts. In the first part comprising Chapters II and III, I put the community of Umatac in its historical and geographical setting.

In Chapter II as background material to the study of traditional and modern Umatac, I include data on social relations, economy, land tenure and land use in ancient Chamorro society.

Chapter III centers on general geographic information on Guam followed by the description of the community of Umatac. In this chapter I argue that one of the main facilitating aspects to forming a community is the present layout of the habitation sites, as well as commercial, religious, and service facilities in and outside the so-called "village." A second argument is that the resident and non-resident view of the uniqueness of Umatac is a reinforcing mechanism to the sense of local identity.
Figure 2. General Locator Map of Guam, Showing Military Reservation Boundaries, Major Highways, Villages, Mountains, and other Place Names (Source: Marsh and Winter 1975 (V):24A).
The second part of this study (Chapters IV, V, VI and VII) focuses first on the description of social relations, the economy, land tenure and land use in traditional and modern times, and secondly on their analysis from the viewpoint of social and cultural change.

Chapter IV concentrates on social relations (consanguinal and affinal) as they are exercised by the members of the household, the kindred. Those under study are connected with (1) events held at different stages in the life cycle of an individual; (2) the yearly celebration of the fiesta; and (3) land tenure and land use. The criteria for these selections are their importance to the people in Umatac. In this chapter some problems raised by anthropologists concerning the dynamics of the formation of effective kindred are analyzed in the particular situation of Umatac. The impact of laws of the Catholic Church regulating range of allowed marriage is examined.

Chapter V deals with the economy. Data on subsistence and wage activities are entered and analyzed within the island-wide economic development. The purpose related to the central theme of this study is to ascertain the impact the shift from a moderately subsistence economy to a wage economy had on land tenure and land use. Furthermore, it is important to determine any existing correlation between economic development in a given area and the monetary increase in the value of land and its impact on land tenure and land use. Finally, within the topic of economic development the impact of technological changes as it relates to changes in occupations and land are examined. By technology it is understood innovations in farming such as the introduction of new crops, new farming techniques directed at increasing production, extensive
use of fertilizers, large-scale mechanization, the establishment of new markets, and the improvement of the infrastructure to facilitate access to other areas and facilities outside Umatac, market and farming areas. If there is sufficient technological innovation in an area, this would ordinarily result in improved communications and considerable changes in land tenure and land use.

Chapters VI and VII focus on the description of land tenure and land use. Their different components are examined and analyzed in their relationship to political, administrative, environmental, demographic and economic factors.

In Chapter VI, as a prelude, I approach the description of land tenure within the framework of the Spanish and American colonial government whose laws and regulations contributed to share and modify the land tenure system. Here, and during the Spanish period the main emphasis is on the emergence of private land ownership. I present evidence which shows that in many instances the laws and regulations regarding land allocation and land use were not followed. Furthermore, the lack of zoning laws during the modern period up to 1953 and the adaptation of the zoning laws to the existing conditions in Umatac are seen as positive contributing elements to the maintenance of the traditional village layout. It is my opinion that the modern system of land tenure as exercised in Umatac is derived from concepts of land ownership that were introduced by the Spanish government during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and that these concepts were in operation between 1850-1899. Next to this description data on environmental conditions in Umatac is followed by the examination of land tenure: Types of ownership and allocation and actualization of land rights.
Chapter VII centers on the types and ways of land transfers, the relevance of land use for habitation and its relationship to population expansion. Changes or persistence in the value of land in its economic and symbolic dimension are seen in relationship to occupational changes and the strength of people's identification with a certain location.

Finally, part three of this study (Chapter VIII) summarizes the findings in terms of the central thesis of this study: that social relations, economy, land tenure and land use in Umatac form an interrelated set of beliefs and patterns of behavior which serve to reinforce each other and may be maintained despite external and internal changes and environmental limitations.

The Significance of the Study

This monograph represents the first ethnographic study of Umatac and of a community in Guam. As such it contributes empirical data on some relevant aspects of Chamorro life: social relations, economy, land tenure and land use within a time framework of change. Change occurring within the community is seen in relationship to the political, administrative, economic, demographic and social context of the island at large. This study fills a gap in Chamorro studies felt by those interested in comparing Guam to other Micronesian societies. The data on land can be compared to other studies in Oceania. As Lundsgaarde writes "empirical analysis of individual systems provides the only input for a general theoretical system" (1974:226).
NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. In this study I differentiate between Guamanian and Chamorro. I consider the first one to be a political term which applies to all Guam-born individuals. Chamorro is an ethnic term to designate first the indigenous inhabitants of the Mariana Islands and, secondly, a sector of the present-day Guamanian population. Some of the characteristics of the Chamorro people in this category are well summarized by Haverlandt:

"a. A method of child-rearing that socializes people to put social obligations before self, to expect capriciousness, and to mistrust verbal commitments.

b. Patterns of interaction which include (1) teasing as a social mechanism, (2) ways of drawing out other people without making a commitment oneself, and (3) a tendency to agree with another person for the sake of harmony and then privately act otherwise.

c. A tendency to use money to further one's immediate social status and to create and discharge the obligations of friendship and kinship.

d. The maintenance of subsistence patterns of informal reciprocal exchange networks in the midst of the development of a sophisticated 20th century capital-intensive economy.

e. A psychological focus upon the immediate detail rather than upon the indefinite future.

f. A high degree of patience and emotional restraint which may be abandoned in the company of family and friends.

g. Withholding real agreement or commitment until advice is sought from trusted others or until a group decision is made" (1975(VI):120).

Included in this set of characteristics of the Chamorro is the knowledge and use of the Chamorro language especially among the adults. For people in the post-war generations the language is often not a distinctive characteristic even though they might adhere to many of the other characteristics mentioned above. This will be true of the community of Umatac. Here most people older than thirty years are fluent in both English and Chamorro while the degree of fluency in Chamorro decreases with the people below thirty. However, I consider Umatac to be a Chamorro community. Other characteristics such as a sense of rootness or sense of belonging to the island which is exemplified in a close land-man
relationship is further discussed in this study. For further information on language use in Guam see Riley (1974).

2. When I speak of land ownership in this study I will use the emic term "family" to indicate a group of people whom I have been able to trace back (cognitively) to a pair of ancestors in traditional times. In this I have been aided by informants' genealogical knowledge and by documentary evidence. Most of the families I will be referring to in the description and analysis of land ownership can trace back their landholdings to a pair of ancestors in traditional times. Some of these families, as referred to in Chapter VI, have the same family name, e.g., the A, B, and C families. However, I have not found any consanguinal evidence among these three pairs of ancestors in traditional times. Therefore, I have treated each of these families as a separate unit, for both land ownership and analysis of marriage patterns.
The first recorded contact between Westerners and the indigenous inhabitants of the Marianas who are called Chamorros occurred in 1521 when Ferdinand Magellan landed on Guam. By the time of this first recorded contact the Chamorros had occupied the Mariana Islands for more than 3,000 years. The total land area of the 15 islands in the archipelago was 482 square miles. Guam was the largest and the most populated in the group with a land area of 209 square miles and a population estimated to be of about 30,000 (Underwood 1973:14). This gives a population density of about 143 persons per square mile. Magellan was followed by Miguel de Legazpi who in 1565, on his way to the Philippines, officially claimed all the islands for the Spanish crown. This claim was substantiated in 1668 when Spanish rule was established with the coming of soldiers and the opening of the first mission post by Jesuit missionaries. This early date for the introduction of Christianity is important for an understanding of the strong impact of Christianity in Guam in subsequent centuries.

The establishment of foreign rule led to armed conflicts between the indigenous population and the Spanish soldiers, lasting from 1671 to 1695. Removal of the Chamorros to Guam from Saipan and Tinian followed, for the purposes of facilitating Spanish control over a population reduced by wars and introduced diseases. As a result, the entire population of the Marianas, estimated to have been about 30,000 at the beginning of stabilized Spanish contact in 1668, was reduced to no more
than 5,000 by 1699 (Underwood 1973:14). Except for a few hundred refugees who hid out on Rota Island, the rest of the population resided on Guam (Underwood 1976:204).

Knowledge of ancient Chamorro society is scarce and based upon sketches of voyagers, missionary accounts, and archaeological surveys. What is known about land stresses the importance of certain environmental regularities in land use, and the association of land rights with the kin group and with class stratification. According to recent archaeological surveys (Reinman, n.d.; 1973) lands in both coastal and interior areas were inhabited (see Figure 3). From a geographical point of view, the criteria for habitation seem to have been proximity to the ocean, access to fresh water, and availability of well-watered and protected valleys. As a result, coastal settlements in the northern and central areas are located (1) near the beach where cliffs provided good rock-shelters, (2) in flat areas protected from the sea by large fallen rocks, and (3) in areas located above sea level but with easy access to the ocean and/or to a valley inland. Interior lands favored as places for habitation were on the banks of rivers or in areas well watered by springs and small streams. In both coastal and interior lands archaeological remains are more abundant near the sources of water or in the hills overlooking the valleys.

Historical sources indicate that coastal villages had from 5 to 150 huts while the ones in the interior had six to twenty huts. Of the 180 villages recorded by the Jesuit missionaries in 1668, the most important, Agaña and Tuuña, were located by the coast and near the sources of fresh water. Agaña was located at the mouth of the Agaña River and included the
Figure 3. Location of Ancient Chamorro Settlements in the Municipality of Umatac. (Source: Reinman, n.d.:41-47)
fertile lands of the Agaña Valley (Thompson 1947:49). Tuuña was located at the central part of the shoreline of Fouha Bay within the boundaries of the present-day municipality of Umatac (Figure 3). Probably the first missionary account in the Marianas (1596-1597) reports: "they [Chamorros] believe they were born on a rock—whence they all go each year for a fiesta . . . . They say that a woman gave birth to the land, and to the sea, and to all that is visible" (Driver 1977:21).

The location of the settlements reflects the practice of a diversified subsistence economy based on horticulture, fishing, and trade. The Chamorros grew rice, yams, and taro. In the jungles they gathered fruits, such as the federico nut (fadang). They fished by hand, with fishhooks made of pearl shell, fishbone, and tortoise shell, with hand nets, and in fishponds constructed of stone along the shore (Thompson 1945:31-33).

Thompson states that there was a considerable amount of trade carried on between the various islands of the Marianas and the Western Carolines and that the sailing canoe was used. This trade was discontinued after the Spanish conquest. This information was gathered orally and documented in the early nineteenth century. In support of the existence of that ancient trade is the fact that when trade between the Western Carolines and the Marianas was re-established in 1788, the group of Carolinians who travelled to Guam was guided by a star-route, knowledge of which they had preserved in songs (1945:41).

There is no information about the items used for exchange by the Chamorros in ancient Guam. The only records are those of nineteenth-century trade and refer mainly to imported items such as iron, pipes,
and cloth. However, in the nineteenth century the Carolinians traded shells, woven cloth, and wooden boxes for those items (Thompson 1945:41).

Further support of the existence of inter-island trade in ancient Guam is the existence of fast-sailing canoes, which were greatly admired by visitors to Guam as early as 1521. The speed of the canoes reached nine miles per hour in a mild wind and fifteen miles per hour if the wind was strong (McGrath 1976:42-43). Hence, the Chamorros had the type of fast canoes capable of carrying on trade which involved long distance voyages.

From the sparse information available on ancient Chamorro society it is not possible to ascertain the structure of kinship groups, their genealogical depth, marital residence rules, or household composition. Thompson claims that the ancient Chamorros followed the matrilineal principle in reckoning relations. If the principle of matrilineality was followed, we can assume from data gathered in other Micronesian societies, e.g., Truk (Goodenough 1951), Marshalls (Kiste 1968, 1974; Mason 1959) that matrilineages were the principal landowning groups.  

In ancient Guam a person's status was ascribed. By status is meant the total rights and obligations a person exercises in relationship to other people (Goodenough 1951:118). In ancient Guam the main criterion for status seems to have been seniority of descent within the matrilineage. There were terms for maga'lahe (first-born male) and maga'haga (first-born daughter) (Carano 1964:22). Birth determined a person's claims to land rights, division of labor, and choice of spouse. It is unknown if there existed any stratification of clans and matrilineages. However, three classes of people were distinguished: the matua, the atcha-
and the magatchan. The matua exercised residual rights\textsuperscript{2} to land and it is logical to say that the magas (first-born) belonged to this class. Members of the matua class lived in Agaña in 53 huts and were considered with respect to the other classes, the persons with the highest status on the island (Thompson 1945:12-13). Quipuha, a Chamorri\textsuperscript{3} who lived in Agaña in 1668 at the time of the arrival of the first missionaries, allotted a parcel of land in Agaña for the building of the Church (Driver 1977:15). This was the first recorded case when land rights were transferred to non-kin members and to non-Chamorros. The transfer gave the Catholic Church full title over land I assume was previously held in collective ownership by the kin group. We do not have direct evidence about the residence location of the matua and of the magatchang outside Agaña, but I assume that members of all three classes inhabited other areas of the island as well.

There are no data available concerning the types of land rights exercised by the atchaot and the mangatchang. From data on other Pacific societies, I do not know of any society where all of the people did not have some form of land rights. In consistency with other Pacific societies, all Chamorros regardless of social class must have exercised at least minimal provisional rights.

Presumably an individual acquired rights in his/her kinship group at birth, but the land itself was corporately held by matrilineages. However, as in other matrilineal societies of Micronesia, the senior males probably held the decisive power of exercising the day-to-day decisions of how use rights were exercised. However, in order to substantiate the existence of matrilineages as land-owning groups and the rights held by the heads of the matrilineages and by the other members
of the kinship group in ancient Guam, an ethnohistorical study is needed. This is beyond the scope of the present study.

Ancient Chamorros believed that the anitis (spirits of the ancestors) inhabited the mountains, the jungle, and paths. Acting as the intermediaries between the people and the anitis were the macanas who were in charge of asking for good crops. The town of Tuuña drew people from other villages to visit the rock located at Fouha Bay, close to the village Settlement (de la Corte 1875:23). People referred to this rock as the birthstone of mankind (Driver 1977). Today it is known as Lalas rock.

**Marriage**

Premarital consorting of the sexes was practiced in ancient Guam. One or two men's houses existed in every village. From historical records we know about the houses in Orote and Ritidian in the northern part of the island. Here, as recorded, young unmarried women lived with young unmarried men known as Urritaos. Usually the father of a young woman arranged with the Urritaos for the dedication of his daughter to the men's house (Murillo Velarde 1749:336, 339, 291). She would live there for a period of about one year. This service was reciprocated by the young men who offered their labor to the parents of the young woman. In Ritidian village, ten or twenty Urritaos lived with one woman in the men's house. This premarital consorting of the sexes was fully accepted in ancient Guam. Women who had lived with the Urritaos married after their stay in the men's house.

Marriage was celebrated with dances and great festivity. In the selection of a partner, a male matua, even if he was poor, selected
someone of his own class and never one of lower class than himself (Murillo Velarde 1749:291-292). A violation of the law led parents to kill their sons who had transgressed (Thompson 1945:13). But we do not know what type of restrictions, if any, regulated marriage among matua females, or both males and females of the atchaot and mangatchang classes.

From an eighteenth-century account (RAH. Retrato geográfico Histórico) we know that marital unions were monogamous and that multiple marriages were prohibited. It has not been specified if this refers to actual marriage or to rules for marriage. If it refers to rules, this ideology is inconsistent with that of other Oceanic societies.

Divorce was practiced and could be initiated by either men or women (Tornos 1789). In the event of divorce, the children remained with the mother (AHN, Ult., Fili., Leg. 5853, Memoria [pp. 33-45]). Adultery was rare (Tornos 1789), but there were rules concerning the proper action to be taken in case of its occurrence. A wife who had abandoned her husband and committed adultery was not accepted back by her former husband (Murillo Velarde 1749:374). Unfaithfulness on the part of the husband towards his wife was punished by her (Memoria [pp. 33-34]), but the manner in which this was carried out is not recorded.

From the brief sketch of ancient Chamorro society here presented, we can draw the following conclusions: land rights were associated with the kinship group, assumedly the matrilineage. Birth determined a person's claims to land rights, division of labor, and choice of spouse but the existence of any stratification of clans and matrilineages is unknown. In consistency with other Pacific societies, all Chamorros regardless of social class must have exercised at least provisional
rights. Finally, archaeological evidence shows that Chamorro settlements were located close to the ocean, in areas located above sea level but with easy access to the ocean and/or to a valley inland, and in well-protected valleys.
1. Matrilineages are known to be effective as landowning corporations. In Kiste's study of the Bikini community the matrilineages corporately owned the land. Within the matrilineage succession was through the senior male, the alab in bwij, who had authority over the use of the lineage's land and oversaw the distribution of its resources (1974:54).

2. The distinction between residual and provisional rights is based on Goodenough's concept of ownership. By ownership is meant "a total complex of reciprocal relationships with respect to the enjoyment and use of something as property" (1951:33). Goodenough further distinguishes between full and divided ownership. Full ownership confers upon a person or a corporation a full title. Title means "a constellation of rights, privileges, and duties devolving on one party as owner in such a complex of relationships" (Ibid.). Divided ownership divides a full title asymmetrically between two parties. It confers on the two owners (individuals or corporations) "two distinct titles respectively, each characterized by different rights and duties. One will be called a provisional title and the other a residual title" (Ibid.) with a distinct set of obligations emanating from each one.

3. The Chamorri were the highest ranking members of the matua class. The differentiation, presumably, was based on seniority of descent which confers a certain amount of rights and obligations to the Chamorri different from those in other classes.

4. Hereafter, this document will be cited by its author's name and the date it was written (Tornos 1789).

5. Hereafter, the term "Memoria" will be used to refer to this document.
CHAPTER III
THE SETTING

Guam is the largest among the fifteen islands of volcanic origin which comprise the Marianas archipelago in Micronesia. They lie at the northeastern extremity of the Micronesian culture area. They are the culmination of a vast submerged mountain chain extending south from Japan. Guam is located at latitude 13° 28' N. and longitude 144° 45' E. The island is 30 miles long and 209 square miles in area excluding reefs (condensed from Tracey in Kay 1968:5).

Guam's climate is warm and humid with two seasons: the dry season from January through May, and the wet season from July through November. The mean annual temperature at Sumay station (sea-level) as recorded over a 26-year period, was 80.9°F, the extreme maximum being 94.0°F, during the months of May and June. Humidity varies in a day from 66 to 85 percent during February and March, and from 75 to 89 percent in September and October (Randall 1974:369-370).

The annual rainfall averages 85-115 inches. The average rainfall during the five month dry season is 12 to 30 inches. Trade winds come from an easterly direction 90 percent of the time; the wind speed is normally in excess of 15 miles per hour with only a few calm periods. During the wet season, the winds may blow from any direction, and seldom exceed 15 miles per hour with frequent calms. December and June are transitional months (Souder 1974:4).

Guam is located in the typhoon belt and has constantly been exposed to the devastating effects of typhoons. Data from the years 1924-1953
(Randall 1974:372) show that July through November are the months with highest frequency of typhoons, tropical storms, and typhoon warnings. However, they can occur at any time of the year as the most recent one, Typhoon Pamela in May 1976, revealed. The constant fear of typhoons and the experience of its devastating effects are reasons, and powerful ones, for the desire to build cement houses. Typhoons are also an impediment to long-term agriculture.

Umatac, where the present study was conducted, lies on the south-westerly tip of Guam, occupying 1,576 hectares of mountainous and hilly terrain. It is bound by the district of Agat on the North, Merizo on the South, Talofofo on the East, and the Philippine Sea on the West (Figure 4). On the west, the coastline, approximately 6 miles long, is protected by a reef. This coastline forms embodiments at Cetti, Fouha, Umatac, and Toguan (Figure 4), and it is considered one of the most scenic routes on Guam. A North-South rural two-line roadway links Agat and Merizo (Figure 6).

Driving from Agat along route 2 (see Figure 6), one can see from the lookout at Memorial Park (see Figure 4) a view of the northeastern side of the village (see Figure 5) which presents a contrasting view to that obtained from Fort Soledad on the southern side. The park is a favorite spot for visitors to the area. From here, the observer can see the houses located in the valley formed by the surrounding hills and watered by the Umatac river (also known as Salupa), which establishes the boundaries between the Mandino and the Ginahit areas. From the lookout, the view is that of an intimate village located in a valley area where one assumes the proximity of the ocean without seeing it.
Figure 4. Municipality of Umatac as of 1976
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Figure 6. Municipality of Umatac: Roads and Rivers
(Source: Randall 1974:320)
From the lookout at Fort Soledad, on the south ridge (see Figure 4) the view is that of the entire Umatac Bay and of the western coastlines. From the fort, along the northern shoreline of the village, the observer can see several rows of houses (see Figure 5) crowded together in mini-sized land parcels, most of them privately owned. San Dionisio street divides the first two rows of houses and the small Niño Perdido street provides some space between the second and the third row of houses which rest against the hills. The Catholic church, a light-colored building surpassing in size and height the rest of the buildings in the second row, is a dominant feature of San Dionisio street. Areas of population concentration are located along: Umatac Bay, in the western inland areas (see Figure 4), the Toguan Bay area, between the Spanish bridge and the Memorial Park, and the Salogna area, about a mile away from the park, three miles from the boundary with Agat.

In the present study, when speaking of the people, I will refer to the community of Umatac, which embraces a population of 775 people divided into 123 households and located in different areas of the municipality. I will also maintain the geographic differentiation—as made by the residents—between the "village" and "outside the village." The term "village" refers to the oldest section of the area (see Figure 5) which includes the San Dionisio and Niño Perdido streets where 35.7 percent of the population of the entire municipality reside. Municipality in this study stands for the political division comprising the whole 4,000 acres and a population of 775 people.

My criterion for defining the population of 775 people as a community is based on Murdock's definition of community as "the maximum
group who normally reside together in face-to-face association" (1960:79).

And, to this definition, I add the qualification of those who have a sense of differentiated identity. I argue that, in the case of Umatac, one of the main facilitating aspects to forming community, despite the large population involved, is the present layout of the habitation sites, as well as commercial, religious, and service facilities, in and outside the village.

This feeling of community is seen as being derived from the old people's persisting attachment to their land holdings, which has allowed people to live where their ancestors lived. And, even though the largest amount of land is owned by the government, the absence of visible manifestations of external control (e.g., military installations, or urban development) are positive contributing factors to people's feelings of ownership in the entire municipality. Furthermore, the residents say "Umatac is a big family where everybody is related to everybody else and where everything about each other is known." Finally the residents and non-residents' view of the uniqueness of Umatac, acts as a reinforcing mechanism to the feeling of community and local identity. Defining Umatac as a community is important to the central thesis of this study as it is related to the land tenure, land use and to local endogamy. "Endogamous groups are important as a social universe in which all sorts of basic interaction go on; the study of endogamy is therefore the study of social communication in the broadest sense" (Adams and Kasakoff, 1976:149).

Symbolically speaking, the heart of Umatac is San Dionisio street. As a continuation of road 2 and the link with road 4 (see Figure 6),
the street is the obligatory thoroughfare for anyone passing through the village; and, because of the reduced size of the land parcels, the street acts as an extension of people's yards and homes.

The street is flanked by houses on both sides leaving enough space, barely, for two cars. Rarely is there a private empty lot, or enough space between two houses on the ocean side, to allow a view of the bay. The house entrance doors face the street, and people from their own porches, windows, or garage interact with strollers, drivers, and neighbors. In the morning, when delivery trucks stop in any of the four retail stores, or at the hamburger stand, the delivery man often converses with the store owner. On such occasions, as in many others, more than one driver has to stop and give way to the car coming from the opposite direction.

Often, drivers have to stop and wait for a child who, after school, walks in the middle of the street on an errand from the store to his house. Or a car has to give way to the numerous dogs who make the street an extension of their owners' small front yards.

A newcomer walking through San Dionisio street for the first time has the impression of entering a stranger's house where he is carefully watched. A new face is always immediately spotted. If he is not a visitor, chances are he is a resident returning, either from a trip to the U.S. mainland, or from military service. After some speculation, the news of the returnee's arrival will be conveyed by word of mouth to the households located both inside and outside the village. This flow of news is facilitated by the constant stream of people who, in the late afternoon and on their way home from work, outside Umatac, stop to greet parientes and friends along the way.
The location of four out of five small retail stores and of the only hamburger stand in Umatac's San Dionisio street (see Figure 5) makes the roadway the commercial center of Umatac. At the stores, one can find a variety of supplies, including canned goods, cleaning supplies, soda, beer, candles, cookies, candy, baby needs, homemade doughnuts and, at times, even fresh fish. People do their general shopping outside Umatac but go to the local stores to buy needed items between shopping days. They always have the assurance that they can get things on credit and pay back on their payday.

Three of these four stores have a pool table and all four have a jukebox. This attracts the children who, after school, stop to buy candy, pickled papaya, rakkiō (pickled onion) and play the jukebox. In the evenings, teenagers compete at the pool tables or sit around the store drinking, joking, and listening to music.

The hamburger stand competes with the other four establishments by offering music and pool facilities. However, due to its location across from the church, the owner has been unsuccessful in his attempts—including a visit to the Bishop—at obtaining a license to sell beer.\(^2\) This lessens the attraction of the place for the local boys. On the other hand, tourists and visitors, who enjoy driving around the island on a sunny holiday, like to stop there to eat. Several outdoor tables are laid out allowing visitors to sit and enjoy the view of the bay. Often, they are joined by the owner, Peling M. Quinata, who likes to talk with his customers and discuss island and village politics.

The presence of the Catholic church makes San Dionisio a busy area on Saturday evenings, Sunday mornings, and any other days of Catholic
religious observance. On such days, people from all over Umatac, including the farthest residential areas, e.g., Salogna and Toguan, drive or walk to church. Some families arrive early and, while the women and children enter the church, the men remain chatting on the porch until Mass begins. From the raised porch, they get a good view of the bay and of the entire street, and they greet and talk with the latecomers. After the Mass is over, the porch is filled with people who greet each other: kinsmen, compadres and comadres, young and old. After a few minutes of joyful interaction, the porch empties as people walk or drive back to their homes or to those of parientes who have not attended Mass, such as the sick or older kinsmen.

"F. Q. Sanchez Elementary School" is located on the left hand side towards the end of San Dionisio street. The school, named after a former educator and political leader of Umatac, serves the local population. The building is typhoon-proof and in the event of a typhoon serves as shelter for people in the community who live in non-typhoon proof houses.

Prior to 1930, part of the school front yard was occupied by the local cemetery, until the establishment of the present one around 1930 in the Ginahit area. Today, the fenced ruins of the old Catholic church and cemetery, located within the school compound, and destroyed by an earthquake in 1861, are kept as a historical landmark.

The school grounds are said to be inhabited by the taotaomo'na, a belief which, I assume, is connected with the previous use of the area as a cemetery. A Chamorro cemetery always inspires respect. During my stay in Umatac, I heard of two women—the school secretary and the
custodian—who, while performing their duties at the school, were attacked by the taotaomo'na. In the former case, the father of the victim went to the school grounds at midnight and asked pardon from the taotaomo'na for trespassing their territory; this is customary action to counteract the harmful effects of taotaomo'na upon the victim. 4

Across from the school, there is a community compound composed of the basketball court, the commissioner's office, and a park area along the shoreline of the bay. At one end of the park, the monument to Ferdinand Magellan commemorates his arrival on Guam. Although this is not historically documented, people in Guam believe that Magellan landed in Umatac. During Spanish times, the Fort Nuestra Señora del Carmen stood to the left of Magellan's monument, and, along with three other forts, guarded the Bay against intruders (see Figure 4).

The commissioner's office provides multi-services to local as well as visiting people. Due to the absence of house numbers or any identification signs, outsiders often stop by the office to get directions on how to locate certain households or villagers, or to get exact information about public works to be done in the area. Because the nearest Post Office is located in Merizo, and even then, few people lease boxes there or in Agaña, many receive their mail through the commissioner's office. Absence of home phones, or their poor service, also take people to the office. At times, the secretary sends out word about incoming messages for people in the area. The priest who resides in Merizo, but who takes care of both Merizo and Umatac parishes, frequently stops at the commissioner's office to convey messages about village-church related activities, such as the annual raffle held during
the San Dionisio fiesta in October. Also, at this office, people stop for a chat during the morning or afternoon hours: the school bus driver waits around, between his morning and noon shifts; government workers stop by after finishing their assigned duty in the village; and some residents come for business to the Bank of Guam mobile unit located here every Thursday morning. This gives everyone a chance to comment on the latest happenings or forthcoming events in the community: a fandanggo, the fiesta, the elections. Through all these means, lines of communication within the community are strengthened.

On Wednesday afternoons after school is over, the children gather under the commissioner's pavilion, and in the park, for Eskuelan Pale, a time set aside for imparting religious instruction to the elementary school children. On Tuesday evenings, teenagers gather at the same place for a study club which deals with religious topics. The P.T.A. (Parent Teacher Association) and also the Youth Organization hold their meetings at the commissioner's office. At other times, the pavilion houses the people for community-related activities, such as mass meetings occasionally called by the commissioner, the annual Christmas children's party, Mother's Day celebration, the naotaotaomano, held after the religious procession at fiesta time, and political rallies for island candidates. Occasionally, bridal showers, fandanggos, bingo sessions and auctions—organized to raise funds for the school or church—are held there.

Next to the school, a narrow and often muddy road leads to the Mandino area. Here, on a road lined by mango and banana trees, children spend their after-school hours. A ripe mango is seldom found because children like to pick green mangos and eat them with salt and red pepper
(donne'). Except for a small parcel of land, the Mandino area is privately owned. A couple of cement houses on the left side of the road contrast with the rest of the wooden and tin structures built (on non-distributed lands) on the right hand side of the road. Potted plants in the yards and numerous additional structures, appended to the houses, abound. Freshwater shrimp is found in a small creek traversing the road in an east-west direction. This is where the Mandino inhabitants catch shrimp to prepare a local delicacy known as uhang kelaguen. The dirt road ends with the last house but, through the jungle, and following the Umatac river, one can reach on foot the valley formed below the Memorial Park lookout (see Figure 4). According to a Mandino informant, the taotaomo'na road passes by Mandino and certain areas are looked upon with fear and respect.

The best Umatac houses are in the west Ginahit area, built on privately owned (distributed) land which are owned by the Quinata family. The cement and wrought iron fences in two of the houses, and the comparatively larger size of the house lots, are somewhat more intimidating to visitors in comparison to the rest of the village. Flowers and trees grow in well-kept yards. The dirt road, on which these houses are located, leads to and ends at the entrance of the local Protestant and Catholic cemeteries. On the well-fenced roof garden of one cement house, movies are occasionally shown for a small fee to school-age children from the entire community. Except for the days people go to clean or visit the cemetery, most of the people driving or walking through this area are residents or residents' parientes. The small retail store located at the entrance to the road, and similar to
those described in the village, derives most of its customers from the Ginahit area.

The Protestant cemetery is very small and has few stone markers indicating names and dates of the deceased. The tombstones face the mountains. Generally speaking, when people mention the cemetery (see Figure 4), they refer to the Catholic one. Here, the tombs face the ocean, lined in non-symmetrical rows which adapt more to the irregularities of the sloping terrain than to any preconceived plan. A small wood and tin structure, located in the middle of the cemetery, is utilized to celebrate a monthly evening Mass on every second Tuesday and on November second, "All Soul's Day" religious observance.

A flat area on the right bank of the Umatac river is, at present, government land and leased to the people of Umatac. This area is known as East Ginahit and is considered the newest inhabited area of the village. The land was formerly owned by the Santiago family and expropriated by the government in 1950 because of nonpayment of taxes.

With the exception of a modular home built in 1976, all the other wooden frame and tin houses are located on the left hand side of the road, parallel to the river. All houses face the road and most have outdoor kitchens. Potted plants establish some territorial boundaries in the otherwise flat terrain.

Leaving Ginahit for Merizo on road 4, we find three houses located on government land, across the Fort Soledad area and close to the proposed Umatac Subdivision (see Figure 4). They consist of frame structures with tin roofing and are surrounded by farm land. Further down the hill, before the boundary between Umatac and Merizo there are two houses erected
on privately owned land, at the low coastal area along scenic Toguan Bay. The families are *parientes* of the Quinatas from the West Ginahit area previously described and who refer to this Toguan area as the *lancho* (farm). Visits between Ginahit and the *lancho* are frequent.

Going back into the village, and crossing San Dionisio street in a northern direction, we reach the Castillo area. This area derives its name from the ruins of a Spanish fortification called "Castillo de Santo Angel" located on a rocky promontory overlooking Umatac Bay (see Figure 4). The houses, built on government and private (undivided) land, stand on both sides of an unpaved dead-end road. Those houses located on the ocean side are exposed to high sea floods during storms and/or typhoons. Castillo is a private and busy corner where children play outdoors while the adults, many of them kinsmen, talk on the road; the residents often keep their front doors open. When there is a party in the area, *parientes* from all corners of Umatac, as well as those from outside the community, invade Castillo. Except for one cement house, the rest of the houses are frame structures painted in blues, yellows, and greens. At Christmas time, the area explodes in brightly colored lights.

Driving from Castillo towards Agat, after the Spanish bridge, we encounter the so-called savanna. Here, there are several houses and farms developed the last few years on government leased land. Because population pressures developed within the families, people left the village area and moved permanently into this savanna area. There is yard space between the houses and the road, and the people take special care of their yards. Houses are frame structures surrounded by farming
land where pigs, ducks, chickens, fighting roosters, and carabaos are raised. Residents in this area are very much aware of the comings and goings of people, because this is the most often used route out of the village. If people are working outdoors and a car passes by, there will be an exchange of greetings: verbally, by a wave of the hand, or by a car horn honk. The passing of a car, at an unusual hour, will raise speculations about its direction, or the purpose of the trip. Often, the drivers will stop and exchange greetings with the ones working outdoors or relaxing in the front part of the house.

Beyond the savanna area, we encounter Salogna, whose households (approximately three miles from the boundary with Agat municipality) mark the end of Umatac's habitation area.

A recent study supports the existence of regional differences between the southern and the northern part of Guam. Within the South, Umatac appears as being uniquely distinct from the central and northern parts of the island. This distinctiveness ranges from the historical significance of the area—especially the Magellan landing site—to those aspects of society which, in the opinion of the people, characterized traditional Guam: hospitality, strong family ties, friendliness, slow pace of life, unity and cooperation from the community in all community events. Umatac's people are seen as having a stronger attachment to their traditions and customs than the rest of the people in Guam. They are also seen as a very tight community where everybody is related.

Outsiders look down upon the residents when life in Umatac is measured by the yardstick of modernization. From this viewpoint, Umatac ranks the lowest among the nineteen villages in Guam, when housing
conditions, infrastructure, job opportunities, number of people with college degrees, number of people holding political offices in Agaña, are considered. In addition, people often make derogatory remarks about the sing-song quality of the Chamorro speech mode used by Umatac's residents. While Umatac is praised because of its link with the past, it is also downgraded on account of its inability to keep pace with the present trend of modernization.

Umatac residents also see themselves as being different. They like the cohesiveness of their community, expressed in the saying: "Umatac is like a big family where everybody is related to everybody else." When referring to the people outside Umatac, they speak in terms of the "people from Agaña" or the "people from the North." They realize that the power rests with the "people from Agaña" and that one needs to have connections to get anything done outside or within the community, if that depends on forces beyond their control. In relation to the central government, located in Agaña, the residents see themselves as "forgotten citizens" and they blame the politicians in Agaña for the backwardness attributed to the area. They point out the many unfulfilled promises made to them every election year by candidates running for public office. Despite criticism generated in mass meetings, or in informal discussions, needed improvements to the community are a long time in coming. In the meantime, Umatac's residents, faithful to their traditional hospitality, continue to welcome any visitor, friend, or pariente, even if the visitor is a government official.

In the preceding pages, I have pointed out that both the settlement pattern in Umatac, and the insider-outsider's view of the place, can be
seen as positive contributing factors to the existence of Umatac as a community. The settlement pattern facilitates and promotes face-to-face interaction; the second factor strengthens the aspect of differentiated identity. The data presented show that, due to the existing limited facilities and opportunities in Umatac, residents have to commute for most of their activities, e.g., jobs, medical assistance, shopping, entertainment. This creates a constant flow of people in and out of the area, through the only existing road across the village. This is seen as enhancing communication between commuters and residents in the village, where 35.7 percent of the population of the entire municipality reside. Also, it has been shown that limited space between the homes located along Umatac Bay facilitates interaction between neighbors; for events which bring together a large group of people, villagers often have to rely on one another to use additional space for parking, preparing and serving food.

Concurrently, due to the fact that the few facilities available--retail stores, church, school, commissioner's office--are for the most part located in the village or next to the village, people residing in the most distant areas of the municipality (e.g., Salogna and Toguan) converge at the village for minor shopping, religious services, education and various communal as well as individual activities.

Furthermore, within specific residential areas, where often kinsmen reside in close proximity, a positive correlation has been found between residential proximity and frequency of interaction, for example in the Ginahit, Mandino, and Castillo areas.
Finally, the emphasis placed on the uniqueness of Umatac, by both residents and non-residents, is seen as a reinforcing mechanism of community, promoting a sense of felt identity among the residents.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Hereafter the term parientes will be used to refer to a person's cognates. For the spelling of Chamorro words, I have followed Topping (1975).

2. P.L. 25205 prohibits the granting of an on-sale license for premises located within a distance of five hundred feet from any church. Exception to the rule can be granted if the premises to be licensed are such that would not disturb the church services. But the exception is based on a written consent to the waiver of such prohibition by the presiding official of the church (in the case of Umatac by the Bishop of Guam). The law was enacted in 1952 and does not apply to licenses issued prior to 1952. So, in Umatac, in the same street other local stores had the license for the sale of alcoholic beverages.

3. After Typhoon Pamela, the office served as an emergency relief center. Here emergency items (canned food, blankets, first-aid kits) were stored and distributed to local residents. Also, information on grants-in-aid and other sources of help was given. And once more the people utilized the place to talk this time about the needs and ways to recover from the recent disaster.

4. For further discussion on the persistence of taotamo'na beliefs in Guam, see McMakin (1975).

5. The naotaotaomano consists of the serving of food to those who have come from different parts of Guam to attend the procession in Umatac. The cooked food is donated by different households in the community.

6. The Eleventh Guam Legislature passed Public Law 11-127, on March 30, 1972. The law provides for a seventy Lot Residential Subdivision to help ease the housing situation and to provide lots for landless residents. The implementation of the law falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works (Subdivision Study, n.d. [1975?]). I will be referring to the Subdivision in Chapter v.

7. Nolan (1975(VI)170) writes: "Contrary to expectations, northern Guamanians are more traditional in some respects than their southern counterparts. They feel threatened on all sides and are worried about losing control. On the other hand, southerners are not concerned that their children are losing their language, and they are not as affected as northerners are by the military, tourism, modernization, and loss of land. Guamanians who live in the southern half of the island appear to feel more secure and less uncertain than do the northerners."
CHAPTER IV
SOCIAL RELATIONS

The base line for this period is the second half of the nineteenth century. By this time, those traits of the ancient Chamorro culture that had survived the decrease in population (e.g., as a result of epidemics and wars) had become amalgamated with those alien traits resulting from steady foreign influence over 150 years. During this period, both the Spanish empire and Spanish Catholic Church ideologies permeated the social structure, economy, beliefs, and education in Chamorro society. The influence of Spain, Mexico, and the Philippines was evident in the amount of contact items, goods introduced and used by the Chamorros, such as musical instruments, household utensils, tools, garments, ornaments, and artifacts of metal. Also the impact on the language is shown in Spanish loan words used to refer to those names, items, and goods not represented in the Chamorro language.

Both indigenous and alien traits contributed to make a unique new Chamorro society. In referring to some of the elements observed in Guam in the nineteenth century, Spoehr says "this is the culture which the Chamorros today consider traditional and which they refer to when they speak of costumbren Chamorro" (1954:62). The synthesis of indigenous and alien traits and of indigenous and alien genes firmly established the Neo-Chamorro society and population by the second half of the nineteenth century (Underwood 1976:208).
After 1830, Spanish census data no longer differentiated between the native and the non-native population. By 1855, the entire population of Guam totalled about 9,000 (Underwood 1976:208).

The purpose of this chapter is to describe social relations in the Umatac community in both traditional and modern times. By social relations is meant principally all those associations which exist between and among people related by blood and/or by marriage. However, from all possible ways of initiating, activating or terminating social relations, the ones selected as the focus of study are mainly those linked to stages in the life cycle of an individual (birth, marriage and death). Secondly, those aspects of social relations whether consanguinal or affinal related to land tenure and land use are stressed. Thirdly, importance is given to the yearly celebration of the fiesta. Here, in addition to consanguinal and affinal relations, those exercised between people in non-related households within Umatac, or between those in Umatac with non-related households outside the community are included.

**Household**

In both traditional and modern Chamorro society the nuclear household consisting of husband, wife, and their resident unmarried offspring constitutes the basic residential and social unit. Furthermore, some other members, mostly parientes of the wife (a widow/widower or adult unmarried males or females) often stay in the household.

**Traditional**

The household, as a unit, sponsored or attended those customary gatherings connected with the life cycle of a member at baptism, marriage
or death. On those occasions, the household members activated their kinship ties through a system of reciprocal obligations to provide goods and services (de la Corte 1875:152-154). This is still applicable to modern Guam and in particular to present-day Umatac community.

In traditional Umatac, census data for the year 1897\(^2\) show that a population of 263 was divided into 45 households with a household density of 5.7. In Umatac the average number of household members has remained stable within the village (5.7 in 1897 and 5.7 in 1975-76). However, when those households at present outside the village are tabulated (6.6) or those in the entire municipality (6.3), there has been an increase in density from that of traditional times. In general the average number of persons per household in Umatac is higher than in the rest of Guam where it is 4.8. The results of a recent socio-cultural survey (Klimek 1975 (VI):125A) on household composition in Guam shows that out of the 199 households included in the survey (most of them with a male head) only 39 (20 percent) of the households included relatives (usually only one or two) other than those comprising the nuclear family. Data on household composition for modern Umatac and entered below in Table 1 show that the nuclear family is the dominant pattern in Umatac's household. Thirty people (9 males and 21 females) in the 20-32 age bracket are found to be residing with their parents. In Guam, the average marriage age for both males and females is between 20-24 according to the 1974 statistical report. The latter statistics show that it is customary for unmarried children to remain at their parental home or with relatives, especially married siblings, until their marriage. Although in some villages of Guam young men and women move out of their parents' home before marriage, this
Table 1
Composition of Umatac Households a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Household</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a For further data see Appendix B.

is considered the exception in Umatac. During my field work I heard of a young unmarried man who stayed in an apartment outside Umatac and this was looked upon as an exception. I did not hear of any case involving a female. In those cases when children are sent to the U.S. mainland for education (high school or college), they are sent to relatives' homes, who in turn exercise parental tutelage over them. Parents feel that the responsibility over their children lasts until their offspring establish themselves in marriage and form a new family. For the new couple, full maturity is achieved with the birth of their first child. Unmarried women without children usually stay with their parents and take care of them when they grow old. When their parents die, they either stay at the family house or move into the house of a married, preferably female, sibling.

In sixteen households we find parientes of the wife and/or of the husband. However, the predominance of parientes from the wife's side
indicates that females are more often expected to take care of their
elderly parents or ill relatives, than males do, an observation reported
by Klimek (1975 (VI):125) in other Guamanian villages. In Umatac, in
cases where husband's parientes were found, there were specific reasons
which would account for it. In two of these households, when the husband's
mother stayed with her son's family, the son had been the one who, upon
establishing virilocal residence, assumed the care of his widowed mother.
In one of these cases, the son was the youngest in the family and according
to custom he was the one to inherit the parental home. Two households
had an unmarried male residing with their married male sibling and his
family. One of them stayed with his male sibling until he married. The
explanation for this being that their father had died and, in such cases,
the oldest brother in a family assumes some of the father's responsibil-
ities.

An unmarried daughter with children often remains with her parents.
Her mother takes care of the children while she goes to work for an
income; in this manner, she is able to contribute with the maintenance
of her parents' household and that of her children. The children join
the other family members and are loved and taken care of by them. Often,
these children are of the same age as their mother's siblings. At times,
unmarried women with children, as well as those separated from their
husbands or divorced, establish a separate household. This is becoming
more feasible at present due to welfare. Under this program, the woman,
as head of the household, receives assistance in the form of food stamps,
housing allowance, child support. However, the young woman will still
maintain strong ties with her parents and siblings in the community.
Most households headed by widows or widowers have one or two married sons and/or daughters with their offspring as residents. The frequency of married sons (5 households) is higher than that of married daughters (2 households). At times, a young couple moves virilocally or uxorilocally for a limited period of time, for example, while the young couple is building their house. This might become a permanent situation, especially in the case of widowed parents.

Ten households (12.3 percent of the total number of households) are made up of two complete nuclear families. Here, the frequency of married sons (7 households) is higher than that of married daughters (3 households). Again, this is in support of virilocality as the second choice of residency. Data show that neolocal residence, which is stressed as the ideal residence pattern, is the one most frequently found in actual practice. The second most common pattern is virilocal residence.

The Fiesta

The activity that illustrates the enduring strength of ties between households is the fiesta. The fiesta is common to all the villages in Guam and goes back to the early contact period. In traditional as well as in modern Umatac the fiesta is the most important event of the yearly cycle of celebrations. It is held in honor of San Dionisio, the patron saint of Umatac during the second weekend of October. Preparations begin weeks in advance for both religious and secular events. It is attended by people (many of them parientes) from other parts of the island. People attend the fiesta for various reasons: To honor the saint as an act of thanksgiving and fulfill a promise made for a previous
favor received, e.g., the cure of a sick relative or to request assistance in case of need and to make the promise to return the following year; or to simply celebrate the event at the home of a pariente or friend. In any event the fiesta is an occasion to measure household ties with people from other villages.

**Traditional**

In traditional times people travelled on foot from the neighboring villages of Merizo, Inarajan, Talofofo and at times even from Agaña to attend the religious procession held on Saturday evening followed by the nataotaomano, and the sharing of food in the households of parientes. The fiesta continued on Sunday morning with attendance to Mass followed by food sharing in the different households. Then those from Umatac packed some food for their parientes and friends, e.g., fish to take on their trip back home.

**Modern**

Today, as in traditional times, the fiesta is an opportunity to measure household ties with people from neighboring and distant villages. However, of all the activities connected with this celebration, both religious and secular such as the mass, procession, nataotaomano, sport games and raffles, the most important one which is the sharing of food takes place at the household level. Friends and co-workers of the household from outside Umatac are well in advance personally invited to come to the house to eat. At times, two or three households prepare for and celebrate the fiesta together; usually young married couples join one of the parental households.
Preparing for the fiesta requires a lot of good planning. In contrast to other gatherings or celebrations held during the year (e.g., fandango), in which the responsibility is shared with related households, at fiesta time, each household has to rely mainly on its own power to generate money, food and ayuda (labor). Most of the preparation of food is done by the members of the household and by other parientes or friends from outside Umatac. But even within Umatac there is an exchange of goods and services on the days prior to the fiesta among different households in the area especially among those of parientes. Figure 7 illustrates the high number of transactions carried on at fiesta time by focusing on those between household A and other households in Umatac, while Figure 8 illustrates transactions between household A and households in other villages in Guam and in the island of Saipan.

Data on the flow of transactions (goods and services) were gathered from one household (A) and the type and number of transactions which occurred for approximately a two week period prior to the fiesta and on the day of the fiesta was recorded. The total number of households involved was 24 and the locations were as follows: 13 in Umatac, 10 in other villages in Guam and 1 in Saipan. Looking at the people among whom the transactions occurred we find that 23 transactions took place among parientes: of the husband (12), of the wife (10) and of both husband and wife (1). Seven transactions occurred among non parientes.

Looking at the transactions of the wife in household A, we see that the wife's mother was from Umatac but she had resided outside of Umatac since her marriage to a man from Agaña in central Guam. Therefore, some of the wife's maternal parientes still resided in Umatac and her initial
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transactions took place there. The wife's other transactions (see Figure 8) occurred among her siblings and among those parental and maternal parientes residing outside Umatac.

In the case of the husband in household A both his mother and father resided in Umatac. Transactions occurred between household A and his siblings, his mother and father's siblings and some of their descendants.

Some of the goods transacted between household A and other households include: cooked food (e.g., corn tortillas, barbecued fish, said); raw food (e.g., octopus, pig, bananas); drinks (tuba, soft drinks, beer, whiskey). A variety of services are also provided such as supplying things from the Navy exchange where prices are lower than at regular stores; helping in building the palapala, helping with the cooking from the day before the fiesta or on the same day, entertaining guests with music, etc. The number and social standing of the visitors contribute to the prestige of the household and this generates competition among the people in the community. Everybody knows that for every-day activities, the people in Umatac come first, but that in order to obtain jobs, to get things done through the government of Guam one needs to rely on proper connections outside Umatac. An invitation to the fiesta is a way to reciprocate for a previous favor or a means to reinforce a tie which could be useful in the future if the need arose.

Summarizing, the fiesta is a strong element of continuity between traditional and modern Umatac which reinforces interaction between households within Umatac, and between those in Umatac with households outside the community. Cognates of both husband and wife in each household
participate in the fiesta. Besides, the fiesta is a reinforcing element of local identity as expressed by the Umatac people themselves and by the visitors who, after enjoying the food in one or more households, comment positively on the overall community hospitality of Umatac people.

The Kindred

In the study of social relations in traditional and modern times it is important to note that the principal social category is what I should call the kindred, namely an ego-centered unit. It consists of all of an individual's parientes, on both sides, including his grandparents and their living descendants. Data obtained from birth records show that most baptismal records include the names of both sets of grandparents. However, when the deceased is an adult the names of his/her parents are entered but not those of his/her grandparents. In this case, it is specified that names of the latter are not remembered.

In some societies like the Ipan, kindreds number 100 to 200 persons (Freeman 1961:207). In traditional Guam, our estimate of 100 people is based on de la Corte's account. He says that about 30 families participated in the major events, e.g., marriage feasts (fandanggo) and baptisms, which brought the kindred together and from which specific action groups (effective kindred) were formed. Since the average number in each family was five, an estimate of 150 people attended the events (de la Corte 1875:152). If we subtract the affines who attended the gathering and who are not considered kindred, the kindred approximated 100 people who were cognatically related to the individual organizing the event.
According to Freeman, kindred relations in many bilateral societies are highly significant and a special morality, based on the importance given to the recognition of common descent, regulates the obligations. "It is usual for kindred to admit a special obligation toward one another; an obligation to give help and support in culturally determined ways" (1961:209). This special morality is restricted to cognates and is quite different from the morality of the wider society (Freeman 1961:210).

In traditional Guam, cognates within the range specified were obligated mainly to provide help and support at the time of baptism, marriage, and death. Obligations included preparing food to be taken as a contribution, participating in the event, and staying with the cognates the day after the event. Food contribution was in the form of pigs, cows, fowl, fruit, aquayente, and/or other drinks. At marriage, other items, such as mats, brooms, and tabos were also contributed but these items were much less important than the gifts of food. The contribution was called chenchule. Food given as chenchule was gathered the day before the event and taken to the sponsors of the gathering; that is, the parents of the newborn child, the parents of the bride and groom, or the closest kin members of the deceased as the occasion dictated. At death, money was given in addition to food to help with funeral expenses.

At baptism, food was shared by all relatives attending the event. At marriage, the bride's family and the groom's family held two separate parties the day before the wedding. On the following day, after the church ceremony, each group gathered again to eat. According to de la Corte, all food that had been contributed was expected to be eaten or else it was distributed among the participants. "If something is left over
this is distributed among the families of those who participated" (1875: 152-154; translation is mine).

In addition to the obligations stated above, a newly-wed couple was required right after the church ceremony to visit maternal and paternal relatives to show respect. Both bride and groom knelt down and nginge\(^6\) the hands of the older relatives.

Relatives were expected to care for the sick and to visit kin members in prison. They attended the religious nobenas\(^7\) held in the homes of close kin members. They also contributed their labor to re-thatching the roof of the houses, a yearly task which was done in a festive atmosphere (de la Corte 1875:152-154).

From what has been reported in the literature, and from the data gathered in Umatac about "long time ago" it is apparent that obligations to help and support in times of celebration, grief, and need were very important. Contributions were chiefly in the form of food and labor, and seldom in cash. Activities such as singing, praying, eating, drinking, weaving, visiting, gathering food, and cooking gave ample opportunities for frequent interaction among parientes.

Freeman says that today there are graded differences concerning the degree of the moral obligation functioning within the kindred (1961:210). I assume that in traditional Guam the differences in obligation to give help and support might have been correlated with the degree of cognatic relationship, but other factors such as residence, marital status, affinal and compadre ties, chronological age, may also have been considered. The basis for my assumption is data gathered in Umatac which will be entered in the discussion of the kindred in the following section.
In traditional Guam, for an adult, the obligation was initially operative from the date of marriage; for an unwed mother, I assume, this custom was enforced after the baptism of her child. Such obligations persisted throughout the remainder of an individual's lifetime. Even those who were poor recognized the obligation to give and to receive. At the events previously mentioned (marriage, baptism, death), each person was expected to contribute an object of fixed value. In time, those who had received were obliged to reciprocate with something similar in value to the object given (de la Corte 1875:152). This is an indication of the existence of specific rules governing reciprocity which are still operating among the people of Umatac.

Modern

In modern Guam, the kindred is still the most important social category. As a rule, the kindred includes all of a person's known cognates (parientes), but in practice only fairly close parientes are socially recognized. Parientes still come together during events connected with the life cycle of an individual--baptism, marriage, and death--or with the celebrations of religious nobenas in the home. Parientes are also called upon when help is needed to build a house, to support a political candidate at election time, or to find a job. An example of the continuity with traditional Guam is the existence of unwritten rules about the strength of the obligation to participate in kindred events and the amount of contribution a person must give in labor, food, or cash (chenchule'). Those parientes are what Yengoyan calls the effective kindred. In the present study I am mostly concerned with the process of how the effective kindred is formed. In analyzing kindred in Umatac, I
am mostly concerned with certain problems, regarding this effective kindred, raised by anthropologists studying bilateral societies (Blehr 1963; Goodenough 1962; Helm 1965; Yengoyan 1973) which are: (1) what is the underlying motivation which prompts an individual to activate kinship ties and how this is done, within the wide range of available kinsmen, with certain individuals?; (2) what is the yardstick for the gradation in strength of an individual's obligations within the kindred?; and (3) how do members of a household solve the problem of overlapping obligations accruing from the membership of each spouse to his/her own kindred?

Prior to this analysis, I am including some data concerning kindred range and categories of kindred obligations.

Kindred Range and Categories of Kindred Obligations

As previously defined, in Umatac, an individual's kindred includes all those people cognatically related to a set of paternal or maternal grandparents in the second ascending generation and their living descendants. Often, the largest number of parientes of an individual's kindred reside in the same village, either staying in households within the family land or in government leased land, usually clustered together. Some parientes are found residing on any of the nineteen villages in Guam and most households will claim parientes in the U.S. mainland, Hawaii, and as far away as Europe. Many of these people were born in Umatac but moved away before or after marriage. At times, an individual's grandparents' sibling(s) are known and used as a point of departure in tracing relationships. This usually occurs when both grandparents reside in Umatac. Yet,
in some cases, due to special circumstances, the relationship is activated even if one of the grandparents resides outside Umatac, as illustrated in the following case:

Case 18 -- Two brothers, Jose and Juan, were born in Agaña. Jose married a woman from Umatac. He moved and established residency there, while Juan married a woman from Merizo and moved to and established residency in Merizo. Jose had six offspring three of whom found spouses in Umatac, two offspring died at an early age, and one, Felisa, married a man from Agaña and established residency outside Umatac. Felisa's children used to come down to Umatac and stay with their mother's siblings; one of Felisa's children, Carmen, married a man from Umatac. Because Carmen's husband was in the military, both of them resided outside the community for many years. Occasionally, they came to Umatac to visit.

At one time, Carmen, her husband and children established residency in Umatac for about a three year period. During this time, both Carmen and her husband activated their kindred ties--Carmen on her mother's side, and her husband on both his mother's and father's sides. Carmen worked in Merizo and became friends with one of her female co-workers. One day both women discovered that their grandparents were Juan and Jose, and since that time, in addition to being friends, they acknowledged each other as parientes because their grandparents were brothers. Since that time, the previous ties based on friendship were reinforced by their kin relation and were actualized at fiestas, weddings, and christenings by mutual contributions in goods and services.

Kindred obligations in Umatac include, but not exclusively, the following:
1. Occasional visits to parientes' homes during the day, evenings, Sundays after Mass, or on special occasions.

2. Expressing respect by nginge' those parientes in the first ascending generation.

3. Providing support (financial, goods, services, advice) in time of need. This includes such things as helping to look for a job, helping fix or build a house, contributing money to bail a pariente out of prison.

4. Supporting political campaigns both in local or island-wide elections, either directly, if a pariente is running for office, or, indirectly, by supporting a candidate one's pariente has promised to support.

5. Visiting those parientes who are sick in the hospital.

6. Participating in planning, preparing, and carrying out events (listed in order of importance), connected with: death, marriage, christening, nobenas, fiestas, farewells, birthdays, job promotions. Also, within each of these categories, the importance of the event varies (e.g., the christening party of a first child, or of the first-born male is more elaborate than that of the rest). Degree of participation in events ranges from being present the day of the event and contributing some cash (called ika in case of death and chenchule' in all others) to active participation from the early preparatory stages and committing oneself to making various contributions in goods and services.
Some of these obligations are answers to everyday needs, whereas some occur sporadically. There are so many obligations, that for purely pragmatic reasons a process by which these obligations are carried out has to be established. As has been previously stated, the household is the basic residential unit in Umatac's society. It is this household, composed of the conjugal pair and their unmarried resident offspring that acts as a unit in fulfilling each spouse's obligations.

Unmarried offspring contribute to the fulfillment of their parents' kindred obligations by performing tasks assigned to them in accordance with their age and sex. When the parents have to contribute cooked food to a gupot (gathering) the daughters will help the mother prepare the food; the young males will gather wood, climb the coconut trees to obtain the nut and grate it. On other occasions, the offspring are sent to help prepare the place where the gathering is organized. There, the females help with the cooking and food preparation, and the males with the building of the palapala, as well as with different stages of cooking. They will be working under the leadership of whoever is in charge of the event. When the parents cannot be present at the gupot, fiesta or other events, the children are sent in their name to bring cooked food, and give the chenchule'. This is often the case when the parents have to participate in more than one event taking place the same day. On such occasions, the choice of which event they will attend is made according to priorities we will mention later in this chapter.

When married sons and/or daughters, with their spouses stay in the parents' household, the young couple is considered as a separate unit when fulfilling kindred obligations; the conjugal pair will have to make
its contribution as if they would have established an independent household. Concurrently, they might be asked to contribute or to help with their parents' obligations.

Often, a young married couple will rely on the help of both their parents: for example, by staying in either parents' home (preferably his) until they establish their own household, in organizing their first child's christening party, or in taking care of the children, especially if the young mother works outside the home. Concurrently, if the parents have a gupot (e.g., on account of the marriage of a younger son or daughter) the married couple is expected to participate and to help with food, money, and/or services. As the parents grow older, the relationship between parents and children shows an increase in respect and support. If the parents die at an early age, their sibling group assumes the responsibilities for organizing the mourning period and burial ceremonies. If the parents die at an advanced age, their children, as well as their spouses, assume the main responsibilities taking into account the deceased's siblings' desires; it is understood that the sibling group, due to their members' advanced age, cannot assume the social and economic responsibilities. However, they will play a very important role in presiding over the bela (24 hour wake) and the lisayo (rosary).

A very important means of social prestige is the acknowledged fulfillment of kindred obligations. Within the obligations listed, those listed under number six (see page 60) are the most important. We will look at the importance given to these obligations from two points of view. First, from that of the people involved, the relevance is based
on the fact that any of those events bring kindred members together to help and participate (for celebration or for mourning) which in turn, enhances reciprocity or gives opportunity to activate ties for the first time. Second, from an analytical viewpoint, the holding of these events demonstrates the dynamics in the formation of the effective kindred, in accordance with the criteria previously established, regarding gradation of kindred obligations.

Social Prestige and Practicality as Main Forces in Activating Kinship Ties

Gatherings and celebrations connected with an individual's life cycle provide the main opportunities by which a person can enhance his/her social prestige in the community. A successful gathering or gupot is measured by the number of people (parientes from and out-of Umatac) attending it; by the quantity, quality, and variety of food; by the type of ayuda (help) in both goods and services generated at different stages of the event; and by the amount of money given in chenchule' or ika.

People's attendance indicates that the host has been very active in kindred events and that his/her previous participation has been appreciated. On several occasions I heard people estimating the number of people who would attend a bela. They based their estimation on the fact that the deceased had been very active in fulfilling his/her kindred obligations within and outside the village. This estimation was corroborated the day of the bela when people from many villages came to pay their last respects. At times like this obligations are reciprocated. I also heard of an elderly woman who attended every kindred's bela. She used to say that she wanted many people to come to pay their respects at her own. In the case of a young person's death or of his/her marriage,
the attendance is based on the active participation his/her parents had, because up to this point he/she has been fulfilling the obligations as a member of his/her parents' household.

The amount of food to be prepared, in case of death, is based on an estimate of the deceased's social standing and that of his parientes: siblings, offspring, parents. In case of the deceased, the social standing estimate is based on knowledge regarding his/her active participation in the fulfillment of kindred obligations. The parientes' social standing is also considered, because many people will come to the event on account of obligations accrued by the immediate parientes themselves.

If the right amount of food has been prepared, this is an indication of good planning based on a correct appraisal of the deceased's social standing, both in and outside Umatac. Planning is very important because there should be enough food to feed everyone who is expected to attend, plus enough food left over to give to the ones who have helped in cooking, building the palapala, and others. If there is too much food left over, this is an indication that some people who were expected to reciprocate previous obligations were absent. If there is not enough food, due to attendance of unexpected visitors, this is acceptable; efforts will be made to prepare extra food and excuses will be made, regarding the large number of attendants, while it is served.

Having quantity, quality, and variety of food is, again, an indication of good planning, the ability of the host to please his/her guests, and an expression of the high regard Umatac's people have for hospitality. The amount of food is important not only in the instances cited, in
regards to death, but in any other event such as marriage, christening, and others. It is, besides, an indication that the host has good relations with a large number of parientes who have provided ayuda.

Chenchule' or ika are tangible forms of measuring one's social standing. The minimum chenchule' amount at the time of my fieldwork was $5.00. The contribution was based on depth of kindred obligation and nature of the event, according to the criteria previously established. This chenchule' is handed to a person(s) in whose honor the event is held, or to those responsible for the expenses incurred.

At baptism, the chenchule' is given to the child through the child's mother as an indication that she and her spouse are the ones who will be reciprocating in the future; while at the marriage party, it is given to the mother of the groom (groom's party) or to the mother of the bride (bride's party). In those cases where both parties are combined, the chenchule' will be given to the "side" you feel you are more obligated to, e.g., if Rosa attends a combined party for both the groom and bride, Rosa will give the chenchule' to the bride's mother, because she is Rosa's first cousin, even though Rosa is also somewhat related to the groom. In some cases, if the person is equally related to both bride and groom, the chenchule' will be given to both their mothers. In one case, where the bride's mother was dead, the bride's father received the chenchule'.

In case of death, the ika is given to the person(s) considered closest to the deceased, e.g., widow, or offspring, or sibling. It is usually deposited in a box located next to the coffin in the room where the bela is held. For both chenchule' and ika, the name of the donor
is written on the envelope containing the money. The money is counted
by the one receiving it or by his/her closest kin. A list is made with
the names of the donors and the amount of money received, and then
measured against the list of chenchule' or ika previously contributed by
the family. In this way a person(s) can measure if one is even with
his/her money obligations, or if one is in debt again.

Even though the chenchule' or ika is counted by a limited number of
persons, the amount will be made known to other parientes, and in time,
people in the community will know about it.

Besides the good relations which are an indication of social
prestige, the practical elements which facilitate the activating of kin­
ship ties are also important. Everyone is familiar with the amount of
labor and goods that go into the preparation of a gupot. Included in
ayuda is the sharing of facilities with other neighbors. Because the
housesites are small, especially those in the village, any gathering or
gupot requires more facilities than those a household located in the area
can provide. Thus, it is necessary to rely on the facilities of neighbor­
ing housesites (see Figure 9). Ordinarily, there is a need for two or
three housesites to accommodate the outdoor cooking facilities and the
area where food is prepared and served. The needs vary according to the
size and nature of the event.

While I was in Umatac I had the opportunity to participate in the
preparations for several fandanggos. The following data in Figure 9
illustrate this sharing of facilities with neighbors. Referring to
section A we see that for this specific fandango two parcels (a) and (b)
were utilized to carry on the different activities of food preparation and
Figure 9. Activity Areas Associated with (A) Fandango; (B) Death Event
the sharing of food. Lot (a) where activities 1, 2, and 5 occurred is
government land, one of the few in the village itself. Lot (b) where
activities 3, 4, and 6 took place is owned by the groom's parents. In
this case the adjacent government lot provides the necessary space to
carry out the fandanggo activities of the groom's party.

In the case of a death event, also additional space is needed.
In the event illustrated in section B of Figure 9, five land parcels
were utilized which indicates some of the activities connected with this
part of the life cycle of an individual. Again lots (a) and (b) were
utilized plus three other lots. Here it is important to note the kin
relationship which exists between the deceased and the owners of the land
parcels where the different activities connected with a specific death
event in Umatac took place. This is illustrated in Figure 10.

In the case of lot (b) the land is registered under the name of
both husband and wife. However, everybody in the community knows that
this land belongs to the wife who inherited it from her father through
her mother after her father's death. This land is distributed and both
husband and wife have legal title to the land. Lots (c) and (d) are
individually owned. In the case of lot (c) the land is still undivided but
the female entered in the genealogical chart is the one who has claims
to the land. Even though she does not reside in Umatac the land parcel is
utilized for the bela activities on account of the existing relationship.
Permission to use the land is granted by parientes of (c)'s owner now
residing in the community.

It is customary that during the bela, held in the house of the
deceased, that food is cooked and served in a separate house located
within a certain distance of the bela. So ideally, it is more convenient to live near relatives; when this is not the case, it is important to have very good relations with the neighbors because of the need to rely on their direct help. Ideally, when land is transferred within the family the proximity of kin members acts as a facilitating element in the fulfillment of kindred obligations. On the other hand, when this is not the case and one has to rely on the neighbors for the use of facilities this necessity forces people to maintain good relations with their neighbors; this in turn contributes to the sense of community in Umatac.
Criteria for Gradation within Kindred Obligations

The selective activation of kindred obligations, which entails including some individuals and excluding others, is guided by the following criteria:

1. **Genealogical distance**: Ego's parents, siblings, ego's parents' siblings, have priority over all other parientes.

2. **Residence in village**: The obligation towards those residing in Umatac is stronger than towards those residing outside Umatac.

3. **Mother's side**: Relatives on the mother's side are more important than those on the father's side. Some qualifications have to be made about this criterion. In Umatac people say that his/her maternal parientes are more important than his/her paternal ones. I have observed this to be true in many cases in Umatac and in other areas of Guam. However, there is one factor which can affect this general norm and that is the obligation to kin members with whom land is shared. In cases when land has not been divided and where a number of people have claims to the land, the parientes through whom the land is traced are more important than others. If there are conflicting obligations, the people involved will try to fulfill both sets of obligations, but the obligations with parientes with whom land or claims to land is shared are most important. This is a matter of practicality because while it is important to maintain good relations with your kin members, it is especially important that you maintain good relations with those with whom you share
or have claims to undivided land. So the matter of land will modify the application of criterion number three in the fulfillment of kindred obligations.

4. **Previous obligations:** An individual feels more obligated towards those *parientes* from whom he/she has received previous help, or from whom he/she is actually receiving it (e.g., staying in their land) than towards those with whom the relationship has not been previously activated.

5. **Affinal and compadre ties:** Marriage and *compadre* ties reinforce or activate a kindred relationship.

6. **Chronological age:** One should *nginge'* any *parientes* in the first ascending generation and older. But the *nginge'* is omitted if the one in the first ascending generation is of the same age chronologically, or younger. In these cases, the relationship is one of equality, rather than one of respect.

While children in a household are the reason for many of the parent's incurred obligations (e.g., christening party for a newborn, *nobenas* held for a sick child with its corresponding party), they are also active participants in the carrying out of these obligations. Through this process offspring learn to recognize *parientes*, who come to the village for a *gupot*, or the level of importance among these *parientes* based on the degree of felt obligations children perceive in their parents. At times, parents emphasize a special relationship, which exists between two adults (godparents) and a child, by asking him/her to go and visit or help his/her *nino* or *nina*. From early age children are socialized into the degree of selective importance given or not given to his/her *parientes*. 
Overlapping Obligations

The differences between kindred obligations for both spouses is emphasized at wedding parties. It is customary to hold two parties, one on the "groom's side," the evening before the wedding day; the other party on the "bride's side," is held the day of the wedding, sometime after the church ceremony. From this time on, the spouses have to deal with a double set of obligations which are far more burdensome for the wife. Ideally, the husband's obligations are more important than the wife's obligations. But, in actual practice, women activate their own kindred ties as much as their husbands. This means that the wife has to continuously balance her double set of obligations; this situation is burdensome when the woman works outside the home and her contribution in services (e.g., food preparation for a marriage party) is limited by her working schedule.

There are ways by which the conflict between different sets of obligations in the household is ameliorated, solved, or neutralized. As has been pointed out before, the children can be sent to help or represent the conjugal pair in cases of conflicting obligations. Also, both husband and wife can go separately to attend their respective obligations, especially if it is outside Umatac. While I was doing the fieldwork, two people died in the village at the same time and the lisayos (rosaries) were held, also, at the same time (8:00 p.m.). Husband A was related to household A and his wife B was related to household B. Each one went to attend the lisayo with their respective relatives. The bela was held on separate days and the couple, as a unit, attended each bela and gave the ika in the name of both. In cases where a person
cannot provide the services he/she is expected to provide, he/she can increase the chenchule' or ika as a compensatory measure.

The overlapping set of kindred obligations decreases when both spouses are related. In this case, there is a higher possibility of both fulfilling certain common obligations, although the depth of obligation may vary. Neolocal residence, which is considered the ideal type, neutralizes the ties of the conjugal pair with their respective families. Informants told me of cases when, if the wife stayed virilocally, she felt pulled toward the fulfillment of her husband's obligations at the expense of her own. When a woman marries a man from outside Umatac and he moves into the village, this leaves the wife more freedom from her husband's obligations, as these would not be as binding in other villages, as they are within her own. In this case, she can dedicate more time to activate the ties within her own kindred. In the latter case, the husband can choose to contribute to his wife's obligations and in this manner he would be accumulating social debts which would be activated in case of his need.

In this chapter's introduction, we selected three main areas of anthropological concern regarding kindred in bilateral societies: (1) motivation underlying selective activation of kindred ties; (2) criteria for gradation of kin obligations; and (3) conflict-solving mechanisms used in dealing with problems of overlapping membership.

In Umatac, the underlying motivations which prompt an individual to activate kinship ties with certain individuals, within the wide range of available kinsmen, are: (a) practicality in the fulfillment of both everyday needs and of those arising from circumstances and events connected with an individual's life cycle, and (b) accumulation of social
prestige resulting from reciprocal participation in kindred events. People's criteria for measuring the strength of an individual's obligations, include the following: genealogical distance, residency, matrilineality, standing social debt, affinity, compadrazgo, and chronological age. It has been stated that the matter of a person's claims to potential ownership of land or the actualization of land use rights will modify the application of the criteria of matrilineality in the fulfillment of kindred obligations. Finally, conflict-solving mechanisms are both situational and structural. The former includes: (a) the fulfillment of obligations in the household's name by either one of the spouses, or by their offspring, and (b) an increase in the chenchule' or ika as a compensatory measure. The structural mechanism includes choice of neolocal residence, endogamous marriage and marriage to male partners from outside Umatac, as positive contributing factors to conflict solving.

Marriage

The Composition of the Modern (Neo-Chamorro) Population

The evolution of the Neo-Chamorro population in traditional Guam resulted from unions between Chamorro and Filipinos. In 1830, according to the last Spanish census to specify population composition by ethnic groups, the two predominant groups were native Chamorro (40.86 percent) and Filipino (40.25 percent). (See Figure 11.) Underwood claims that "the rise of a mestizo group was more likely to have involved mixed marriages between Filipinos and natives than a massive infusion of European and Asian genes" (1976:208).

Figure 11. Relative Propositions of Ethnic Groups Mariana Islands, 1793-1830 (Spanish Censuses)
The Filipino population further increased after 1856, the year of an epidemic which reduced the total population of Guam from over 9,000 to less than 5,000. After 1856, about 1,000 Filipinos were brought in as convicts and laborers. Approximately 1,000 Carolinians came to Guam. Some of them were brought in, e.g., in 1869, 338 were brought in from Saipan to work in the cotton company in Tamuning. Others landed on Guam on account of shipwrecks (Driver 1977:21, 26) or voluntary migration for causes similar to those who moved to the other islands in the Marianas had, e.g., the destruction caused by typhoons in their home islands (Spoehr 1954:326).

Marriages by native Chamorros with Filipinos were more likely to occur than with Carolinians because of the shared relationship with the Catholic religion among Chamorros and Filipinos. Marriage licenses were more readily granted provided both bride and groom would comply with the laws of the Catholic Church. Also, as reported by Olive, the Carolinians were concentrated in Tamuning; in 1868, there were 450 Carolinians living in that area (cited in Underwood 1973:24). We infer from this that the Carolinians interacted more with members of their own ethnic group than with those from the Chamorro or Filipino groups. Although there might have been intermarriage between Chamorros and Carolinians or other ethnic groups, the dominant pattern seems to have paired the Chamorros with the Filipinos. Such intermarriage was the principal basis for the Neo-Chamorro population.

The government, in addition to granting the civil license for marriage, made it mandatory that prior to marriage, and before the marriage bans, the bride's and the groom's families notified the
governor of having a house available and allowed government officials to inspect the house. If no house was available, this was considered a marriage impediment and, I assume, the marital contract was delayed until it was completed (SCGR [Spanish Colonial Government Records] Micro. 94, document dated November 14, 1855). A nineteenth century document says:

Ramon Mendiola from Agaña is out of prison. He had no house where to reside with his wife and children. He is commanded to build his own house within four months and to fence the property which is to be his farming area. The Cabezas de Barangays [District Officers] should investigate and give an account if in their respective cabecerias find people who do not have a house and are residing with other couples. (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated November 14, 1855).

A proof that the regulation was implemented in Umatac is found in the 1897 census. In a total of 46 households, no two couples occupied the same household. So, presumably, for those who had married prior to 1897 a housesite had been provided by the groom or the bride's family at the time of marriage.

In traditional as well as in modern times marriage has been monogamous. In this predominantly Catholic population, the majority of Chamorros in Guam marry in the Catholic Church and are therefore subject to the regulations established by Canon Law. Furthermore, the religious ceremony is customary after the principals have obtained a civil license. The ceremony takes place in church (most likely in the parish where one or the two parties live) and is presided over by an ordained priest. As an example, marriage certificates from Umatac for the years 1850-1928 indicate that of 139 marriages, 135 were performed by a priest, 1 by a person other than a priest, and 3 not specified.
According to Canon Law No. 1076, marriage was invalid between people related in intergenerational direct line whether legitimate (within marriage) or illegitimate (out of marriage), and in such cases no dispensation of the law could be granted. Marriage between people collaterally related on either side (maternal or paternal) to the third ascending generation (e.g., third cousins where grandparents were first cousins) was declared invalid (Bouscaren 1958). However, in cases when people were related as first, second or third cousins, dispensation from the law was possible when a prior request was forwarded by the parish priest to the Bishop. We do not know how often such an exemption from the law was requested or granted. However, an examination of genealogical relationships between spouses in Umatac reveals that there were cases of marriages in the first, second and third degree of cousinship.

In addition, marriage was forbidden by Canon Law No. 1079 between people symbolically related through the ceremony of baptism (e.g., the baptized person and the one performing the ceremony, or the baptized individual and a godparent). No dispensation was provided in these cases which were classified as "spiritual relation." Although any lay person could perform a baptism under special circumstances (e.g., absence of a priest when the child is in danger of dying), I assume that baptism in traditional Guam was usually performed by a priest. Since 1918, Canon Law No. 1077 has forbidden marriage among people who are related as second cousins whether on the mother's or father's side (Bouscaren 1958). However, in cases of dispensation, the same procedure as previously outlined applies here.
As priests are not allowed to marry according to the long-established ruling of the Roman Catholic Church, the part of Canon Law No. 1079 forbidding marriage with one who performed a baptism was irrelevant in most cases in Guam. But the ruling concerning the godparents did regulate marriage between parientes because, generally speaking, godparents are selected from the kindreds of an individual's parents. All of these rules apply to Umatac as well as to other parts of Guam.

**Marriage Patterns**

The discussion of marriage patterns in Umatac in traditional and modern times will be divided into three main areas: (1) people's ideology of marriage preferences; (2) the geographical range of exogamy; and (3) importance and frequency of endogamy. Endogamy is defined by Keesing (1975:149) as "a requirement for marriage within a defined category or range or group or community ('in-marriage')."

1. **Ideology of Marriage Preference.** Most of the data included in this section specifically relates to modern Umatac. Yet, as a whole this ideology seems to have permeated people's behavior since traditional times. Among people in Umatac, opinions regarding the degree of kin allowed in marriage offer a wide range as to whom is included or excluded. A thirty-year-old female informant said, "My husband and myself are second cousins. If you are third cousins you are not too close, but the old people believe you are, and they say you should not marry your third cousin. They say the same about fourth cousins."

A second informant stated: "If two people who are related as third cousins want to marry, their parents will get together to discuss the matter. If the two young people do not have similar family names, the
parents will allow them to marry but, they will show certain amount of displeasure." (Note that Chamorro people keep their mother's family name and enter it as an initial before that of their father's family name, e.g., Luis A. Topasna.) In tracing a relationship between two individuals (ego and alter), both ego's and alter's father's and mother's side up to the second ascending generations will be considered. As a rule, you should not marry someone who has the same family name.

Even among young people, opinions concerning the range of allowed marriage vary. While some think it is acceptable to marry a second cousin, others think it is not. But all, young and old, agree that you should not marry a first cousin, even though they recognize this has happened in the past. Also, if both spouses are related through the mother, they are considered to be more "related" than those individuals related through the father, or through either father or mother.

In general, people's opinions regarding inclusion or exclusion of the range from which spouses are chosen seem to be influenced by interpretation of Catholic laws and by the perceived biological consequences of in-breeding. The prohibitions of Canon Law are mentioned as one important reason for not marrying first, second or third cousins. The latter rule (third cousins) is often referred to as being still held by the old people, even though changes from a third to a second cousin range have been introduced. Secondly, people believe in an existing correlation between in-breeding and mental retardation. Thirdly, some informants have referred to people's association of certain sudden deaths or long-term illness to the fact that the deceased or ill person was related to his/her spouse as first or second cousins.
People often make the differentiation between the ideal (the norms for marriage previously mentioned) and actual behavior. An informant said: "According to the custom we are not supposed to marry first, second, third cousins, but people go ahead and disregard the custom. For example, my husband's father and my father's father had the same last name, Sanchez. My husband referred to my father's father (FF) as uncle, and you are not supposed to marry a person you call uncle or aunt."

At the same time that people point out the discrepancy between ideal norms and actual behavior, they offer explanations. The first explanation is based on isolation. Informants consistently attribute endogamy in the old times to the isolation of Umatac and to the fact that opportunities for interaction with people from other villages were limited to the annual fiesta, and to those opportunities resulting from jobs (people coming to Umatac or Umatac people working outside). But even those types of jobs were limited to a few individuals prior to World War II. Umatac people often express the belief that an increase in communication and interaction between people from Umatac and those from other villages (e.g., by making recreational facilities available in Umatac) will decrease the frequency of local endogamy.

A second explanation frequently offered for the recurrence of endogamy is adults' inability to contradict the young people's plans in case of marriage. An informant said: "People say that you are not supposed to marry a pariente, but if the young people want to do it the parents do not have any alternative but to abide by their decision."

The inevitability that they will carry out the decision is emphasized; besides, parents want to avoid conflict. A 44 year-old female informant
said: "I think it is not good to marry your relative but if my daughter is in love with a first cousin and there is a second man who wants to marry her, but with whom she is not much in love, who do you think is best for her to marry? I think the most important factor is that she is in love."

Finally, people see local endogamy as the basis for the strong sense of local identity as indicated in both descriptions of the community and of the local fiesta. This is expressed in the following statement often heard: "People are constantly attending and organizing gupot(s) because all of us are related. We are like brothers and sisters, like a big family." "If you begin with one family you can include the entire village." Or as a young father said: "It seems that the young people like the way the village is and want to keep it that way so they look for partners among the people in the village."

From what has been said there is evidence of an existing discrepancy between norms and actual behavior. On the one hand, people say it is not good to marry relatives; on the other hand, they are affirming it is best to marry people from within the community, which is to say, for the most part, to marry parientes. Also, in cases when marriage beyond the accepted range occurs, there are explanations given which ameliorate the fact of there being exceptions to the rule. Furthermore, a variety of opinions exists concerning the range from which marriage is included or excluded. It is precisely the ambivalent character of the norms, the fact that not following them can be justified for the most part, which I see as a contributing factor to the frequent occurrence of endogamy. Or conversely, it can be argued that, because people have often married
parientes, the norms are ambivalent and explanations are sought for the behavior. It seems to me that what the people are saying is that the most preferred marriage is one to a Umatac resident (local endogamy) which in most cases will be a pariente. And that preferably the relationship should be beyond the second cousin range.

2. Geographical Range of Exogamy. For the consideration of exogamy I analyzed two sets of data: (1) place of residence entered in marriage certificates (1865-1955);¹⁰ and residence of male and female spouses included in vital statistics reports for the years 1970-73. From these sets of data two choices were considered for a total of 294 people: (1) spouse selected from Umatac and (2) spouse selected from elsewhere.

Data in Table 2 show that in both traditional and modern Umatac, the trend for spouse selection has been limited to Umatac residents, and that the trend has shown a decrease in modern times, mostly after World War II.

When we look at the number of spouses selected from the Southern villages (Merizo, Agat, Inarajan, and Talofofo; see Figure 12), we find a positive correlation between propinquity and number of spouses from those areas. But when we look at all the villages in Guam (see Table 3) factors other than propinquity have also contributed to spouse selection. For example, we note that the number of spouses from Agaña before the war was higher than those closer to Umatac such as Merizo and Agat. As Adams and Kasakoff have pointed out after their study of 21 societies (1977), propinquity cannot be judged as the sole reason for spouse selection. Other factors such as economic opportunities, population density, and social
Table 2
Marriage by Place of Residence of Bride and Groom: 1865-1955, a 1970-1973 b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Bride &amp; Groom from Umatac</th>
<th>Bride from Umatac &amp; Groom from Elsewhere</th>
<th>Groom from Umatac &amp; Bride from elsewhere</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-1884</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1904</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-1924</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-1944</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-1955</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1973</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Between 1865-1955, 8 marriage certificates did not designate residence. Residency data for the years 1955-1969 were not available.

No marriages are entered in records between December 1, 1941 and September 2, 1944. I assume this was due to the Japanese occupation of Guam.
Figure 12. Spouse Selection Outside Umatac
(Source for base map Tenorio et al., n.d., plate 1).
Table 3

Number and Percentage of Bride's and Groom's Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Bride</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Groom</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agat</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrigada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dededo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inarajan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangilao</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merizo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinajana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talofofo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 55 99.4 81 99.4 136 99.3

Source: Marriage certificates (years 1865-1955); for source of data for the years 1970-1973, see Table 2, footnote b.

For location of places, see Figure 12.
conditions of the people involved, among others, are to be taken into consideration. There is a need to study further this question of spouse selection both in Umatac and other villages in Guam. However, this is considered beyond the scope of this study.

3. Importance and Frequency of Endogamy. The examination of data on endogamous marriages points to the following conclusions:

(1) Local endogamy appears as the dominant pattern in spouse selection.

(2) In exogamous marriages propinquity is important but other elements such as economic opportunities and social status have to be considered.

(3) Those who marry a pariente, for the most part, establish their residence in Umatac (see Table 4). Census data during the fieldwork indicated that a higher number of females residing in Umatac were married to a pariente.

(4) The highest number of endogamous marriages is based on bilateral relationships between the spouses. Following in order of decreasing importance are those who both trace their relationship patrilineally, and those who both trace their relationship matrilineally (see Table 5).

(5) Endogamy for the most part occurs among the landowning families (see Table 6).

(6) The number of cases when females had received land is higher among those who had married a pariente than among those who had not. This applies also to those who are actualizing "use rights" to undivided land.
Table 4

Number and Percentage of Place of Residence of People in Five Families Who Have Married Parientes: 1850-1955\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Umatac</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Approximate dates.

\textsuperscript{b}At the time of the fieldwork (1975-76) 103 persons of those included in this table (46 males and 57 females) were residing in Umatac.
Table 5
Number and Percent of Endogamous Marriages by Sex and Type of Relationship in Five Families for the Years 1850-1955

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Related through Father</th>
<th>Related through Mother</th>
<th>Related through either F-M or M-F or both</th>
<th>Relationship Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Number of Marriages Examined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*approximate dates
Table 6

Number of Endogamous\textsuperscript{a} Marriages Among People in Five Selected Families
for the Years 1850-1955\textsuperscript{b}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Others\textsuperscript{c}</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total  | 7 | 10| 24| 36| 14| 13| 10| 35              | 9       | 158   |

\textsuperscript{a}Endogamous refers to marriage between parientes

\textsuperscript{b}Approximate dates

\textsuperscript{c}Includes 11 families
(7) Family endogamy is noticed among those with a considerable amount of land (C and D families) while it is not found in family (V) where the land has been on the decrease since 1950. In this family the rate of endogamy among the females is higher than among the males. And the number of males who have found spouses out of Umatac is comparatively higher. Finally, while marriage patterns have and are still changing, the ideology supports marriage to a pariente or to a Umatac resident as the best possible choice. Endogamy, in turn, is an important element which gives the community a strong sense of identity.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. For the purpose of this study, household is defined as the basic residential unit comprised of people who reside, eat and sleep in the same quarters.

2. Hereafter this document will be referred to as the 1897 census; L.C. Microfilm 3527, item 99, 1897, Vital Statistics of Various Towns of the Mariana Islands.

3. The palapala is a temporary structure made out of bamboo or wooden poles sustaining a roof made out of palm fronds, canvas material, tin or wood. Its purpose is to provide protection from the sun and the rain for people attending a gupot.

4. The aguayente was a distilled liquor made from fermented fruits (Topping 1975).

5. The tabos were kitchen utensils made out of a halved coconut shell with a wooden handle attached to it.

6. Nginge' means kissing the back of a person's right hand.

7. The nobenas are prayers said during nine consecutive days and addressed to God, the Virgin Mary or to a saint with the aim of obtaining some special favor, e.g., the cure of a sick child. Nobenas are practiced today and are often accompanied with songs in Chamorro. At the end of a nobena the people in the household with the help of other parientes prepare and serve food to those attending the nobena or to others who come on the last day of the nobena to attend the gupot.

8. All the cases cited in this study are examples which reflect the general norm unless the contrary is stated in the text. For the sake of preserving the anonymity of the person(s) mentioned in the case I have changed the names of the people mentioned. Any other information entered correspond to that provided by the informant(s).

9. There is a need to study the impact which nineteenth century Filipino migration to Guam had on the Chamorro society. The study should embrace both the social conditions of their place of origin and those of the host society. For a good review article on the topic of migration see Graves (1974).

10. For the years 1865-1901, I examined marriage certificates at the Chancery Office, Diocesis of Agaña. For the years 1901-1955, I examined marriage certificates at Vital Statistics, Public Health, Mangilao contained in the following volumes:
Vol. I  11-20, 1901 to 10-5, 1916
   II  10-12, 1916 to 6-8, 1922
   III 6-17, 1922 to 9-13, 1928
   IV  9-13, 1928 to 12-1, 1941
        9-2, 1944 to 6-30, 1946 (no marriage was entered during the Japanese occupation)
   V   6-30, 1946 to 8-13, 1955

Marriage certificates were written in Spanish up to May 1, 1905. From this date hereafter, all entries are in English.
CHAPTER V
THE ECONOMY

In traditional Guam the people's means of obtaining their livelihood were mostly based on subsistence activities, especially farming. This type of economy was often unbalanced on account of the frequent typhoons which afflicted the island, resulting in the destruction of crops, homes and other facilities, some of which were reported by Ibáñez between 1850 and 1898 (Driver 1977). According to de la Corte, between approximately 1855 and 1870 people cultivated the necessary food for subsistence and supplemented it with what they gathered in the open lands (1875:147-148). Presumably they might have acquired food items in their trade directly from the galleons stopping at the island, or indirectly through the resident Spanish officials. Data on the nature and amount of the barter are not presently available. A detailed study of the traditional economy from eighteenth and nineteenth century documents would be most useful.

Traditional Economy

From the data available, we know Umatac people also obtained their livelihood mostly from subsistence activities such as farming, animal husbandry, fishing, tuba\(^1\) making, hunting, weaving, and salt making. Most of these production activities were carried out by members of the household. At times, members of related households (e.g., three or more siblings) joined in production activities, such as farming and fishing, especially at planting and harvesting time.
Farming

Farming and transport relied mostly on man and animal power. Occupations for Umatac, as listed in Table 7, reinforce the importance attributed to land because of the obvious relation to subsistence farming. Farming in Guam (Umatac included) was a small enterprise which involved a diversification of crops, simple technology and the involvement of the members of the household. Farming was geared to fulfilling the basic subsistence needs of the individual household. Most people in Guam had a small farm (lancho)² outside the main habitation area in a village, and a small fruit and vegetable garden in town. In the lancho corn followed by rice were the most important crops. Fruit trees and vegetables were grown on the lancho and in the vegetable gardens in town.

Corn had been introduced from Mexico and rice had been cultivated in the Marianas prior to the arrival of the Europeans in the sixteenth century. For the cultivation of both crops simple technology was utilized. On the higher lands corn was planted at the beginning of the rainy season and in the lowlands (e.g., by the Talofofo river in southern Guam), it was planted at the beginning of the dry season. In those areas where the soil was deep enough the land was prepared by ploughing. The plow consisted of a piece of wood with an iron point with one handle. It was driven by an ox or most preferably by a carabao. When the soil was not deep enough to use the plow, the land was prepared by digging with the fusiño. The fusiño was thrust ahead of the laborer, and served to clear away bushes and cut weeds. On the higher land people cleared, dried and spread the weeds and bushes over the field and burned them. This process killed the weeds and acted as fertilizer for the land. After
Table 7

Occupations of Umatac Males for the Years 1865-1955<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1865-1884</th>
<th>1885-1904</th>
<th>1905-1924</th>
<th>1925-1944</th>
<th>1945-1955</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborer</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy &amp; Air Force&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Marriage certificates

<sup>a</sup>People who left Guam or bachelors are not included as well as those who entered residence other than Guam in their certificates.

<sup>b</sup>No differentiation is made between military employees and enlisted personnel.

<sup>c</sup>Included here are: Manager (1); sales worker (1); clerical (1); transport (3).

Note: Female occupations entered are: Farmers (28) and school teacher (1) for the years 1865-1899. Students (2) for the years 1945-1955.
harvesting the corn, people shelled it and spread it on mats in the streets to dry in the sun. Rice was the second important crop. Safford says that the process of rice cultivation was similar to that followed in the Philippines. The plow drawn by a carabao was used. However, the amount of rice cultivated in Guam did not fulfill the needs of all the inhabitants.

The most important fruit trees found on the island under cultivation were lemons, limes, sugar apple and soursop. The varieties most often found in the garden lots in town were bananas, oranges, sugar apple and mangoes. In addition, people planted a variety of vegetables (eggplant, peppers, beans, etc.) and tobacco for family consumption. It is interesting to note that even though tobacco, an introduced plant, thrived well on the island there were no tobacco plantations established (Safford 1905:123-150).

In Umatac, coconuts abounded and were utilized for many different purposes. The nut was used in food preparation and it was processed for oil; the palm was utilized for thatching the roofs, and some coconut trees were tapped to obtain tuba. The dried meat of the coconut (copra) was exchanged for clothing, sugar, coffee, canned sardines, and corned beef at the local store. The local store owner acted as intermediary for the main copra dealers who resided in Sumay or in Agaña and who exported copra to Japan and the U.S. From the sale of copra and pugua' (betel nut), people mainly obtained the necessary cash for payment of both personal and land tax.

Animal Husbandry

In traditional Guam animal husbandry was second to farming as a major subsistence activity. Safford describes the cattle as resembling the
Jerseys in size and color (1905:77). In Umatac good grazing areas existed from Fouha to Facti point where as local informants recall Francisco Isezaki, Francisco Q. Sanchez, Antonio S. Sanchez and Rovino G. Babota raised cattle. In Umatac, as in the rest of Guam, animals in domestic use were kept tethered, to keep them away from the unfenced garden patches or corn fields of the local population. Hogs were fed on coconut, vegetables and breadfruit and their meat was very much appreciated. Chickens and fighting roosters were kept in the lancho (Safford 1905:77).

Various Production Activities

Other subsistence activities such as fishing, tuba making, hunting, weaving and salt making were carried out by members of the household. People in Umatac fished in the ocean and in the rivers. Many coconut trees were tapped to obtain tuba and men hunted for binadu (deer) in the montes and fanihi (fruit bat). People recall nostalgically that fanihi abounded in Umatac, especially in the area known by the old people as Acalaye Fanihi. Both men and women, but especially men, wove baskets, mats, hats from coconut and pandanus leaves and these items were utilized for everyday needs by members of the household.

All those subsistence activities intensified in Umatac during the years of Japanese occupation. The people from Umatac were forced to move out of their homes in the village area which was occupied by Japanese military personnel. People moved into their family lands where some of the families had their lanchos, e.g., into the Salogna and Mandino areas. Informants say people combined working for the Japanese on the rice fields and for their own subsistence. In the evening when they finished working
for the Japanese, they cultivated their lands, fished in the streams and rivers located in the valleys, in the ocean, and raised animals. As informants emphasize, they were able to survive because of their land.

For transport in traditional Umatac, people relied mostly on animal power. The kareta (cart) drawn by bulls, cows or carabaos was the most common means of transporting produce and people from the farm to the village. They used boats for long distances or for transport of heavier loads during the rainy season where the roads, especially between Umatac and Agaña were impassable. Informants say that prior to the war there were about two cars in Umatac.

Modern Economy

Reasons for Shift

The island-wide rapid change previously explained reflected in the shift from a modified subsistence economy to a wage economy occurred after World War II, although at different speeds throughout the island. This rapid economic development was mostly due to the creation of many new jobs in both the military (navy and air force) and the private sectors, and to the amount of money which circulated in the island as a result of the presence of the American military personnel stationed in Guam. Concurrently, an overall decrease in agricultural products occurred which until the present time has not been replaced by any great intensification of a single crop in any given area. Today, out of a total land area of 54,331 hectares (209 square miles) the amount of land dedicated to agriculture as of 1975 amounts to 1,576 (1974 Census of Agriculture 1977:17). An estimated 90 percent of food consumed in Guam is imported
(Ford et al. 1976:41). In the case of Umatac, the impact of this island-wide economic development from a modified subsistence economy to a wage economy has been apparent. Yet the following factors are significant to an understanding of social and cultural change in the community. Despite island-wide economic change (1) Umatac, for the most part, has remained outside the mainstream of development, and (2) concurrent with wage activities, small-scale subsistence activities have remained an integral part of life in Umatac. Let us turn first to the consideration of the shift from modified subsistence economy to a wage economy.

Wage Activities

Today, most people in Umatac work for wages in jobs outside the area. Those available in town are limited to the elementary school (teaching, maintenance, administration, secretarial), commissioner's office (one person). In general (see Table 8), occupations are predominantly in the craftsman, clerical and service categories. As expected, more men than women are in the labor force, and are mainly people in the 25-64 age brackets. A breakdown of those occupations entered in Table 8 by the type of industry of employed persons indicates that 36.9 percent are in public administration, 13 percent in manufacturing, 11.5 percent in motor vehicles, 11.5 percent in education (elementary and high school levels) and 10 percent in transportation. Median income per family in 1970 was $6,885 and mean income $7,531; mean income per capita was $7,171. No mean income has been reported for 20 families with a female head, and I assume most of those were on welfare (1970 Census 1970:54, 42, 46, 50). It is interesting to notice that most people earn their living
Table 8

Number and Percentage of Occupations of Employed Persons in Umatac: 1970a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical and kindred workers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health workers, except practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, elementary and secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and administrators, except farm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried: Other industries besides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and retail trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and kindred workers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries, stenographers, and typists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other clerical workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile mechanics, including body repairmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics and repairmen, except auto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction craftsmen, except carpenters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other craftsmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives, except transport</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durable goods manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmanufacturing industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment operatives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transport equipment operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers, except farm</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction laborers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight, stock, and material handlers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other laborers, except farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm laborers and farm foremen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers, except private household</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1970 Census, pp. 54-56.

aSixteen years old and over
outside Umatac, and in this respect, Umatac is heavily dependent on the outside economy.

The decrease in agriculture has affected crop production, land use and technology. Rice and tobacco production have disappeared in Umatac and corn is cultivated in only two farms with a total yield of 103 pounds for 1975 (1974 Census of Agriculture 1977:24). Copra, the main export prior to World War II, has disappeared. No significant crop has been introduced. As a result of these changes land which according to informants was cultivated or used for grazing in traditional times, e.g., land in the Sella and Bay areas, Pajon and As Teban in inland areas, has been left idle. The descendants of the people who practiced agriculture and animal husbandry in those areas work at present for wages and engage in some small-scale subsistence activities in nearby areas to their present habitation site.

Concurrently, the use of animal power has decreased with the disappearance of rice and corn extensive cultivation, and the old method of the plow drawn by a carabao or ox has not been replaced by extensive mechanical power. As I have said previously, on certain occasions people rent a tractor to prepare the ground for planting, but this is not frequently done. I assume this is due to the small size of the parcels, to the diversification of crops which require different times for planting, and to the leisurely attitude most people in the community had towards farming.

Although Umatac remained geographically out of the military and commercial sectors, people benefited from the abundance of jobs. As local informants recall, many young men went to work in Agat as stevedores when
the commercial port opened in Apra Harbor in 1950. This movement for employment out of Umatac was accelerated by the opening of the road between Umatac and Agat. Concurrently, many Umatac men joined the military as an opportunity to acquire both training for skilled jobs, and new experiences in travelling beyond Guam. As a result of the new job market, and availability of new economic opportunities in Guam and beyond Guam, subsistence activities decreased in the entire island, and in Umatac, as in the rest of Guam, people became almost totally dependent on wages as their stable source of livelihood, a trend which has continued until the present time. People moved from farming as their main occupation into a variety of occupations (see Table 8).

Reasons for Umatac Outside Mainstream of Development

Despite people's reliance on wages, Umatac for the most part has remained outside of the mainstream of economic development, the main causes being: (1) limited infrastructure which is unsatisfactory for massive residential or economic development and (2) environmental limitations. There is no tourism to speak of. The beauty of the area is constantly praised and tour buses pass through the San Dionisio street, stopping at Fort Soledad's lookout where the tourists (mostly Japanese), capture the view of "Umatac by the Sea," with their cameras. Nevertheless, tourism does not bring money to Umatac.

External manifestations of economic development such as urban housing, hotels, condominiums, shopping complexes, amusement facilities, four-lane roads, do not exist in Umatac. Umatac, for all practical purposes has remained untouched. As a result, for the majority of residents, the source of money income lies outside Umatac. For jobs and most basic necessities
--shopping, medical attention, entertainment and schooling beyond the elementary grades--people have to depend on facilities outside Umatac.

**Limited Infrastructure.** A two-lane road constitutes the only access to Umatac and it cuts through the heart of the village. This road is characterized by numerous horizontal and vertical curves, and, on rainy days, certain zones are extremely slippery (Tenorio et al., n.d.:29; Randall 1974:135-136). The stretch of the road linking Agat and Umatac was built in the early 1950s. It has facilitated communication and has changed the traditional mode of travel used in traditional times. At that time people drove carabaos, karetas or travelled by foot and the village layout was suited for it. Today, traffic counts obtained by the Department of Public Works along Route 4 at Umatac village indicate the dramatic change in street use from that of traditional Umatac as shown in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Count Data, Route 2 Umatac-Agat for the Year 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average hourly traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak hour traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average peak hour traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(taken from a five hour count)

Source: Tenorio et al., n.d.:29.

However, none of the technological advances in transportation seem to have greatly affected agricultural development in the area. The car and
pickups have supplanted the kareta as a means of transporting people and produce but no vehicle (e.g., jeep) is available in Umatac for the rough or mountainous terrain. Those who venture into the higher areas do it on foot. There are no boats used for transport between Umatac and Agaña. The few boats owned by Umatac residents are used for fishing and occasionally are rented for transporting tourists or visitors from Umatac to Cetti Bay.

At present there is no sewage in the village to meet the needs of present inhabitants, not to mention those of any additional population. Also, the available water supply barely meets the needs of local residents. Contrary to what the Subdivision Study affirms (that the present water system is adequate to supply the village's domestic water requirements, but does not have sufficient reserves for fire storage; Tenorio et al.:30), the experience of people located in the Salogna area is that water does not reach the area.

As far as technological innovations in the existing infrastructure are concerned, there is one possible project which could affect agricultural development in Umatac and that is the proposed construction of dam-reservoir systems for the Umatac and La Sa Fouha rivers (Ford et al. 1976:41-42) which would maximize the agricultural potential of the private lands located on the banks of both rivers. Other than this proposed improvement in the water system, there have been no other proposed improvements in sewage or transportation.

Environmental Constraints. The second reason accounting for the lack of development in Umatac is related to environmental conditions. Of the total land area of the municipality of Umatac, which consists of 4,000
acres, only 83 acres or 15 percent is included in the 0-15 slope. Since land suitable for development has to fall within the 0-16 slope, Umatac, with 15 percent, has the least amount of land available for development in all of Guam (see Table 10).

Table 10
Slope Gradient in Umatac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>0---- 15%</th>
<th>16---- 35%</th>
<th>35% +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acres</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


An example of the difficulties encountered for large urban development is the present subdivision of Umatac (see Figure 13). For location selection 79. 53 acres were found in the 0-15 slope. Out of these only 35 acres were found to be readily available, the rest of the flat land being located beyond steep hills, ravines and inaccessible slopes. So, even within a land area which meets the proper slope requirements, only a small portion (less than 50 percent) is considered technically appropriate (Tenorio et al., n.d.:38-39 and Appendix 3, p. 3). As Figure 13 shows, only six other possible habitation areas were found in the entire municipality.

Subsistence Activities

Despite Umatac' dependence on wages as the main source of livelihood, small-scale subsistence activities continue to be an integral part of life
UMATAK SUBDIVISION AND
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL SITES

PHILIPPINE SEA
Figure 13 Umatac Subdivision and Potential Residential Sites
in Umatac. In fact, we can affirm that people in Umatac, regardless of their work involvement and dependence on wages, have continued to be engaged in subsistence activities. This is evident when we consider that most of the households (102 or 82.9 percent) carry out some type or types of subsistence activities which by order of decreasing numerical importance are: farming, animal husbandry, fishing, *tuba* making, hunting, weaving and salt making (see Table 11).

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsistence Activities by Type of Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes hunting, weaving, *tuba* and salt making.

Source: Writer's household census

1) Farming. The primary subsistence activity is farming. A breakdown of the 102 household by household composition shows that there is a positive correlation between farming and extended family (27 out of the 28 extended families do farming or 96.4 percent). Those households not engaged in farming are in the nuclear category. Within the nuclear
category the reasons found for the lack of farming are to be attributed to the poor health of some of its members (mostly male household heads) and to women's occupations. For example, in four households where there is no subsistence activity we find that the male head is seriously ill or that there is some other relative in need of special care. Also in some of the households the women work for wages outside Umatac.

Farming in Umatac is a small enterprise when judged by the amount of land and size of farms under cultivation, number of people and type of technology employed, and the type of crops and disposal of produce. The same judgment applies to other subsistence activities as well. Of the 1,555 hectares comprising the total land area of the municipality (6 square miles), only 50 hectares are dedicated to agricultural land which includes both cropland and pastureland. Of the 31 hectares designated as cropland, 27 of these are used for crops, and 2 hectares for pasture, and 2 for neither. Five hectares are designated for pastureland and 14 hectares are described as "other." (1974 Census of Agriculture 1977:18.)

Of the 50 farms within the municipality of Umatac, only 4 farms are from 3 to 4 hectares in size; 25 farms are 1 to 2 hectares, and 21 farms have under 1 hectare. Except for one farm which received at least 50 percent government support, the rest (49), were entirely financed by the operator of the farm. There were no paid workers which suggests that the work was done by the members of the household or related households; this is in agreement with information gathered from informants during the fieldwork. Of the 50 operators, only 4 were full-time farmers while the rest worked mainly for wages in non-agricultural (10) occupations; then, they dedicated a certain amount of time to farming (1974 Census of Agriculture 1977:19, 33, 35-37, 39).
Statistics from the 1974 census and information gathered on subsistence activities by households, show that short-term planting is more important than long-term planting; and that most of the produce is consumed locally. The fruit and nuts included in Table 12 require an average of 5-10 years to harvest, while most of the field crops and vegetables (see Table 13) require 24-110 days. Of these the vegetables most often found in farms are taro, tapioca and yams, and bananas, coconuts and mangos, among the fruit and nuts. In an island subject to typhoons the amount of time taken for harvest is very important. At typhoon time you hear people saying: "This is a banana typhoon" which means the wind power is strong enough to destroy the banana trees. However, strong typhoons destroy everything.

The information I gathered from the household census shows that 80 households engage in some variety of farming as listed in Table 11. The number of households (80) is higher than that of farms reported in the census (50). The difference might not totally correspond to an increase in farms; some of the households might have been cooperating with relatives in the same farm unit or perhaps the amount of farming was not considered important enough to be reported in the official census, but was reported in the household census.

Farming or gardening is done by the members of the household, but there are cases when two or three related households work together (e.g., two male siblings and their families). Men do the heavy work and women and children weed, clear the area and gather the crops. Work is done in a steady but leisurely way. The fusíno and machette (machete) are used for digging, cutting and clearing. In some cases and in order to prepare
Table 12

Fruit and Nuts Available in Umatac: 1975 and 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varieties</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Trees</th>
<th>Pounds harvested</th>
<th>Pounds sold</th>
<th>Days to harvest(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pugua'</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achoti</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocados</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadfruit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>23,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemons</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangerines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oranges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papayas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineapples</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star apples</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guavas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangos</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconuts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>11,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grapefruit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soursops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fruit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\) Planting Guam Calendar, 1975:1-11.

Abbreviations and symbols: (--) represents zero and (Z) less than half of the unit reported.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days to Harvest&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Varieties</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
<th>Pounds</th>
<th>Harvested</th>
<th>Sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taro</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>3,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>2,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweetpotatoes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cassava (tapioca)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gado &amp; other wrc&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 60</td>
<td>Radishes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 70</td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 86</td>
<td>Head cabbage</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 60</td>
<td>Chinese cabbage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 65</td>
<td>Green beans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>2,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 50</td>
<td>Green onions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 70</td>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 50</td>
<td>Cucumbers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>2,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 70</td>
<td>Eggplant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 70</td>
<td>Peppers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 110</td>
<td>Pumpkins &amp; squash</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 90</td>
<td>Watermelons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bittermelons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other crops</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(Z)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>a</sup>Figure on days to harvest from Planting Guam Calendar, 1975:1-11. *wrc=wild root crops

Abbreviations and symbols: (-) represents zero and (Z) less than half of the unit reported.
the field for planting they rent a tractor from the Department of Agriculture for $15.00 an hour. But this is done in a few cases where the land is big enough. When the lancho is far away from the housesites and especially during the planting season (March and April), the entire family goes to the lancho in the evenings and especially during the weekends. There, while the female head and her daughters prepare the food and take care of the small children, the male head(s) accompanied by his sons feeds the animais and works in the fields. The farm area has a temporary shelter where the cooking is done and the family members gather to eat, to relax and at times to spend the night. People come and go from the village to the lancho, many of them located in the savanna area, in cars or pickups and on the road they greet and talk to their neighbors. Occasionally adult males and youngsters ride the carabao. During the planting season in the lanchos located in the savanna area, there is much interaction between farmers, and passers-by. When the garden is located in the housesite people work in the evenings and on weekends. At times during the day women do some planting and weeding in the small vegetable garden located within the village area. There was an 84 year-old woman who resided in the village and who as part of her daily routine took care of her plants in the small front yard and found great pleasure in doing it. On one occasion, she proudly pointed out the flowering red pepper plant to me.

During the year 1975 the governor of Guam, Ricardo J. Bordallo, launched a "green revolution" for Guam. He encouraged people to get back to the land in order to work towards a self-sufficient island economy; to move from a "consumer to a producing society" (PDN, October 8, 1975). In
support of the program there were courses organized by the Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture (University of Guam) in the different villages. A team moved into the villages and made information accessible to the villagers through a slide presentation, oral information followed by discussion on farming and farming related problems. They distributed pamphlets on products, pesticides, calendar for planting and harvesting, etc. The meeting organized in Umatac and conducted in the vernacular (Chamorro) was well attended and was followed by lively discussion. However, I am not aware of specific results of these educational efforts, partly due to the destruction caused by Typhoon Pamela within a four month period.

A second measure to promote agriculture was the relocation of the Farmer's Market from Anigua to a more central location in the Paseo de Susana in the heart of Agaña. While the Paseo de Susana market is about the same distance from Umatac as the Anigua market, it is more easily accessible now because it is located on the main road while the former market was located in a back street. The new market was inaugurated in its new location on October 7, 1975. Finally, the people were encouraged to lease land for agricultural development.

In general, the produce is mainly for family consumption. As indicated in the 1974 Census of Agriculture, the produce of 49 of the 50 farms was consumed in the household (1977:37). As of 1976 I did not know of anyone in the community who took the produce to the Farmer's Market in Agaña. What produce was sold, was sold in the community. In general, people look at farming as a way to grow produce they like to have for the preparation of certain local dishes, e.g., taro leaves cooked
with coconut milk and donne' (hot pepper) and they take pride in contributing raw or cooked food to a gupot held by one of his/her parientes.

In Umatac several people who retired from employment with the government of Guam went into full-time farming (some on private lands and some on lands leased from the government). Two of them farming on private land (undivided) invested money to buy a tractor, to fix the road, to establish the water-line system for irrigation with the aim of going into full-scale commercial farming. They planted mostly taro, cucumber and bananas. However, Typhoon Pamela destroyed all the crops before the first harvest could be made. One of the two farmers moved to the U.S. mainland after the typhoon. After these results, it will be important to see if the increase in farming reported previously for the years 1970-1975 continues after the typhoon experience, and if the government continues to encourage agriculture.

The analysis of the data on farming by category of land (government or private) shows that land ownership is not a decisive factor in farming; accounting for this is the fact that most farming is included in the short-term category. In those cases when people farm on lands leased from the government on a year-to-year basis, the leases, as far as I know, are always renewed. Also, the people who live on very small parcels in the village cultivate garden vegetables while those with more land go into long-term crops (e.g., bananas, papayas and others). People who do not have enough land to farm in the village, farm the land they have claims to, e.g., undivided land outside the village or land leased from the government, as mentioned above. I will be returning to the different categories of land mentioned here in Chapter VI.
2) Animal Husbandry. Statistics for the year 1975 (see Table 14) on animal husbandry by order of decreasing importance included the following: chickens, roosters, pigs, carabaos, cattle horses and milk cows (1974 Census 1977:31-34). Again, as in the case of farming, this represents an increase from the previous census taken in 1970. The household census I conducted showed that 72 households raise domestic animals with chickens and pigs being predominant. Some of the chickens and roosters were sold but the rest as in the case of produce was consumed in the households. Pigs are almost indispensable at any large gupot (gathering).

According to the regulations established by the Department of Public Health, animals should be kept 50 feet from the households. Due to the crowded conditions in the village, very few households, if any, could comply with the regulations. At times pigs are taken to the households of parientes outside the village where there is more land, and then some agreement is reached about the raising of the pig. For example, the owner of the pig agrees to provide the food for his pig and, if possible, some extra food for the pigs of his pariente. Or, if two pigs are given to be raised, the owner agrees to give one to his pariente. At times, despite regulations, pigs and chickens are kept in a confined situation within the village.

Outside the village area both cropland and pastureland (about 7 hectares) are used for pasture or grazing. Often the few cattle are pastured in the non-cultivated areas of their owner's lancho. People say that in the old times there were some families who kept numerous cattle in the area between Cetti and Fouha Bay but this is no longer the case. As
### Table 14
Livestock and Poultry in Umatac: 1975 and 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carabaos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle and calves</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk cows</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cattle &amp; calves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogs and pigs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats and kids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses and colts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken hens, 4 months old and over</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial layers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other chicken hens</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens less than 4 months old</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickens 4 months old and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosters &amp; pullets</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other poultry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


No sale was reported for 1970 and 1975.
Table 14 indicates, pigs, hogs and chickens are more important than carabaos, cattle and milk-cows, but it is interesting to notice that the number of carabaos has increased between 1970 and 1975 despite the fact that they are no longer used to plow the fields. Today, as in traditional times, male farmers and youngsters are occasionally seen riding a carabao from the village to the lancho area. However, the carabao with the disappearance of the plow is no longer used in the fields for corn and rice cultivation as in traditional times.

3) Fishing. It is the third important subsistence activity which is carried out by 44 households. The most common forms are spear and net fishing; the latter includes the use of the throw net known as talaya. Most fishing activities are done by men who go out either during the day, or at night. Albert T. Topasna, the village commissioner, was considered one of the best fishermen in Umatac, and I was told he could get a catch of 200 pounds in one night. Children and women at times do some shelling in the shallow reef areas or catch shrimp in the creeks, especially in the Mandino area.

4) Various Activities. Finally, tuba is collected by the men in two households in the traditional manner. They collect the tuba twice a day in the early morning and in the evening. Fresh tuba sells for $4.00 a gallon and is moderately consumed at a gupot where most people drink beer, soft drinks and coffee. When tuba is left to be fermented it is used as vinegar for sauces and pickles. It is very much valued in the preparation of local dishes such as fina'denca, manahak (small fish preserved in salt and vinegar). Hunting for deer is carried out by the
men in three households. Deer meat is considered a delicacy and people make favorable comments when binadu meat is served at a gupot. Deer hunting is done at night; deer hunting is prohibited by law during the non-hunting season. A technique used to attract the deer is to burn the grass; people say the deer like to eat the ashes. Finally, the women in two households do some weaving for gifts and for sale. The male head of a household located by the beach makes salt by a process of slow evaporation of ocean water on an open fire; the salt is for family consumption. Again, all of these subsistence activities are small-scale operations and people rely primarily on wages for their livelihood.
NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. **Tuba** is the juice extracted from the bud of the coconut tree. It ferments very quickly and the Chamorros used it for cooking and for drinking. It is still used in some villages in present-day Guam.

2. The **lancho** included a land area for raising cattle and a wooden shed for the animals and also to provide temporary shelter to the person or persons working in the area.
CHAPTER VI

LAND TENURE: ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS,

LAND TITLES AND LAND RIGHTS

The system of land tenure in traditional Guam and therefore in Umatac was influenced by land ownership concepts introduced from Spain. As part of the Spanish empire, the Laws of the Indies promulgated for all the Spanish possessions applied also to Guam. Likewise the colonial experience of Spain in the New World indirectly influenced legislation designed particularly for Guam. However, despite the rigidity of government rule expressed in countless regulations addressed to the Chamorro population, non-compliance with the laws produced important modifications in the land tenure system designed by the government.

The Spanish government, by right of discovery, claimed full title to all land on Guam formerly owned by Chamorro social units. Some of these lands were communal lands which, according to the Spanish system of land tenure, fell into the following categories: ejido, dehesas, and montes. The ejido was land located at the entrance or exit of a village and cultivated in common by the inhabitants of that village (Vicens 1957:412). Ejidos existed in Spain as early as the fourteenth century (Enciclopedia 1958 (XIX) 444). There, the village authorities were responsible for the implementation of or exception to the laws regulating the rights to cultivate ejido lands. The dehesas were lands set aside for pasture, and the montes were the hilly and forested areas where people obtained timber, gathered fruits and edible plants, and hunted (Vicens 1957:412).
Spanish authorities introduced the *ejido* system to Guam, where the lands were also located at the entrance of the villages and were about one square league (approximately three square miles) in area. According to an 1828 document some Guam *ejidos* had been in existence for a long time. The *ejido* of Agat included the Orote peninsula, where twelve individuals managed copra plantations, and where all Agat residents had the right to obtain wood, gather fruits, and use the area for hunting (AHN, Leg. 5169, doc. 25). The *ejido* of Inarajan was established in 1855 (SCGR, Micro 94; document dated November 21, 1855). Permission from the *gobernadorcillo* in every village was needed to cultivate crops or pasture cattle in *ejido* land; only the residents from the village where the *ejido* was located were entitled to use it. In case of conflict between the use of the *ejido* and the claims to *ejido* land by some individuals the Laws of the Indies were followed. For example, in 1850 a permit to establish an *estancia* in the Orote peninsula within the *ejido* of Agat was granted by the Spanish Government to Silvestre Inocencio Palomo and Jose de Torres. The permit was revoked in 1856, despite strong protest raised by the two grantees, because the permit violated the communal character of the *ejido* (AHN, Leg. 5169, doc. 25). I do not know if the measure was temporary or if the permit was granted again in later years. All *montes* in Guam were considered public domain and people freely gathered fruits, edible medicinal plants, and hunted (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated September 22, 1855).

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the Spanish government conferred use rights on the Chamorros in several forms: (1) to kinship groups, (2) to non-kinship groups, and (3) to individuals. This
identification of land rights with individuals, and with non-kin groups, constitutes another basic change in Chamorro land tenure, inasmuch as under the ancient system the only kind of landowning units were the kin groups. Furthermore, the transference of rights followed a nonunilineal principle, contrary to prior practice as it has been previously explained.

The new concept of private ownership developed under close government supervision throughout the last quarter of the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth century. It had been proposed by government officials and encouraged by missionaries since the early contact period. But it was not fully implemented until the eighteenth century under governor Mariano Tobias and it was further expanded with the promulgation of the 1828 law as I will explain shortly.

As part of Governor Tobias' program of reform (1771-1774) to improve the declining economic conditions in the Marianas, he distributed land to every family conditional on the obligation to cultivate it (Carano 1964:106-107). This move seemed to answer the criticism voiced in the eighteenth century against the Spanish colonial system in the New World. Those critics attributed native disinterest in the New World's agricultural development to the encomienda system where natives worked on the lands of foreigners. The solution suggested by critics to motivate natives to cultivate the land was land re-distribution. In Guam, where the Spanish governor exercised tight political and economic control, this increase in land ownership by the native population must have been seen as a threat to centralization of government authority, and I assume this must have been the reason for the land re-distribution process being so carefully controlled.
The Law of 1828 provided for re-distribution of the land of the Royal Haciendas to landless married Chamorro men and their spouses. The Royal Haciendas consisted of three large tracts of land set aside by the Spanish government and used mainly for government farms and cattle ranches (de la Corte 1875:34; Thompson 1947:102). In 1828 the Haciendas were located in the southern part of the island, in Umatac, Dandan, and Agat (AHN, Ult., Fil., Leg. 5853, Año de 1829, p. 26). The Law of 1828 assigned use rights to a man and wife with the obligation to cultivate the land. The grantee was entitled to transfer those rights to his/her children, but to no one outside the nuclear family. The government held the residual right to revoke the grant in case of non-compliance (AHN, Ult., Fil., Leg. 5853, Reglamento . . . de 1828). In practice, however, by 1891 much of the land distributed as a result of the 1828 law had been transferred to naturalized foreigners, thus indicating the inefficiency of the government in implementing the law provisions, or people's ability to evade laws and regulations regarding land allocation and land use as indicated in the following document:

In accordance with the Reglamento of Ricafort [law of 1828] lands are granted for the benefit of the natives of these Islands [Marianas] under the following condition: that they [natives] be forbidden to alienate the land so that their children will be able to inherit from their parents those benefits and rights [of land ownership]. This has been the manner and the conditions in which most of the land has been given to private individuals. Nevertheless today [October 1891] much of this land has been sold disregarding the conditions which were originally given, and at the present time it is held unlawfully by people outside the family to whom the land was given. Today, land is held by appropriators who had neither title, right or permission to hold the lands. Some lands are in the hands of the appropriators. Some lands have been sold by the appropriators to private individuals in an unjust and scandalous manner. The ones who sold the lands and the ones who obtained them, undoubtedly were acquainted with the laws of
adjustment and sales. Nevertheless they let the years go by with no attempts to legalize their land title, the only aim being that of placing themselves in an increasing favourable position by having on their side the 10, 20 or 30 years of occupancy, the thirty years term being the one best preferred. Or they might wait for the opportunity to sell the land—which the seller as well as the public considers to be his/hers—to someone, preferably a naturalized foreigner. The seller's claim is based on the length of occupancy, even in those cases where the seller has not been cultivating or taking care of the land. These transactions will cost the government considerable losses and be of no benefit whatsoever. And as a result of this situation the land is being transferred to foreign hands for a small amount of which the government receives no percentage. In this way, the law of demarcation promulgated for the natives, is working for the benefit of foreigners with the result that the foreigners obtain in one day land whose ownership claims are based on 30 years of occupancy. It also works to the advantage of those natives who even though were not entitled to those lands, are able to acquire in one day for a small price that land which ordinarily is given to others by reason of having held the land in ownership for 30 years. (SCGR, Micro. 96, document dated October 28, 1891; translation is mine)

There is enough information available to show that between 1850 and 1899 people requested permission from the government to utilize a given land parcel for subsistence activities: farming, grazing, tuba making, as well as for selection of the river and ocean shoreline to establish their corral de pesca and for habitation, and that those requests were processed by government officials. After a request was made, government officials assessed the land parcel in terms of its size, location, and current use of adjacent lands. Both men and women were granted leases although more men solicited them than women. In general, those individuals who showed readiness to cultivate the land had priority in cases when more than one person had requested the same land parcel. Also, requests for cultivable land were considered by officials more important than those for pastureland for raising cattle. The terms of the lease emphasized the obligation to limit land use for that for which it had been granted,
e.g., pasture, cultivation, habitation. Rights to produce, rivers, and ocean shorelines as well as the land were included.

The Spanish Government stressed the formation of compact towns which facilitated centralization and government control. Generally speaking, the lands leased to individuals to build their homes were located parallel to the road and preferably next to an already established household. The standard housesite size requested and granted was 12 varas by 12 varas (120 feet by 120 feet), and it was mandatory for the house to be built in the middle of the parcel. It was mandatory to fence the habitation area. A second house could be built on a parcel leased by another individual, provided that permission be obtained from the first lesee (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated November 2, 1855). I assume that in the case of Umatac, this might have contributed to constructing more than one house within a given land parcel, and the fencing regulation to have more accurate boundaries in the village otherwise deprived of natural boundaries (in contrast to other lands outside the village). In Umatac, the exact location of some housesites was recorded at least by 1876.

It is interesting to notice that in Umatac, the location of many of the private landholdings outside the village coincide with those areas attributed by archaeologists as habitation sites of the ancient Chamorros, such as Sella, Cetti, Fouha, Toguan and Machadgan areas as it will be illustrated in another section of this chapter. To pursue this latter point is beyond the scope of the present study. The reason for entering it here is that it stresses the fact about the selection of lands outside the village being not an arbitrary one or one dictated by the policies or conveniences of the colonial power. My position is that the selection
resulted from choices the Chamorros made themselves, and in its spatial dimension it is a statement of people's knowledge of their own physical environment. In their selection, they had been operating in a cultural framework which, even though it was influenced by colonial dominance, it was presumably operating already in ancient Guam.

Whether the granting of land rights was the direct result of the 1828 law or of subsequent regulations is not clear, and whether the lands leased were other than those distributed under the 1828 law is also not clear. However, it is certain that in the second half of the nineteenth century (1850-1889), people in Guam exercised a variety of land, produce, river, and ocean shoreline rights, as the following list drawn from Spanish government documents illustrates.

1. Right to a land parcel for cultivation with the right to plant and gather its produce. If the parcel was abandoned by the lessee before the termination of the lease he had the right to harvest the crop he had planted in that year, but not to subsequent gathering of fruits from the trees planted. (SCGR, Micro 94, documents dated: July 22, Oct. 1, Nov. 17, 1885; Dec. 26, 1857; Jan. 15, June 7, Dec. 10, 1858; Oct. 8, 1862.

2. Right to an estancia (large tract of land) for raising cattle. The lease carried the obligation to fence the area and to keep the cattle within the fence. If the cattle went outside the fence and damaged another cultivated parcel, the lessee was obliged to pay for the damages. (SCGR, Micro. 94; documents dated Sept. 22, 1855; Aug. 2, 1858).

3. Right to establish a lancho of pigs and cows. (SCGR, Micro. 94, documents dated June 7, March 22, Sept. 29, 1858; March 18, 1859; Aug. 22, 1860).

4. Right to plant in a vacant parcel of land adjacent to an individual's residence. This applied to Agaña according to a law passed in 1857. Implied in the right to plant was the obligation to fence the area, to keep it clean, and to clean the area of the street in front of the vacant parcel. (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated Nov. 6, 1857).
5. Right to build a house on a land parcel at least 12 by 12 varas (approximately 120 by 120 feet). According to the provisions of the lease, the house was to be located in the middle of the parcel.

6. Right to a parcel of land of at least 12 by 12 varas for building a house and additional structures such as an outdoor kitchen and buildings needed to keep domestic animals. Obligations of the lease included the fencing and cleaning of the area and of the street in front of the house. If there was an empty parcel between the house of the lessee and neighbour each was responsible for keeping half of the empty land clean. (SCGR, Micro. 94, documents dated Nov. 17, 22, Dec. 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 27, 28, 29, 1855; Dec. 4, 1858).

7. Right to cultivate land for an indefinite period of time unless the land was needed by the government. In that case the lessee lost his right to use of the land and also to any improvement on the land.

8. Right to tap coconut trees to obtain tuba (sap extracted from the inflorescence). The permit allowed access to an average of 14 to 25 trees. (SCGR, Micro. 94, documents dated Dec. 24, 30, 1855; Sept. 15, 1857; Jan. 9, 15, 30, May 22, 1858).

9. Right to lease coconut trees for obtaining tuba. The permit to tap trees was separate from this.

10. Right to establish a corral de pesca (fishing trap) in designated area of the river and/or of the offshore waters. (SCGR, Micro. 94, documents dated Aug. 16, Sept. 7, 1858; Aug. 2, 1860.

11. Right to build a house in an area already leased to another person. The permit obtained from the government was conditioned to the establishment of an agreement with the original lessee. Then, a co-signing of the lease was required. (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated Nov. 2, 1855).

12. Right to cultivate a given area within the communal coconut grove in Agaña. This right was limited to the person in charge of guarding the area as partial payment for his services. He was granted the right to coconut leaves upon payment of a small fee (2 reales). Otherwise, this right was restricted to those who utilized the leaves for public works. (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated Sept. 15, 1857).
13. Right to cultivate certain land located near the port of Umatac unless needed to provide for population expansion of the village. If the permit was revoked the lessee had no right to be compensated for the trees he had planted or for any other improvement he had made on the land. (SCGR, Micro. 94, document dated Nov. 27, 1855).

Official recording of titles to land existed prior to 1855. Between 1855 and 1858, the government required the presentation of such titles as proof when the rights to certain parcels of land were questioned or in the case of land transfers (SCGR, Micro. 94, documents dated Sept. 15, 1855; Sept. 25, Oct. 5, 1858).

The Spanish government did not conduct systematic land surveys. It made isolated surveys in which land locations were recorded with reference to adjacent holdings or natural boundaries (Souder 1971:198), such as trees, rivers, and rocks.

A royal decree promulgated in Manila in 1894 provided for the transfer of certain lands in Guam, located both outside and inside the ejido, from the government to private individuals. These lands were designated as terrenos realengos enagenables (unappropriated alienable lands). This category consisted of lands requested by private individuals from the government and granted under permits approximately between 1855 and 1894. The lands fell under the following categories:

1. lands under cultivation for six consecutive years;
2. lands leased for twelve consecutive years;
3. lands leased for the three consecutive years previous to 1894;
4. uncultivated land held in lease for thirty or more consecutive years.
In order to obtain the title to the land it was mandatory to present proof of land classification in any of the above categories.

A second provision of the 1894 law stated that after the expiration of the one-year term for negotiation, all the unclaimed terrenos realengos enagenables would revert back to the government, or to the corresponding village in the case of ejido land. In the event that the government decided to put up those unclaimed terrenos realengos enagenables within the next five years, the people who had such land would have the right to its acquisition. A third provision stated that the government could transfer land at no cost to colonizing agencies, but the type of agencies were not specified (SCGR, Micro. 24, document dated September 24, 1894).7

Four years after the law was promulgated in 1894 the American government took over the island of Guam as a result of the Spanish-American War. This political change prevented the Spanish government from implementing some of the provisions of the 1894 Law. I assume that if all provisions had been carried out, more people would have acquired land, and those who had land under cultivation in 1894 would have had a clear title to the land. In the case of Umatac it is documented that Umatac people held lands in the village prior to 1894, in fact, later claims presented in the early American governing period were based on possession and cultivation dating from that time.

A second effect of the shift in power in 1898 is the transfer of land from the Spanish to the U.S. Government under the provisions of the Treaty of Paris in 1899. I was told by a Land Management Official that some of those lands were unsurveyed and therefore the boundaries at the time of transfer were uncertain. In his opinion it is feasible that some
of the lands considered now government property were cultivated by people who at the time the transfer took place were in possession of the land but had not acquired title to it. People in Umatac believe land in the past was easy to acquire, that there was no land pressure and people were not concerned with titles unless the government demanded them, as I assume was the case of the 1894 Law. Also, the study of the location of landholdings in Umatac as it will be presented in Figure 17 shows that some government lands are surrounded by private landholdings which could be an indication that those holdings might have been held under some provisional permit by landowners of the neighboring lands. After having considered the Spanish colonial influences on the traditional land tenure system, let us now turn to those in operation in modern Guam.

**Modern Guam**

The focus on this section is on land control, laws and regulations and the economic value of land. At present the greatest control on land is exercised by the U.S. and Government of Guam who together own 55 percent of the total land area, while the private sector owns only 45 percent (see Table 15).

Some of the lands controlled by the Federal Government (see Figure 15) have historical and environmental significance. The U.S. Air Force owns much of northern Guam, an area with good beaches, great scenic beauty, and valuable remains of old Chamorro settlements. Especially significant is the old settlement located in Finegayan, the area which is partly occupied by the Naval Radio station. In southern Guam, the U.S. Navy controls a large amount of land which, from an environmental viewpoint,
is better suited for the disposal of solid wastes than the land presently utilized in the northern area (Marsh and Winter 1975 (V):20). The Fena Reservoir, a natural lake fed mainly by rainfall (Ford et al., 1976:17), which is the only one of its kind in Guam, is also Navy territory. Navy areas in central Guam are located near some of the fast-expanding areas of commercial and residential importance.

Table 15
Land Ownership in Guam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acres</td>
<td>acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%*</td>
<td>%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,221.1</td>
<td>24,549.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of total land area on Guam


Most of the Federal land was acquired from private owners during the final period of Naval Administration (1946-1950), by purchase, condemnation, and cession (Ford 1976:17). Today, the restrictive use of these lands by the military make them closed areas to the majority of the Guamanians, even though some of these areas were habitation sites of the ancient Chamorros.

As indicated in Table 15, an estimated 22 percent of the total land area of Guam is in the hands of the Government of Guam. Most of this land was transferred from the Naval Administration to the Government of
Guam in 1950 after the signing of the Organic Act, and included some of the Spanish Crown lands acquired by the U.S. in 1898. In addition, the Naval Administration had over the years acquired lands from private owners through purchase, by cession, and especially by tax forfeiture (Land Management Office, Binder No. 43).

Much of the land now owned by the Government of Guam has never been surveyed or registered. The Government uses the land for roads, schools, and granting of leases, for houses and for agricultural uses. Recent legislation created the Land Transfer Board which is responsible for decisions concerning the disposition of government land. The responsibilities of this Board include the establishment of requirements for the lease and purchase of government land, determination of priorities for the recipients of such land, and prohibition of its resale (Marsh and Winter 1975 (V):33).

Leases are handled through the Land Management Office. Leases granted on a yearly basis for construction of houses prohibit permanent cement structures. This provision is considered by the people totally impractical on an island where they have experienced two devastating typhoons in the last fourteen years—Karen in 1962 and Pamela, the most recent one in May 1976. Land Management is also responsible for granting agricultural leases for short-term planting, while the Department of Agriculture administers the leases for long-term farming. The difference between the two classifications lies in the yearly fee paid by the people and in the terms provided by the lease.

It is important to mention the laws passed by the Government of Guam which directly or indirectly affect land use. As I will point out when
dealing with land tenure in Umatac, the laws set the parameters within which private owners have to operate.

The Subdivision Law was enacted in 1952 and was later amended by P.L. 6-134 in 1962. This law controls and regulates the subdivisions of any land for any purpose whatsoever. It "states how the land can be legally developed, divided and sold" (Marsh and Winter 1975 (V):32).

The first zoning law in modern Guam (P.L. 1-88) was also passed in 1952. The bill allows for the classification of land according to various uses: rural (agricultural), residential, industrial, commercial, and parking. It is based on the premise that the public welfare is served by segregating land uses which are not compatible with each other. It is the primary regulator of land-use activities in Guam (Ibid.; for further information on zoning see also Ford et al., 1976:32-38).

The initial Master Plan for the entire island was drawn up in 1966 for the purpose of establishing land-use zones in each community and defining goals for Guam as a whole. In practice, the impact of the plan on the regulation of growth has been very limited. A revision of the plan in 1972 was later abandoned (Marsh and Winter 1975 (V):33). At the present time, the Bureau of Planning created in 1975 is responsible for the general planning of the island economy including land use.

Other laws indirectly affecting land use deal with preservation of historic sites, regulation of water resources, air quality control, and water quality standards. Chapter IV (Conservation), Title XLV, of the Government of Guam code authorizes the Director of Land Management, with the approval of the Governor, "to set aside government-owned land for forest preservation" (Marsh and White 1975 (V):33).
Since the lifting of military security restrictions on Guam by the Federal Government in 1963, the island has experienced an economic boom. Among the many factors contributing to this development, the following are the most important: federal money in the form of relief funds after Typhoon Karen; the significance of the military bases during escalation of the war in Vietnam; the growth of the tourist industry, and the increasing amount of foreign investment in the island, especially by Japanese and Taiwanese investors. As a result of the economic boom, land prices have increased and land today has an inflated real estate value. However the value of land as I have stated in Chapter I varies with its location (on land valuation see Ford et al., 1976:23-26 and Souder 1971:203-204).

The increasing demand for land and the rise in its value have influenced many people to have their land registered. Concurrently, the devastating effects of Typhoons Karen and Pamela have emphasized the need to build more durable, concrete homes. A land title is needed to obtain the building permit for a concrete home as well as to obtain bank loans to finance the construction. Property deeds dated prior to World War II are not considered sufficient proof of ownership, and a certificate of title obtained through court action is mandatory.

Under the present system the following steps are required for the acquisition of the title of ownership:

1. survey of the land by licensed surveyors;
2. registration of land with the Land Management Office;
3. settlement of land issues in court;
4. certificate of title approved by the court (this certificate negates further litigation by other claimants).
The present system is costly and complicated for the average citizen. Many parties to claims have migrated to the U.S. mainland and it is necessary for those registering the land in Guam to contact all of them for approval. Additionally, the cost of surveying and registering undistributed land often averages $3,000 for a rather small parcel of land, and this has to be paid by the claimants. Therefore, there is a need to settle matters within the family before the claims are taken to court, and this is often the cause of family conflicts. Concurrently, people are reluctant to take the litigation to court for fear of the negative consequences this might bring to family relationships; the maintenance of harmonious relations among kin members is very important and direct confrontation is avoided for the most part. It is important to note that in Umatac a good part of privately owned land is still undivided.

According to the Guam Code, when a person dies without a will the land is divided in the following manner:

1. If the deceased leaves a spouse and one child, half of the property goes to the wife and half to the child. If there is more than one child, a third of the property goes to the wife and the rest is equally divided among the children or among the lawful heirs of any deceased child (The Probate Code, Article I-221).

2. If the deceased leaves neither spouse nor children, the land goes to his/her parents in equal shares. If both parents are dead, the land goes in equal shares to his/her brothers and sisters and to the descendants of any deceased brother and sister (Ibid., Article I-225).
In Guam it is quite common for land never to have been officially distributed and to be still in the second or third ascending generation, under the name of a deceased person who died without a will. This situation and the current legal provisions contributed to the increasingly growing number of people who claim legal rights to certain lands; this is the case in Umatac. Under the circumstances, if the lands were to be divided among all the claimants, the result would be mini-sized lots which would not comply with Government of Guam zoning laws. In those cases, the claimants have to decide upon the person(s) who will be named as title holders.

These problems of land ownership and land use are not unique to Guam but exist in many Pacific communities which have experienced the imposition of a foreign system on their indigenous systems of land tenure (Crocombe 1969:1).

**The Economic Value of Land**

With the political, economic and administrative changes Guam experienced in the post-World War II era and in an intensified manner since 1962, the monetary value of land has been on the increase. In the shift from a subsistence, agricultural economy to a wage economy there has been a decrease in land value for agricultural activities. The rise of land value resulting from land speculation, on the other hand, is a product of U.S. military expansion (Souder 1971:203). Since the lifting of security restrictions in Guam, Japanese, Chinese and U.S. investors (Haverlandt 1975 (VI):117) have acquired a considerable amount of land in the southeast (Inarajan, Talofofo), central and northern parts of the
island. Prices have been on the increase until approximately 1974 (Ford et al., 1976:23) when the Guam economy began to experience some setbacks. Land that in Dededo sold in January 1967 at $2,000 per acre was bought in December of the same year at $8,000 per acre. In the Tumon Bay area (Guam's resource center) land sold at $2.00 per square meter in January 1967 was valued at $8.00 per square meter in September of that same year (Souder 1971:203-204).

Land values vary according to lot size, zoning classification, and especially location. Lands in the Central area (Agaña, Sinajana and Tumon) and those in the northern area (Dededo) are comparatively higher than those in the southern area. As figures for 1974 show in the entire island, land values in Umatac are second to the lowest (Ford et al., 1976:24-25). So while land has increased in value in the post-World War II years, land in Umatac when compared to other parts of Guam is remarkably lower. This is related to the fact that most development has occurred in the northern and central parts of the island. I will be returning to this point when I explain the correlation between lack of development in Umatac and the existing environmental limitations in the area.

Environmental Conditions

The environmental conditions in Umatac are such that they exert some restraint and place limits within which the Umatac land tenure system and land use had operated. As a result the environment makes certain choices more likely than others. It is important to notice that since traditional times most privately owned lands are located in the lowland areas (coastal and valley areas). Favorable conditions such as
the terrain's low gradient, presence of water, soil conditions, and accessibility by land or sea, are seen as important to successful subsistence activities (farming, fishing, gathering, salt making). These conditions are found in the areas where privately held landholdings existed in traditional and even in ancient Guam.

The Southern mountains, where the municipality of Umatac is located, are made up principally of basaltic lava flows, basalts, limestone, breccia, sandstone and shale beds. The volcanic and limestone rocks approximately 670 meters thick, have been normally faulted and display minor foldings (Randall 1974:25, 35-37). This physiographic province is dominated by a high cuesta which approximately parallels the west coast, and by a gentle dip slope, which reaches from the cuesta ridge to the capping limestones along the east coast. Umatac municipality is located within the cuesta ridge, a feature which gives the area its specific topographic character.

Of the seven physiographic units present in Guam (see Figure 14) those present in Umatac are volcanic uplands, coastal lowlands, and valley floors, plus rough summit land. Rough summit land represents a very small percentage of the total land area and is government unsurveyed land. In this study I will concentrate on two dominant physiographic units: (1) volcanic uplands and (2) coastal lowlands and valley floor areas. Within each unit I will consider the following environmental elements: (a) soil composition, (b) source of water, (c) soil drainage, and (d) existing vegetation.
Figure 14. Land Types
(Source: Taken from Tracey et al., 1959. In Randall 1974:190).
Volcanic Uplands

Most of the 1,576 hectares of land which constitute the Umatac municipality are composed of mountainous and hilly terrain. Landforms range from gently sloping ridge tops near the coastal areas to gradually hilly, very hilly, and mountainous areas towards the East, where the elevation reaches a height of 380 meters in Mount Humuyong Manglo' (Randall 1974:26). Going southwest one finds Mount Bolanos, Mount Shroeder and Mount Sasalaguan, the last two mountains forming a natural boundary between Umatac and the municipality of Merizo, with only one coastal road serving as the link between the two municipalities.

The prevailing gradient of the soil surface ranges from 1 to 100 percent with the predominant gradient being 35-100 percent (Ford et al., 1976:31). Silty clay in the upper part and sandy silt in the lower part are the two existent soil groups (see Figure 15). The consistency of the existing clays ranges from moderately plastic (wet) through friable to firm (moist) to hard (dry). Even though these areas are good for farming because silty clay is found in them, due to the gradient of the slope no large farming area is available. Also the observed rate of natural drainage varies and this is a determinant factor in the amount of land available for farming and in the type of crops which can be grown.

The position of the water table ranges from 0 to 100 with an average of 50 feet below surface. The observed rate of natural drainage on the surface varies as follows: (1) slow to medium and rapid on the exposed C horizon; (2) slow, on concave surfaces and rapid, on convex surfaces; and (3) rapid. The internal drainage is slow, in some areas it is rapid in the A and B horizon and slow in the C horizon.
SOIL GROUPS AND COMPONENTS

- Upper Strata Silty Clay
  Agat and Asan Clay; Sparse Atate Clay
- Lower Strata Sandy Silt
  Agat and Asan Clay
- Silty Clay
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Figure 15. Umatac Soil Classification

See appendix for more information
The vegetation is predominantly of the savanna type (see Figure 16), largely bushy and grassy on humps and open slopes. It offers a mosaic of several kinds of grass lands, herbaceous vegetation and erosion scars with shrubs and tangled ferns. Large areas are covered with swordgrass (Miscanthus/tuppon nette), and Dimeria, a silvery, tufted grass. Small ironwood trees (Casuarina equisetifolia/ gago) are found scattered in many parts and in sparse woodland areas. The existence of very dense areas of swordgrass makes the place inaccessible by foot because swordgrass leaves are likely to lacerate the skin. Areas which have plants other than swordgrass are easy to traverse (Randall 1974:221).

In addition to the savanna type of vegetation, the mixed forest type is found in ravines and along water courses where water drains and moisture accumulates. This vegetation consists basically of a most broad-leafed evergreen forest dominated locally by hibiscus (Hibiscus tiliaceus/ pagu), screw-pine (pandanus/ pahong) and occasionally by wild breadfruit (Artocarpus marianensis/ dokdok). In other areas the mixed forest vegetation contains a reef marsh or hibiscus shrub, betel nut palm (Areca/ pugua') and Cycas circinalis (fadang). Coconut trees, while common in some areas, are scarce in others. The coconut trees are generally low in height, seldom over 40 feet, and the canopy ranges from dense to irregular. Large trees are closely spaced. Some temporary construction timber of poor quality is available (Randall 1974:220).

The Coastal Lowlands and Valley Floors

The lowland areas by the coast or near the coastal areas range from narrow to moderately wide valley bottoms with alluvial fans, e.g., on both
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Figure 16. Uma:ac Vegetation Types
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sides of the Umatac river, south of Machadgan point and along Toguan Bay (see Figure 15). Discontinuous, low, narrow coastal terraces exist about one-fourth of a mile from Facpi point, south towards Achugao point. These narrow lands from Facpi to Fouha were utilized for grazing in traditional times. Near Fouha Bay general elevation at Chalan Anite point is 247 feet, it is 288 feet at Fouha point (Randall 1974:129). Coastal flats and wide valley bottoms exist along Cetti Bay, and on both banks of the Cetti river, and also along the southern part of Fouha Bay. The narrow valley bottoms and alluvial fans are exposed to only occasional severe flooding while the coastal flats and wide valley bottoms are exposed to frequent flooding. The terraces are exposed to typhoon floods and high encroaching seas. The Toguan river located at highway bridge on Route 4, 1.0 mile south of Umatac Catholic Church has a drainage area of .48 square miles. The differences in the soil and the drainage characteristics previously described I assume provide the necessary variant for selection of land in terms of one type of crop over another for the subsistence activities of the Umatac people.

Vegetation in the lowland and coastal areas is of the mixed and savanna types, and of both open grounds and mixed forest type on plateaus and cliffs (see Figure 16). The mixed forest found on limestone plateaus and cliffs is a most-broad-leafed evergreen forest dominated by wild breadfruits (Artocarpus or dugdug) and banyan (Ficus) trees; in some large areas screw-pine (Pandanus) is found also. The forest varies with a dense scrub on edges, faces of cliffs, and near the sea. The canopy of the trees is irregular and up to 75 feet high; the trees are six inches or more in diameter and range from fairly close to widely spaced. Where the
forest is little disturbed the undergrowth is sparse, and it is very dense where disturbance has been great. Some temporary construction timber is available, but it is generally short and of poor quality.

The prevailing gradient in this area is between 0 to 3 percent. Soil is silty clay which is occasionally flooded and usually ranges from moderately to well drained. In the coastal terraces, the soil group (see Figure 15) is that of poorly graded sand. Here there is no surface flow and rapid internal drainage above the water table. The presence of silty clay makes this land good for farming as it retains moisture. The natural drainage on the surface in the coastal and valley flat areas where silty clay is present gradually decreases from rapid to medium to slow, with no surface flow found where graded sand is present.

All the lands on the coastal area can be reached by boat or on foot during the low tide. In traditional times there was a trail which linked Umatac with the center of the Spanish government in Agaña. The trail, as present-day remains indicate, transversed private land in the Sella, Cetti and Fouha areas. Today the coastal lands in the Toguan and Machdgan area can be reached on foot or by pick-up from route four. The lands located in the valleys also could be reached on foot, e.g., Salogna from Mandino following the course of the rivers. During the Japanese occupation of the village, people easily moved onto their lands in the inland valleys where they farmed and fished in the streams and rivers for their subsistence.

An important characteristic of the physical environment of the low-land and valley areas where some of the oldest landholdings are located is the presence of several rivers and springs. This is an important
feature in Southern Guam when compared to the Northern area of the island which is basically a plateau. Most privately owned lands are located on both banks of the rivers. In Umatac all of the rivers constitute natural boundaries between adjacent lands and at times between privately owned lands and land owned by the government.

The La Sa Fouha, Sella, Umatac, Madog rivers have their beginnings in the cuesta ridge and cut through the valleys forming fertile areas where the privately owned lands are located. Lands located along the Sella in a well-protected ocean embodiment receive water from the Sella river (for location of rivers see Chapter III, Figure 6), which changes its name into the As-Nunge river at the beginning of its course. Sella Bay forms natural boundaries between five different land parcels.

The Cetti river and its tributary form the natural boundaries for the lands located on both sides of the river. The Cetti river has a drainage area of 0.72 miles and the average discharge over a five year period (1960-1965) was 4.44 cts. The maximum discharge in all the rivers to be mentioned occurs during the month of October and the minimum during the month of May. La Sa Fua river's drainage area covers 1.93 square miles and the average discharge is 4.43 cfs. The mouth of the river is near the legendary Lalas rock and one of the earliest historic villages.

Within the historical and environmental framework presented the following sections will focus on land tenure in Umatac. Land tenure is here defined as the aggregate of rights and obligations exercised between men with respect to the acquisition, exercise and transfer of land and land rights including both ideas and behavior. The ideational level encompasses people's perceptions, opinions and concepts of land which have
been elicited from informants or abstracted from recurring patterns of behavior. The behavior level is quantifiable and observable. In the following sections I will focus on two aspects of land tenure: (1) origin of title and (2) rights to land. However, prior to this discussion on land tenure, I am including background information on government land in Umatac for the following reasons: (1) to account for the changes in the amount of private land available at different time periods; and (2) to explain how land taken by the Naval Government for tax forfeiture was redeemed by private owners.

**Government Land**

*Traditional*

From previous information we know the Spanish Government first assumed full ownership of land and gradually returned certain types of land rights to the local population, the people of Umatac included. However, most land in Umatac remained in the hands of the government, judging from present-day predominance of government (unsurveyed and registered) over private land. Some of this land was transferred from the Spanish to the U.S. Government as a result of the Treaty of Paris, but most government acquisitions have occurred in the latter part of the period between 1927 and 1940 on account of tax forfeiture and sale as Tables 16 and 17 indicate.

*Modern*

There has been further acquisition of private land by the government in modern times (see Table 16). Concurrently, some lands taken by the government for tax forfeiture between 1926-1940 were redeemed between
Table 16
Acquisition of Government Land in Umatac Between 1898 and 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of acquisition</th>
<th>Area hectares</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Consideration (dollars)</th>
<th>Market Value at the time of acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>treaty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tax forfeiture</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>warranty deed</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>deed of sale</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>quick claim deed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tax forfeiture</td>
<td>n.r.(a)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>n.r.(a)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>deed of sale</td>
<td>16,725.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures from Land Management Records.
Table 17

Land Taken by the Government Between 1926 and 1940 and Redeemed Between 1959 and 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area hectares</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Year acquired by the government</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Redemption year</th>
<th>instrument</th>
<th>consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>153.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0246</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1937*</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>53.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1938*</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1939*</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>1,425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1938*</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1939*</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1939*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>116.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>W.D.</td>
<td>332.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>751.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>473.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>813.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1961*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>473.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>T.F.</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] Tax forfeiture; \[b\] Warranty deed; \[c\] This land parcel was sold back to the government of Guam in 1968.
1959-1962 as indicated in Tables 17 and 18. Redemption occurred by parientes of those who owned the land at the time it was lost to the government. In many cases those who redeemed the lands by-passed the rights of other kin members thus introducing changes in the traditional manner of land inheritance. At present (see Figures 17 and 18) despite lands redeemed, government holdings are higher than those of traditional Umatac. This decrease in the amount of land available has been counteracted by land acquired by Umatac residents from non-Umatac residents (see Table 18) thus resulting in some increase in private landholdings from traditional to modern times.

**Origin of Title**

The approximate dates for establishing the baseline regarding development of private land ownership in Umatac are 1865-1899. The people who acquired land or owned land at this period were born between 1838 and 1869, and married between 1866 and 1899. Marriage dates are significant in ascertaining land ownership because people were obliged to have a house prior to marriage. There is documented evidence that during traditional times certain individuals (male and female) had legal title to the land, in and outside the village. Some landowners had their land registered as early as 1876.

I have grouped the people who had landholdings on Umatac on the basis of their length of residency in the village: old residents, transfer residents, and non-residents. Within each category I will include the following characteristics: place of origin, occupation, marriage, descendants' residency pattern and location of lands (see Figures 19 and 20).
Table 18
Changes in the Amount of Land Owned by the People of Umatac Between 1923 and 1962

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Acquired by the Government</th>
<th>Acquired by Umatac Residents</th>
<th>Redeemed by Individuals</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923-1940</td>
<td>44.05</td>
<td>60.66</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959-1962</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24.28</td>
<td>24.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.14</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.66</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures taken from Land Management Records.
Figure 17. Registered Government Land - Umatac - 1976
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Figure 18. Registered Government Land Umatac Village - 1976
Figure 19. Traditional Land Ownership by Families and by Categories of Original Landowners and Others
Figure 20. Traditional Land Ownership in Umatac Village
Most of the landholdings which are presently (1975-1976) registered at the Land Management Office can be traced back to those three groups mentioned above. Yet, this study focuses mostly on landholdings by old residents and transfer residents. We will be concerned with the non-residents only when (1) explaining, if possible, the reasons why land was transferred from residents, or transfer residents to outsiders; (2) pointing out the time period (e.g., before or after the war) and the amount of land that was involved in the transfers, and (3) pointing out the location of the land (e.g., in or outside the village). These data will be relevant in showing a pattern of change in land transfers within the stated period and changes in the amount of private land actually held by Umatac's residents.

Residents

This first group includes the original landowners, meaning the oldest known landowners. Within each family in Umatac, we will look at the oldest known landowner. The first group includes the Aguon, Gofigan, Fegurgur, Quinata, Sanchez and Topasna families. The following are the characteristics of this original landholders' group. All of them were born in Umatac, at least by 1850, and even though some of these families can be traced back to other villages, e.g., Aguon to Agaña and Topasna to Merizo, people cannot ascertain when these people moved to Umatac. Their time of established residency in Umatac is beyond recall. Some of the landowners held political offices and educational jobs, e.g., Don Mariano Gofigan was Cabeza de Barangay (District Officer); Don Vicente Cheguina Sanchez was Cabeza de Barangay in 1897 and school
teacher in 1879. In most cases, the parents of these landowners were from Umatac. In the case of Vicente Cheguina Sanchez, his father, a "mestizo español" (Spanish mestizo), was also a school teacher at Umatac in 1869. When we look at the marriage pattern of twelve men within the original six families, we see that six of them selected women from Umatac, five from elsewhere (Agaña, Inarajan or Merizo) and birth place of one spouse is unknown. For example, Vicente Gofigan Quinata, married Manuela Blas Mendiola, seamstress by occupation, and resident of Agaña. Jose Aguon, married Sabina del Rosario, from Agaña. A final characteristic of the original landholders is that there was a high percentage of in-marriage; and that a good number of their descendants remained in Umatac.

The findings on endogamous marriages entered in Chapter IV show that for members of landholding families the tendency is to marry people from Umatac ("in-marriage") and preferable parientes with the highest frequency occurring among the people in the "residents" category. This practice of endogamous marriage among those who hold land is considered to be related to the fact that most private land in Umatac has remained in the hands of the descendants of the so-called "original owners" (compare Figures 19 and 21 and 22).

That the practice of endogamy reinforces land tenure is due to the fact that most of those who marry parientes remain in Umatac. Residency is one element among others (sex, amount of land available, age, marital status, residency, sequence of marriage) considered relevant to land transfers. Women who marry out of Umatac are most likely to establish residency elsewhere. Thus marriage to a pariente, for women, facilitates the female's actualization of rights (e.g., land use rights to undivided
LAND OWNERSHIP CHANGES
(Traditional to Modern)
Figure 21. Land Ownership Changes Outside the Village from Traditional to Modern Times
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Figure 22. Traditional Land Ownership and Number of Parcels Transferred from Traditional to Modern Times in the Village
land) and female's rights to land inheritance. Those descendants of the original owners, who remained in Umatac, in addition to their claims to land on the basis of genealogical closeness to the original owners, reinforced their claims by residency.

Finally, it is important to notice that the resident group which had the largest amount of landholdings selected the best land areas in terms of the terrain's low gradient, presence of water, soil conditions, and accessibility by land or sea. Some of those lands are located on the banks of the Laelae, Pajon, Umatac and Madog rivers. Some of the landholdings, e.g., in Sella, Cetti, Fouha areas coincide in their location with those of ancient Chamorro settlements as manifested by the existing archaeological remains. Some of these choices involved non-compliance with the laws and regulations dictated by the Spanish colonial power and by the freedom of choice people had during the Spanish regime to request land leases in a given area.

Transfer Residents

The second group of original landowners were born outside Umatac (Agaña, Agat, the Philippines) but moved to Umatac sometime between 1869 and 1897. Some of them, such as the Santiago and Babaota males, married Umatac women and settled in the village. Some of them held jobs in Umatac, e.g., Don Jose Diaz Charfauros, originally from Agat, was a school teacher in 1897. All of them by the end of the nineteenth century had landholdings in and outside the village and were listed as household heads in the 1897 census. In some cases, the association of a family with a certain occupation goes back to this time, e.g., the Santiago family has a reputation of being good farmers and fishermen, a reputation
which people connect with Mariano Santiago, one of the landowners already mentioned. The following cases illustrate some of the points already mentioned.

Case 1. Jose was originally from Agat and married Maria from Agaña. Two of their children, Vicente and Manuel, married two women from Umatac, Maria and Teresa, who were siblings. Both Vicente and Manuel were landowners in Umatac and listed as household heads in 1897.

Case 2. Hilario was born in the town of Tayabas in the Philippines. His parents, Guillerma and Nicolas, were from Tayabas. Hilario must have moved to Guam before 1868, the year he married Luisa from Umatac. Hilario had land in Umatac and was head of the household by 1897.

Case 3. The Santiago family are considered as being originally from Agaña. In the great grandparents generation (G+3) we find that Jose, resident of Agaña, married Rita Manalisay from Merizo. Three male children, Felipe, Mariano and Vicente, were born in Agaña. It is documented that by 1889 Felipe owned a considerable amount of land in Merizo, some of which had been acquired from other Merizo residents. Felipe married Juan de los Santos from Agaña (year of marriage is unknown) and by 1897 he is listed in the Merizo census (1897 census) as Cabeza de Barangay. Felipe's brother Vicente married Doña Carmela de la Cruz, from Merizo and a school teacher in Umatac in 1884. Mariano married Marcela Infana Quinata from Umatac in 1888 and resided in Umatac ever since. Mariano was a well-known fisherman and farmer, and that tradition has continued within the Santiago family to the present time. The present family landholdings can be traced back to Mariano, although the exact time of acquisition and the process is not documented.
Non-Residents

Finally, the third group of original landowners were born and raised outside Umatac (see Figures 19 and 20). Their descendants also resided elsewhere. This group had no kinship ties with Umatac's residents. They, however, either held jobs there or came to the village for business. How they acquired land in Umatac is not known as described in the following case.

Case 4. Don Lino Roberto was Ayudante del Puerto (Port Assistant) at Umatac in 1857 and 1891 (I assume this was a continuous assignment). Don Lino married Dolores Diaz Sablan, from Agaña. Don Lino's father was Don Juan Roberto, originally from England, naturalized in Guam, resident of Agaña, and merchant by profession. Don Juan Roberto married Doña Maria de Montufar, Spanish mestiza born in and resident of Agaña, and weaver by profession. Don Lino had land in Umatac. How he originally acquired the land is not known. I assume he acquired it from some Umatac resident during the time he held the post of Ayudante del Puerto. Don Lino's land eventually was mortgaged to the Western Commercial Company and then bought from the company by a resident from Agat.

Generally speaking, the people in modern Umatac believe that a long time ago land was relatively easy to acquire, especially through the mediation of the land agents. If a person wanted to farm, he selected the area, went down to the land office, and informed the people there about the selected area. Then, after two years of farming, he went back to the land office and registered the land under his name. According to the informant, you did not have to make any payment for the land. Your only monetary obligation was the annual land tax. Land office agents during pre-war American administration were highly regarded. They resided outside
Umatac but came down to the village on certain occasions. Their authority included the granting of land permits and demarcation of land boundaries. People say that land agents knew when a parcel of land was declared delinquent on account of the owner's non-compliance with tax payments. As informants say, the land agent could go to the land office, pay the taxes and redeem the land under his name. From that time on, he was the legal owner of the land. In the opinion of an informant one of the families in the "transfer resident" category obtained a good amount of land as a result of this family friendship with one of the land agents, who in return received cattle and pigs.

After seeing the facility with which people could obtain land permits, and eventually land titles in traditional Umatac and, comparing it to the amount of land privately owned, the question arises: Why did people not acquire more land? My assumption is that the system of taxation was a limiting factor. People claimed the land needed for their subsistence activities and paid taxes for it, and even some of the land they claimed was lost to the government due to tax forfeiture. I assume people did not want to acquire more land than the amount needed for habitation, farming and grazing. Otherwise they would have been paying taxes on unused land at a time when people did not think of land as an investment for the future. Also, land acquired through the land agents implied a reciprocal exchange which might have been accessible only to a few people in Umatac.

Modern

At the present time, knowledge about the origins of land titles by people who own land, or who have claims to land, goes back to their
second ascending generation (G+2). For example, an individual (Ego) says that a certain land parcel was originally owned by his grandfather (Ego's FF). If I asked ego for further genealogical ownership information, his answer would be that he assumes his father's father (FF) inherited the land from his father (Ego's FFF). When an 80-year old woman was interviewed, her knowledge of the land's original owner went back to her G+2. In cases of undivided land, as I will explain in another section of this chapter, people refer to the person who has his/her name in the land records. In some cases this will be a person in the G+3 generation. Also, one informant told me he believed the land that his family owned might go back to one of the Spanish governors to whom, he thought, they might be related. But, in general, the genealogical knowledge and the knowledge about the original landholder goes back to ego's G+2 generation. Here it is interesting to note that most of the present-day government lands were originally held by private owners (individuals, a father and his children, a sibling group in both the village and outside the village; compare Figures 17 and 18 to Figures 19 and 20).

**Land Rights and Types of Ownership**

**Traditional**

Individual land ownership in Umatac for both men and women has been exercised ever since the second half of the nineteenth century. At that time it was common for a man who held the legal title to the land to grant land use rights to his children. An informant recalled, "In the old custom [they say] because of the difficulties involved in documenting the property, usually a few days prior to the wedding day, or
on that same day, when the whole family came together, the father or the mother said: 'That land is going to be yours. Later on, we will have your share and that of your brothers documented, but from now on, you can go to that land, farm as much as you want; we have the farming tools for you; now you are ready to get married.'"

Seldom were any of those transactions recorded in the land office in Agaña or a will made. In fact, I do not have any knowledge of a person in Umatac who made a will in traditional times. Upon the death of the landowner, land use rights were held by his children. In these cases, the land title was under the deceased's name or under his heirs and land was referred to as being his land. Usually the oldest in the sibling group assumed the responsibilities of paying the land taxes. From that time on land was considered undivided and those individuals considered the legal heirs were entitled to land use rights and to inherit the land once it was divided. Table 19 shows the large number of land parcels registered in the Land Management office and considered undivided land.

The following case is an example of traditional land distribution by a father among his children, including both males and females.

Case 5. Jose, in the grandparent's generation (G+2), divided the land among his seven children, four females and three males. This was done in the traditional way, by saying: "This is your land, from this tree to that tree" or "your land is the one on the right bank of the river." The oldest daughter Maria sold her two land parcels to a non-resident who held a job and temporarily resided in Umatac but who originally was from Agaña. The land parcel inherited by the second
Table 19

Undivided Land Held by Families in Umatac and Recorded Between 1903 and 1941

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Year First Recorded</th>
<th>Area in hectares</th>
<th>Location in village</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family B</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family G</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family M</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family T</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family P</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>0.052(^b)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family P</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family P</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family U</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family U</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>0.046(^b)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family V</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Y</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Y</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 45.642 28 30

\(^a\) Village refers to main habitation area (see Figures 19 and 20 for location of families in the village and outside the village).

\(^b\) Located outside the village.
oldest female, Ana, was verbally transferred to Ana's children. This land was taken away by the Naval government in 1938 on the basis of tax forfeiture; it is today registered as government property. However, Ana's children today still refer to it as their land. The rest of the land parcels are still under the name of Jose and at the present time still no legal agreement has been made. The only legal action that was taken was that of naming an administrator, Joaquin, the only male in the father's generation (G+1) living at that time. Figure 23 shows all the people who had claims to the land. This information is based on those who were considered claimants as of 1975. Since that time, as indicated in the figure, two more people have died and so fifteen more claimants have been added within a year's time to the list (husband plus seven offspring of one deceased female, and seven offspring of a deceased male). This is in agreement with the Guam Code provisions.

Two additional land parcels owned by Joaquin, and not included in the verbal distribution, were located in the village; one of them was the family's housesite. Both were taken over by the government before the war on account of tax forfeiture. Later on, both were claimed by Joaquin, the administrator, who registered them under his name. The housesite was transferred to Joaquin's youngest son (kirido) who resided with his father in the village, and the second land parcel was transferred to Joaquin's only daughter, Carmen. Carmen has married a Umatac man who had potential claims to his family's undivided land but who in actuality did not have land to build a house. Joaquin, a widower, stayed at Carmen's home.
Figure 23. Bilateral Descent Unit Indicating Claimants to Land (D Family)
In cases where a verbal transaction exists regarding undivided land, the implementation of this agreement later on depends on claims and persistence by people who were bound by the agreement. Usually, the longer the time span of the verbal agreement, the lower the possibilities are of taking it into consideration at the time distribution is done.

Modern

In modern Umatac the exercise of rights to land and land title vary according to the two main types of ownership.

1) Owned Land Individually. This category includes land that has been legally transferred or distributed to an individual (male or female), or individuals (husband and wife or group of siblings), the land title is held (a) by the head of the household; or (b) by the head of the household and his spouse. The transfer occurs during a person's lifetime when the transaction is entered in the Land Management office; or in cases when a person dies without a will through the regular court procedures as previously described. In any of these cases those who had obtained a title certificate have uncontested title to the land. This land can be sold, transferred and mortgaged. It is no longer communal family land in the sense previously described for undivided land. However, people in the village know how the person who has the title to that land obtained it, e.g., if the land belonged to his/her mother's or father's side.

People often compare and contrast the old people's regard for a verbal agreement of a land transfer, to that of the post-war generations. The contrasting attitude is stated in this 50 year old informant's saying: "In the old times, they told you this is your land and nobody questioned it. But, later on, government officials came down to the
village and started telling people they had to prove certain land parcels were theirs. Even if your father told you that this was your land, if the land transaction was not documented, another brother could come and ask for proof of ownership. So, the best way now to give land to a son, to one's own children, is to have the land documented in court and legally divided. In court, the signature of the parents is needed so that ownership cannot be doubted. If this is not done, the word of the claimant is not as good as a title."

It is important to notice that in some cases where land is owned individually, those who have title to the land exercise residual rights and grant provisional use rights to other kin members as in the following case.

**Case 6.** Rosa is married to a Umatac man and has six offspring (two males and four females). Rosa inherited a land parcel in the village from her father. She had a lot leased from the government and used as *lancho* outside the village. Rosa and her husband had built a cement home on the village lot.

Rosa's oldest daughter married a non-Umatac man and resided out of Umatac. The second offspring, Vicente, married a Umatac woman and *pariente*. Rosa and her husband gave their village home to Vicente and spent most of their time at the *lancho* house. However, on certain occasions and due to convenience (e.g., celebration of *nobenas*, the fiesta), they go and stay at their village home. Concurrently, the young couple spend much time at the *lancho*. Vicente farms during the weekends at his father's place, raising fighting roosters and pigs, and both families share in the produce of the farm. The village house is
under Rosa and Rosa's husband's name and most likely these people are paying the taxes. However, Vicente is responsible for the maintenance of the house, e.g., the outside painting during the week before the fiesta. Vicente and his wife participate in any of Vicente's parent's gupot as well as in those of his wife's parents. However, in case of conflicting obligations between both sets of parents those obligations on Vicente's side take precedence over those on his wife's side.

In Umatac 75 land parcels were distributed through court action between 1950 and 1974 (58 land parcels or 77 percent were distributed between 1962 and 1974); this is shown in Table 20. The documented origin of the land varies, with some having been registered as early as 1896 but most of the registration occurred between 1900 and 1937. Some of the parcels were first registered at the time of distribution, e.g., the years 1953, 1964, 1969 and 1973. In some cases there was a previous recording in maps compiled by the Navy in 1924 and 1937.

Registration is usually one of the first decisions made by the family (siblings) in the case of a deceased parent. Usually, the land is registered under the name of one of the siblings (oldest) or under that of the spouse and all the siblings (e.g., heirs of Manuel Babaota) or, in those cases where the wife owned the land, in the name of the deceased's husband and of her offspring. After the land is registered, in order to get legal title, one must follow the court procedure as previously explained. However, many land parcels have just been registered and are held in ownership (though without title) by a group of siblings or by a female and her offspring.

As Table 20 shows, the amount of land that has been distributed varies among the landowning families. For example two families (D and V)
Table 20

Distributions of Land by Families Between 1962 and 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Area (hectares)</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Z</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Q</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 58 parcels, 79.497 hectares, 15 in Village, 43 outside the Village.

\( ^a \) Village refers to main habitation area (see Figures 19 and 20 for location of families in the village and outside the village).
have the largest amount of land distributed. Also land parcels outside the village are larger than those in the village, and more parcels outside the village have been subdivided among the offspring. The manner of distribution depends on the amount of land available, e.g., if there were enough land parcels to be given to each of the offspring, then each offspring received at least one or more parcels. In such a case there is no need for subdivision.

Case 7. Simon had six land parcels. After his death, the land was legally divided. He had five offspring and each of them received a land parcel. The administrator (oldest sibling) received the largest land parcel (7.30 hectares) while the rest of them received smaller shares. The youngest male retained the family home. Pedro, the second youngest sibling, in addition to his share, redeemed four lots formerly owned by his father's father (FF) which had been taken away by the government on account of tax forfeiture; Pedro had these lots registered under his name and that of his wife, obtaining a title certificate. This is an example of someone who assumed title to the land which in traditional times would have been shared with other siblings.

Where there was not enough land parcels to be given to a person's offspring, a land parcel was surveyed and subdivided as in the following case.

Case 8. Dionisio had eight offspring (all males), five with his first wife and three with his second wife. After his death, the land was legally distributed. One of the lots was distributed among Dionisio's offspring (second wife): Luis, Juan and Ramon. Ramon was deceased so Ramon's offspring inherited the share. As a result Luis obtained a
part of 1216 square meters, Juan one of 897 and Luis's offspring one of 805 square meters. These land parcels cannot be further subdivided on account of the present lot size regulations.

2) Undivided Land. This category includes land registered in the Land Management office since traditional times under a person's name from the second ascending generation (G+2) to the fourth ascending generation (G+4), most in the G+2 who died without a will or under the general entry of heirs, e.g., of Antonio Sanchez Aguon. In most of these cases (see Table 19) there is no recorded transaction, even if the land has been verbally distributed or transferred during the lifetime of the original owner. In those cases when transactions have been entered, e.g., quick claim, deeds, or deed of gift, the land is considered undivided. The reason for this is that those transactions do not carry enough weight to support claims to land title. However, there are cases where ownership is clearly defined in the minds of the people.

Undivided land is spoken of as land belonging to the entire family and often called "family land." It is understood that each claimant can speak of undivided land as being his/her own land, but the land cannot be sold. The excessive number of claimants is often mentioned, as being the reason for conflict among family members. In most cases, people refer to undivided land by the name of the area where it is located, such as Cetti, Caballero, Fouha, or by the name of the family owning the land, e.g., Aguon's or Sanchez' land. There are cases when people are specific and point out the name of the person who seems to have assumed certain responsibilities regarding a specific piece of land or land parcel. For example, people will say, referring to land in Salogna as "Tun Pepe's
land," even though the land is still under Tun Pepe's father's name. Yet, it is Tun Pepe who has been administering the land and paying for the taxes.

In referring to those who have claims to undivided land, people in Umatac follow the Guam Code regulations. As a result, all the direct living descendants (males and females) of the ancestor under whose name the land has been registered are included. If one of the claimants dies, his wife and children are added to the list of claimants. At times, more than fifty people are potential holders of provisional rights as already discussed. While land is undivided, people exercise a variety of provisional rights including the following:

1. Right to build a frame house (a cement house can only be built on land held in full ownership title). The one who builds it holds ownership on the house and its improvements; also, he/she pays the house taxes.
2. Right to stay in a house already built. The person pays the house taxes and is responsible for the house maintenance.
3. Right to farm, this includes the right to build a lancho, to plant and to gather the produce.
4. Right to obtain fruit or materials from trees or plants which grow wild including pugua', firewood, coconut palm fronds, federiku palms and coconuts.
5. Right to pasture animals such as carabaos or to raise pigs, fighting roosters.
6. Right to use the land for recreational activities, such as picnicking, and hiking.
7. Right to use the land, to build a structure when additional space is needed, for example, at *fandanggo* preparations, the use of an adjacent parcel to install an outdoor kitchen.

8. Right to refer to the land as one's own land.

In general, even though a large number of people hold provisional rights over a certain land parcel, only a limited number ever exercise them. Ideally full title is vested in the person under whose name the land is registered. As in most cases, the name corresponds to a deceased in the grandparents' generation (G+2), even though someone else (the administrator),\(^\text{15}\) is assuming responsibility for the land in the name of all those who are entitled to land rights. In most cases of undivided land the legally elected administrator (male or female) acts as steward for the land. When the administrator becomes too old or if he moves away his/her oldest son often acts on his/her behalf. The administrator allocates provisional rights to kin and non-kin members as in the following case.

**Case 9.** Vicente asked Jesus' permission to run a water pipeline through the land Jesus administered. Jesus did not consult the other members who had land rights but granted Vicente's request. Jesus and Vicente were not kinsmen.

At times provisional rights can be transferred from a provisional right holder to another one, but the approval of the administrator is needed. This is shown in the following case.

**Case 10.** A land parcel was given by Joaquin to his son Luis in 1876 who obtained the legal title to the land in 1904. At the present time the land is still under Luis' name. Luis had four offspring (one
male, Jose, and three females). Luis' oldest son, Jose, has been the administrator and the one paying the taxes up to the present time. When people refer to this parcel of land they refer to it as Jose's land. One of Jose's sisters, Maria, married a pariente. Maria's oldest son, Pedro, used to farm with his uncle Jose when he was small and Pedro claims there was a special relationship between himself and his uncle which he expresses as one of affection. Pedro was told that some of the land was going to be his because he was Jose's sister's oldest son.

Pedro joined the military and stayed out of Guam for several years. He returned to Guam occasionally and a few years ago he returned to stay for a while. Pedro needed land to build his home and asked his uncle Jose for permission to build the house on his land. Jose gave Pedro permission. Pedro built the house and paid for the house and taxes on the house while his uncle continued paying the land tax despite offerings from Pedro to pay for them. Jose's responsibility for paying land taxes being interpreted as the land still being his own, despite the fact of Pedro owning the house.

Pedro farmed the land during the weekends. He faithfully fulfilled his obligations towards his mother's kindred including a visit to his uncle every Sunday after Mass. There was an affectionate relationship between Pedro and Jose's son, Justo, who stayed in the house with his father. Justo went hunting often and kept some of the binadu (deer) meat for Pedro. This was also reciprocated in other ways by Pedro.

When Pedro left Guam to return to the U.S. mainland, he obtained permission from his uncle Jose for his daughter, married to a Umatac man, to stay in the house, I assume under the same previous conditions. Pedro
had previously reinforced his kinship ties with Jose by establishing ties of *compadrazgo* with Jose's daughter (becoming godfather to her child).

In the exercise of claims to land those claimants who were bound by a previous verbal agreement, especially if they are still living, and have shown persistence on their verbal claims, ought to be taken into consideration, also, those who have no land, e.g., living on government leased lands, are to be given special consideration when other claimants have their own land, or if females live on land owned by their husbands. People believe land should be distributed according to priority of needs, such as, the need for a housesite. People who reside in Umatac exercise their rights more frequently and for a longer period of time than those residing outside the area.

The responsibilities of the administrator last until the land is legally distributed, and the claimant(s) obtain the full title to the land parcel(s). By that time the administrator due to his/her responsibilities, has accumulated certain claims, which he can exercise at the time land is distributed by selecting a specific parcel, or by obtaining a share larger than that of other claimants. Ultimately, people believe it is up to the administrator's siblings to say: "As you have been paying for the taxes, choose the largest share." If the selection of the administrator, or the one who pays the taxes, was a family agreement, this was already an expression of this person's special standing in the family and people assume he/she might obtain the best and largest share.

Following are some ways people perceive the problem of undivided land should be solved. Firstly, the oldest person, or the one assigned by him/her, should initiate the process. For example, if he/she is too
old, his/her oldest son should assume the responsibility. Once the administrator has been selected, it is his/her responsibility to be the link between the members of the family, between the family and the lawyer, the surveyors, land management, and the court. An informant stated that a good way for the administrator to call the family together is to organize a picnic, or prepare food and invite the family members to the house. Secondly, it was suggested that the best way to pay for the cost of surveying the land is to survey all the family parcels at once. The surveyor can survey one, skip the middle one, and continue to the next one. In this manner you get one surveyed for free--the middle one--and the cost goes down. Thirdly, in those cases where there are too many claimants, and not enough land to be given to each one, the best thing is to sell the land and distribute the money among all the claimants. This is a solution to a number of undivided land parcels. The time that has passed between the year when land was registered and the current legal provisions has increased the number of people who claim legal rights to those lands. Under the circumstances, if the lands were to be divided among all the claimants, the result would be mini-sized lots which would not comply with Government of Guam zoning laws. In those cases, the claimants have to decide upon the person(s) who will be named as title holders; this could cause family conflicts which people prefer to avoid. However, people with undivided lands seem not to have had significant prospective buyers. This might be one reason, among others, for the continuance of numerous parcels under undivided ownership.

The following case illustrates how provisional rights in the village area are actualized.
Case 11. A lot in the village with an area of 1622 square meters was inherited by Ana from her mother, Manuela, sometime about the year 1916. Ana was already married when she inherited the land and was Manuela's youngest offspring. The land is still under Ana's name (G+2 generation). As Figure 24 shows, in 1975 four people (two in the first ascending generation and two on the ego generation) exercised their claims to the land by living in houses built on it. The youngest females in the first ascending generation lived in their parents' former home.

Accounting for the large number of undivided landholdings are the following factors:

1. With the shift from a modified to a wage economy the pressure on agricultural land has decreased and therefore many of those lands under undivided ownership and formerly cultivated are at present left idle, e.g., those in Sella, Cetti.

2. There has not been significant interest from out-of-Umatac investors to pressure people to have lands divided and land with legal title available for sale. This lack of interest in the area is related to Umatac being out of the mainstream of economic development as previously explained.

3. The legal system of land distribution is complicated when there is a large number of claimants, this being the case for most undivided parcels in Umatac and besides is a costly process.

4. Having the land undivided is functional as it allows for multiple land use in a manner based on traditional patterns of land rights allocation. This ranges from rights to farm the land and to obtain its produce, to those granted for building a home or to use one already built. Having
Figure 24. Land Claims to a Land Parcel in the Village (D Family)

Legend:

- △ O UnGerman residents
- △ O Have house on the land as of 1976

Note: The diagram shows the family tree with symbols indicating land claims and ownership details.
the land undivided delays family conflicts concerning the selection of certain people to inherit the title from the large number of legal claimants available. It gives a strong sense of identity to a group of people greater than the one which would be entitled to the land once it is divided. This identity is based on people's claiming as their own the same landholdings their ancestors owned since traditional times and also by their potential or actual exercise of their land rights.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. The **gobernadorcillo** was the village chief magistrate who represented the administration and who acted as both lawyer and judge. This position was held by Chamorros (Driver 1977:86).

2. The **estancia** as it existed in Spain was a territory of one or more leagues measured in a circle or square. It was measured from some tree or **corral** (yard surrounded by a stone fence) located at its center. The **estancia** was granted to individuals to pasture or raise cattle and excluded any right to land ownership or land use other than the one specified (Vicens 1957:413-415). The **estancias** in Guam were generally located in remote areas. It is known that in 1849 Silvestre Inocencio Palomo and Jose de Torres had **estancias** in Tarague, Bubalao and Sagna where they pastured and raised 144 cows, 30 carabaos and 100 pigs. Rights to the **estancias**, unless revoked by the government, were transferable to the grantee's children as inheritance (AHN, Ult., Fil., Leg. 5169, doc. no. 25).

3. The **encomienda** consisted of a tract of land granted by the Spanish king to a discoverer or military leader as a reward for his service. The grant bound the grantee to protect the natives who worked the land for him.

4. From the document I gather that an individual who had held land under cultivation and/or habitation for ten, twenty or thirty years could claim title to the land. (This applied to males as well as females.) If the government offered the land for sale the occupant of the land was given first priority. In Umatac and during traditional times several people obtained title to the land on the basis of occupation. On those occasions, other Umatac landowners acted as witness and testified on behalf of the occupant about the length of time he had held the land.

5. The 1890 census lists 7 people under the category "foreigners." The classifications found between 1888-1890 are: Natives, Spaniards, foreigners and Chinese. Included in the "native" category were Filipinos and Carolinians. So the term foreigners must have been given to people other than the ones listed here (L.C. Micro. 3527, item 96, numbers 245, 348).

6. The **corral de pesca** might have been similar to the ones Spoehr reports being in use in Saipan and consisting of "a number of weirs, constructed of stakes and wire mash" and built along the shore of the lagoon (1954:157).

7. The Royal decree was promulgated in Manila on April 17, 1894. Those provisions of the decree which were applicable to the Mariana Islands were promulgated in Agaña by Gobernor Emilio Galisteo Brunenque on September 24, 1894.
8. According to a local informant, the area shown on maps as Chalan Anite (translated as "the path of the spirits"), differs from the location of the Chalan Anite area as known by the people in the community. The latter is located below Fort Soledad and close to the present site of the cemeteries.

9. In the Sella area, historical sources indicate the existence of habitation from 1700 to 1852. In the Cetti area there are indications of the existence of a historic village which was occupied before 1700 to the early 1800s. In the Fouha area there is documentation for the existence of an early historic village called Fouha. In the valley areas there are latte remains found along the Madog river which is indicative of the existence of a common river-valley settlement plan. Also there is scattered pottery along the Alatgue spring (Guam Historic Preservation Plan 1976:49, 51, 61). In the Salogna upland area, overlooking the valley, there are remains of latte and the strong belief among the people of Umatac of the presence of the taotaomo'na in that area, a belief associated with ancient Chamorro habitation sites.

10. Here, as in many other instances, the name of the river is identical to that of the land. From the data available it seems that the name of the river changes according to the area which it cuts across, e.g., La Sa Fua river changes into Chagame river when it cuts across the area known as Chagarne. I see the need for further study of land names and their relationship to other features of the environment. This study will give us deeper insights into Chamorro perception of their environment.

11. The data for this section were derived from certificates (birth, marriage and death), land records, Spanish Government documents, census material (especially the 1897 census), maps, numerous interviews with informants, within and outside Umatac. The latter includes some of the oldest members in the community, surveyors, as well as staff members at both the Land Management Office and the Department of Revenue and Taxation.

12. Fegurgur and Sanchez are not indigenous Chamorro names which indicates that both families descend from people who came to Guam from other places, e.g., the Philippines, Mexico or Spain. But both Fegurgur and Sanchez families were in Umatac by 1865.

13. Don was used as a mark of respect when addressing someone who held certain office, e.g., a teacher, the gobernadorcillo; the term Doña was used for women. The term Don has been changed into Tun or Ton. The term Doña is still in use.

14. This should be the focus of further investigation by using historical material and archaeological study of settlement patterns. Linguistic studies of place names in those areas should yield valuable information.
15. The administrator, usually the oldest (male or female but more frequently the latter) assumes responsibilities concerning payment of taxes and court procedures in those cases when land has not been legally divided among the rightful heirs.
CHAPTER VII

LAND TENURE AND LAND USE

As a continuation of the previous chapter on some aspects of land tenure, the focus in this chapter is on (1) types of land transfer; (2) means of land conveyance; (3) habitation and commercial land use; and (4) economic and symbolic value of land. As in Chapter VI we are concerned with both ideational and behavior levels as applied to land in traditional and modern Umatac.

Types of Land Transfer

The analysis of types of land transfers points out the existence of common characteristics operating in both traditional and modern Umatac. The first characteristic is the occurrence of transfers between kin (lineal and collateral), between affines, and between non-kin members. In land conveyance between kin (see Table 21) patrilineality is the dominant pattern. The matrilineal pattern is mostly the result of legal distribution through court procedure in modern times and is entered in Table 21 under the "occasional" category. For example, a wife receives land from her deceased husband and she in turn transfers the land to her offspring, more often to her male than to her female offspring. In general, land is transferred both during a person's lifetime (gift, deed, warranty deed) or after a landholder's death (inheritance or legal distribution). The following case outlined by a government official in 1857 indicates the traditional procedure followed in land inheritance.
Table 21

Lines of Transfer among Kin Members in Umatac from Tradition to Modern Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lineal</th>
<th>Collateral</th>
<th>Between Spouses</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ During a person's lifetime

2/ Through court procedure after the death of the landowner
... that the person in charge of the port of Umatac [Lino Roberto] return [to Umatac] and gather Maria Chiguina and the brothers and sisters of [the deceased] Mariano Sanchez and the most immediate relatives of the children who remain of those brothers and sisters [of Mariano Sanchez]. That they agree upon the manner of dividing the house Mariano Sanchez left. Half of that house belongs to all [Mariano's] brothers and sisters or to their children. His wife [Maria Chiguina] may keep the house if she gives to all the claimants the equivalent to the value of half of the house and at the same time that she reconciles them in such a manner that all of them [claimants] remain satisfied without the need of litigation. (L.C., Micro. 3527, item 94:72; translation is mine).

In this case the deceased's siblings or children were the inheritors entitled to half of the property and the deceased's spouse was entitled to the other half. It is not known if this was the ordinary pattern of land inheritance or if the siblings received half of the land on account of any of the following reasons: (1) if Mariano had no children; (2) if land was held in joint ownership by the group of siblings; or (3) if Mariano's children were too young to inherit the land and eventually the land obtained by Mariano's spouse would be given to her children. Any of these three possibilities agree with the practice followed in Umatac from traditional to present times.

Most land transfers among non-kin members as illustrated in Table 22 occurred in traditional times between 1896 and 1940 with the period 1920-1927 exhibiting the highest recorded number of land transfers. The parcels were transferred on a permanent basis to non-kin members most of whom were Umatac residents. Some of those who purchased land (in and outside the village) were transfer residents who obtained land after years of residency in Umatac. Those individuals who sold their land (both male and female) fall under the following categories: (1) born in Umatac, married to a non-Umatac person and residing elsewhere in Guam; and
Table 22
Land Permanently Transferred to Non-Kin Members Between 1896 and 1956

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Area hectares</th>
<th>between residents</th>
<th>between a resident &amp; a non-resident</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Consideration (dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 (*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deed of Sale</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deed of Grant</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deed of Sale</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deed of Sale</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deed of</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conveyance</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Deed of Sale</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 21 76.662 11 4 6

(*) Approximate date. aThe grantees were residents of Umatac at the time of the transactions; bThe grantor resided in the village of Merizo at the time of the transaction; Figures from Land Management Records.
(2) residents with additional landholdings in and outside the village. Four of the twenty grantors were females and two of the females had inherited the land from their husbands. Of the grantees, all, except two, were male. The time of transaction for nineteen of the twenty-one land parcels was before World War II. There were six land parcels where cash was entered as the medium of exchange. Presumably, the other land parcels were bartered for animals, living and non-living things.

A second characteristic of land transfer in traditional and modern Umatac is the existence of certain criteria which emerges from the analysis of people's ideology of land and of data on land transfers. By decreasing order of importance these criteria are: (1) sex; (2) amount of land available; (3) age; (4) marital status; (5) residency; and (6) sequence of marriage.

1) Sex. Criteria: Males receive land more frequently and in larger amounts than females.

As Table 21 shows, within the various existing options proper to a bilateral system, land is more often transferred patrilineally. Within the patrilineal pattern land is more often transferred to males than to females. People believe that a man, especially if he is the oldest son, should receive some land to build his house when he marries. Generally, the man is considered the provider, and the woman the one to be provided for. Therefore, it is preferable to give a land parcel or a home to a man rather than to a woman. This is consistent with the general opinion that it is best to give a man more opportunities than to a woman, so as to prepare him best to be the provider. Also, people believe that by giving land to women, the land goes out of the family if the woman marries, or if she is married already.
There are cases when land is given by by-passing the oldest offspring, a female, for the second offspring who happens to be the first male. In the comparatively small number of cases when land has been transferred to females, certain conditions (e.g., the landless condition of the spouse, marital status, number of siblings, and amount of land available) have been determining factors in land being transferred to females. This is clarified further in the following list of possible cases.

a. Cases when the only daughter is married to a relative who has no land, she resides in Umatac and her widowed father stays with her.

b. Cases when a female married a man from outside Umatac. After widowhood, she returned to Umatac, received land from her father, and established her residency there.

c. Cases when a female married a man from outside Umatac (I assume he had no land) and established residency in Umatac on land she received from her father.

d. Cases when the number of female offspring is considerably higher than that of the males (e.g., a case of two males and four females) and the father has a large number of land parcels. In the latter case, there is a higher frequency of females receiving land, except in those instances where there is not enough land for everyone, in which case land will go first to the males.

e. Cases when the female is an only child.

2) Amount of land available. Criteria: If enough land is available, all offspring receive some.

The amount of land influences how and to whom it is going to be given. Here, as in most cases, sex is the predominant factor.
3) **Birth order.** Criteria: Older siblings receive more than younger ones.

People affirm that the oldest and the youngest males are entitled to the largest shares of land. Thus, the youngest male gets more than the youngest female. People's reasons for this age differentiation are as follows: The oldest (first-born male) has more responsibilities than the rest of the siblings. The youngest child, in many instances, stays in the house while the parents grow old and he will be responsible for taking care of them and of the home. But, also, he is the one who would have had less years of parental support as opposed to the other siblings. The older children have had time to get experience and to learn from their parents, but the youngest has had less time for that. By giving him the best, it is hoped he will be able to compensate for what he has missed. The youngest is considered to be special, and at times he/she is the *keridu*. People recall that in the old days the youngest child kept the family home and the biggest piece of land. However, they say that things are changing now with the present generation. If the youngest has a home, he should not get the family home but it should go to another sibling who does not own one; in this case, the emphasis is on need rather than on age.

In land transfer, people want to avoid situations which might lead to conflict among the family. An informant says: "Juan is the youngest in the family and has a good house in Dededo. Maria (Juan's sibling) does not have a house. Rosa (Juan and Maria's mother) wanted to give Maria the family house and Gregorio (Juan and Maria's sibling), the store. Maria's husband said to Rosa: 'Exclude my wife from the distribution, even though we do not have a house, so you will avoid quarrels
among your children. It is best to have some other land rather than the house and to live in peace." In practice the first born receives more land than the rest of the offspring, and, also, older siblings receive more than the younger ones, except for the youngest or kiridu. In some cases, land was registered under the name of one of the siblings (usually the oldest) but at the time of distribution it was distributed among all the siblings. The family home usually goes to the youngest male or female; in cases when there is documented evidence, we see that the number of males who obtained land, along with the family home, is slightly higher than that of their female counterparts.

4) Marital status. Criteria: Married offspring receive more land than single ones.

Among a group of siblings, married ones receive more land than the unmarried ones. As I have pointed out in Chapter IV after marriage a young couple is expected to act as an independent unit, and supposedly establish neolocal residency.

5) Residency. Criteria: Residents in the village receive more land than those living elsewhere.

Those males who resided in the village received more land than those residing elsewhere. Where land is distributed and the number of land parcels is smaller than that of the claimants, often those who reside outside Umatac gave up their claims to those claimants, e.g., siblings who were Umatac's residents.

Case 1. Vicente gave a land parcel to his son Juan (first born son from Vicente's first wife). Around 1916 Juan gave it to his son Jose (second offspring but first-born son) who sold it to a non-kin Umatac resident; the transfer was based on a verbal agreement. Rosa
(Juan's wife) disregarded the former verbal agreement and transferred the
land to her third offspring Felipe; Felipe, his wife and children
resided at Rosa's home and he was Rosa's only offspring residing in
Umatac at this time.

(6) **Sequence of marriage.** Criteria: Children of the first wife
receive more land than those of the second wife.

In those cases when a male landowner has married more than once,
land has been distributed during his lifetime to his first wife's
children. Then, twenty years after his death, and when land was legally
distributed, the children of his second wife also obtained land. But,
usually, the first wife's offspring received more land than those of the
second.

In those cases when a man has had children from two wives, land
transfers between siblings of the same mother and father are more frequent
than those between or among half siblings or step-siblings (same father
and different mother). However, there are some exceptions as the following
case shows.

**Case 2.** Dionisio married Maria and had five male offspring. After
Maria's death he married Juana (Maria's sibling) and had three offspring:
Luis, Juan and Ramon. Juan married and had eleven offspring (8 females
and 3 males); two died unmarried. The rest were residing outside Umatac
except for Rosa who was married to a statesider who resided in Umatac.
In 1953 at the time of land distribution instead of the land going to
Rosa, a land parcel went to Luis, Juan's step-brother's son. I do not
know if he was a resident of Umatac.
Means of Land Conveyance

Traditional

As means of land transfer we find by decreasing order of importance bartering, gambling, selling and using land as collateral. In these cases the medium of exchange has been money, land, living and/or non-living things. When bartering was involved land was often exchanged for (1) living things, e.g., carabaos, pigs, cows; (2) non-living things, e.g., fishing nets, wheel carts (kareta), farming tools and whiskey; or (3) land, in Umatac (e.g., a land parcel from Ginahit near the present-day cemetery was exchanged for one in Mandino). An informant recalled that his father exchanged land for a cow because he had enough land and did not have a cow. We know of instances where land was transferred through gambling. The following case was recalled by one informant: "On one occasion Vicente was gambling and at one point he took out a land title from his pocket and gambled for it. When Vicente lost the game with Felipe, he then signed off the title. Felipe then became the owner."

There have been instances, also, where land has been transferred by being used as collateral for a cash loan. In actuality it was used to pay off this loan, e.g., Pedro borrowed some money from Luis (both Umatac residents). Luis did not have enough money to pay off his debt so he gave Pedro a land parcel instead.

When we look at when these transfers took place, we realize that bartering and gambling predominated in traditional times. Money was also used in land sales. Barter occurred both between kinsmen in Umatac and between non-kinsmen in and outside Umatac. Finally, it should be noted
that the people who sold, bartered or gambled land had additional landholdings and were not depending on those lands for their livelihood.

**Modern**

I have no first-hand knowledge of land having been bartered for living or non-living things. In one case, a land parcel in Umatac was exchanged for a land parcel in Agaña and the transaction entered in the Land Management Office. Neither have I heard of land having been gambled. The predominant way to transfer land in modern Umatac is by using money as the medium of exchange. After World War II people began to "sell" their lands. At this time land fees varied and were dependent on location within the municipality (e.g., land in the village had a higher price than land outside the village) or island economy. As I had mentioned in Chapter VI prices in the central and northern areas of the island are higher than those in the southern part. In modern as well as in traditional times most of the cash transactions or land sales have occurred between Umatac's landowners and out-of-Umatac non-kin members.

**Habitation and Commercial Land Use**

Having discussed land utilization for subsistence activities in Chapter V, the focus in this section is on land for habitation and commercial usage in Umatac, especially within the village area. The traditional layout of the village of Umatac has remained unchanged and the San Dionisio street is the main throughfare as it was in traditional times. During the Japanese occupation of World War II (1941-1944) people in Umatac were forced to move out of the village where they lived and use their lancho lands for both subsistence and habitation. Even though
rice was cultivated prior to that time, new lands were used to increase rice production. With regard to the war experiences it is important to notice that the fighting and air raids which destroyed other villages in Guam and accounted for the total redistribution, rezoning of land, settlement of lost boundary markers (e.g., Agaña; Souder 1971:202) with its subsequent problems, left Umatac basically unchanged. It was necessary, however, to rebuild the village habitations after the Japanese occupation. The main changes according to informants took place in the types of material used for buildings after the war. From utilizing ifil wood, bambu, masonry (few cases) coconut and nipa fronds, people began to utilize lumber and tin for partitions, walls and roofs. The utilization of these materials which were made available through the commissioner of Umatac from the American military personnel, changed the physical appearance of the houses but the layout of the village or the size of the housesites remained as it was before the war.

Concurrently, the tendency of parcel owners to build too many appendages to their dwellings continues and present regulations on construction of accessory buildings are often not enforced. This type of construction is part of the preparation for any big event, starting with the fiesta and followed by a nobena, a fandango, or a bela. Some of these temporary structures (a portion of the palapala, an outdoor kitchen) are left standing after the event is over. As one of the villagers jokingly commented, looking across his front yard a week prior to the fiesta: "A, adds something to his house every year and then he forgets to remove it." Or "everytime B has a gupot he keeps on extending
his house into the bordering government land; soon he will forget where his property boundary is."

Turning specifically to the question of zoning regulations since 1952, we can say that, in general the zoning rules are impractical either on account of pre-existing land parcel conditions, especially in the village before the law was enacted or because of their present conditions. The first Guam zoning law was passed in 1952 and regulated land use according to established criteria. The law allows for the classification of land according to various uses: Rural (agricultural), residential, industrial, commercial, and parking. It is based on the premise that the public welfare is served by segregating land uses which are not compatible with each other. This law is the primary regulator of land use activities in Guam (Marsh and Winter 1975 (V):32; for further information on zoning see also Ford et al., 1976:32-38). In accordance with the law most land in Umatac is classified as rural (see Figure 25). Zoning limits the land use in the municipality and establishes rules concerning height of building, yard size, and location of accessory buildings. It is in the village situation where the inapplicability of these zoning regulations is most evident.

Most of the present housesites in Umatac village do not conform in size to the regulations made for the whole of Guam. Since most of the houses in Umatac village were built before 1952, and the law provisions excluded all those houses built prior to the law, Umatac represents an exception to most of the situations found in other villages in Guam.

Besides habitation sites, the areas allowed for commercial purposes were affected by the 1952 law. Those areas, which according to the law,
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were allowed for expansion of either business or public facilities are those classified under Residential 2 (R 2) and Commercial (C) as indicated in Figure 25. Areas designated as (C) were declared commercial areas to fit existing conditions, with no provision, apparently, for expansion to meet future needs. At the present time the 19 small land parcels (3.6 acres) located in the commercial zone were probably so classified in order to accommodate the scattering of small neighborhood stores in the village (Tenorio et al., n.d.:18). In practice, residential use of the land predominates in the areas zoned as commercial.

Another example which points up the inapplicability of Umatac to administrative regulations made for the whole of Guam is seen in the shoreline regulations. An environmental protection law of 1968 prohibited any building within thirty-five and, in some cases, within twenty feet of the mean high water mark bounding the beach. This shoreline regulation, if enforced in Umatac, would have affected most of the housesites along Umatac and Toguan Bay. Umatac, because of its people's long tradition of living by the shore, falls under the exception included in the law (P.L.-163, effective March 7, 1968; Tenorio et al., n.d.:11).

While the village layout has remained basically unchanged, new habitation areas have been developed in lands located outside the village. This change has resulted from population growth. As Table 23 indicates, the population of Guam has increased especially between 1940 and 1950 due to post-war resettlement and reconstruction activity. After the war thousands of Americans came to Guam as a result of the military importance given to Guam by the U.S. Government as a highly strategic base in the Pacific (Haverlandt 1975 (VI):120).
Table 23
Population of Guam and Umatac Between 1940 and 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>22,290&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59,498</td>
<td>67,044</td>
<td>84,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatac</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Includes native men enlisted in U.S. Navy, but excludes United States Naval personnel


The population growth stabilized between 1950 and 1960 and continued to increase in the next decade as a result of the political and economic changes already stated. The migrant population (Filipinos, Koreans) and U.S. personnel settled where the economic opportunities existed, mostly in the central and northern side of the island (Tenorio et al., n.d.:12). As a result population increase has occurred mostly in Dededo (110.3 percent), Mongmong-Toto-Maite (100.9 percent) and Tamuning (71.9 percent) (Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstracts Guam 1974, 1975:3).

However, the population growth in Umatac contrasts to that experienced in the island as a whole (see Table 24). The reason given for the slow growth is that Umatac did not absorb either the military personnel or the construction workers and the alien labor component. The population increase in Umatac resulted from natural growth which was partially balanced by migration mostly to other villages in Guam and the U.S. mainland.
Table 24
Population Increase of Guam and Umatac Between 1940 and 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Increase by 10 years period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1940 to 1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>37,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatac</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstracts Guam 1974; Tenorio et al., n.d.:11.

Because of the slow rate of growth and the existing migration, the population in Umatac has not exerted extreme pressure on the land resources available as has been the case in other areas of Guam which had a resulting increase in land value, need to have the land subdivided for sale, urban development, and the expansion of the infrastructure. In support of this lack of pressure is the fact that while the number of registered land parcels in Guam increased by almost 65 percent between 1965 and 1972, in Umatac, they increased by only 8.9 percent for the same span of time (Tenorio et al., n.d.:17). This increase of registered land parcels includes private and government land. This lack of registered land has been a deterrent to development in Umatac.

Even though there has not been great population pressure resulting from accelerated growth, natural growth alone has brought about changes. When we compare the Umatac population figures from the nineteenth century (1897) with those of 1970, we see there has been an increase of 522
people. This increase has had an effect on land tenure and land use especially in lands outside the village area. In the village when we compare present figures with those of the 1897 population shown in Table 25, we see that the population density, a small increase per square meter, has remained stable.

Table 25
Population Density in Umatac Village\textsuperscript{a} in 1897 and 1975-1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Household Density</th>
<th>Population Density Square Meter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1897 Census and Writer's census.

The movement in Umatac has been towards areas considered farming areas when Umatac was mostly dependent for its subsistence on agriculture. Those who did not have land and whose claims to undivided land were not actualized, have moved into government land leased on a year-to-year basis (Savanna and East Ginahit). Some people have actualized their claims to undivided land in the Mandino and Salogna areas. Furthermore, some land has been subdivided and people obtained their legal title to the land in the West Ginahit area, where land is individually owned and where cement houses are more abundant than in any other part of the community. But still the pressure for housing is felt and people's needs for expansion poses problems.
It is interesting to note that regardless of the movement from the village out into the other areas, the frequent interaction between people in the village and people residing outside the village continues. This is possible because land in the village continues in the hands of the original landowners except for a few parcels owned by the government and other private owners. As a result of this situation, people who move outside the village have their parientes occupying housesites in the village. In fact, every household outside the village has relatives in one or various households in the village area. This fact constitutes a reinforcing element to the strong sense of community.

The Value of Land

In both traditional and modern Umatac land had economic and symbolic value. Economically, land is regarded as the basic component for subsistence activities, habitation and as a form of investment. From a symbolic viewpoint, land is the visible expression of people's link with their past and one of the means by which man's relationship to his environment is expressed. It gives people in Umatac a sense of rootness (identity) as they associate themselves with a distinct geographical area on the island. Within the municipality of Umatac people identify themselves with land parcels held in ownership by families since "long long time ago."

In traditional Umatac when people's livelihood was mostly derived from subsistence activities the economic value of land was pivotal. Having access to land constituted a security of having the means to satisfy people's basic necessities. People depended on farming, husbandry, and
fishing for their food; they obtained their building materials: ifil
wood, bamboo, and coconut palm fronds directly from the mountains, or
from their plantations. A 43-year-old informant recalls his father's
advice: "My son, be sure you keep this land; do not sell it, regard­
less of the price they offer you. If you own land, you can always have
a place where you can plant, a site to build your house." And a second
informant (50 years old) states: "In the old days, if my father gave me
land and I went ahead and sold it, this would have been considered
wrong."³

The secrecy surrounding land and land matters in traditional Umatac
is interpreted here as a strong indication of the importance attributed
to land as a means of economic security. According to informants,
people in the old days maintained an attitude of secrecy in matters
related to land. People say that their fathers seldom discussed with
their children the amount, or the importance, of the land they held. An
informant says: "In my family, we never knew my grandfather owned a
forty hectare parcel; we never talked about that land as if he were the
owner." A second informant stated that "land was the only thing the old
people owned and wanted to be in control of it until their death; they
were afraid land would be taken away and be left with nothing. The old
people were also afraid that if they showed some favoritism among their
children in discussing land matters, this would become a source of con­
flict among the siblings who eventually would be the ones inheriting the
family land."

Even though it is certain that land in traditional Umatac was
transferred for cash, the predominant pattern of land exchange was through
other than cash. Also prior to World War II a limited amount of land was mortgaged. Land records show that five land parcels located in the Cetti and Fouha areas were mortgaged by Lino Roberto from Agaña to the Western Commercial Company. After the mortgage period expired due to non-payment, the land was claimed by the company.

Today with the shift from a modified subsistence to a predominantly wage economy, there has been in people's opinions and in actual practice a decrease in land value for agricultural activities. People in Umatac think of themselves as being less dependent on the land and more dependent on wages as their livelihood; and consequently the cash value of land is stressed more than the value of land for subsistence activities.

The relative real estate value of land in Umatac has been discussed and compared to that in other parts of the island in Chapter VI. Related to the monetary value is the utilization of land as collateral to secure cash loans which in Umatac is mostly a modern development as Table 26 indicates.

Table 26
Mortages on Land in Umatac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Parcels</th>
<th>No. Mortgages</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-World War II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-World War II</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures from Land Management Records.
After World War II, a considerable number of land parcels were mortgaged from two to five times, mostly to banks, construction firms and loan corporations. Many of these mortgages were used by the people to finance the construction of new homes, or remodeling of old ones. Usually, the person or persons (often husband and wife) who mortgaged the property had individual claims to it. This means that the mortgagor had acquired the land either by distribution, a deed, or, as in sixteen cases, the owner of the land was in possession of a title certificate at the time of the mortgage. None of the mortgages occurred with undivided land.

With a change in the economic situation, the strong attachment to the land people in Umatac have had since traditional times is more symbolically expressed in modern times, and constitutes a visible expression of the people's link with their past. Umatac's people like to speak of family holdings as family possessions from "long time ago." People often refer to their lancho lands as the area where "the old people farmed" and like to associate their family farmland with childhood and adolescent memories. "When I was little, my father had cattle (between four and eight heads) and I used to help him. We tied the cattle with cords made out of the pagu (hibiscus tiliaceus) tree so they would not run loose. We had a good number of pigs which were kept within a pen. We bartered some of the pigs for things we needed, such as fish." Or, another informant recalls: "When I was small, my father farmed at Maaja; this land belonged to my uncle (FB) who allowed my father to farm and use the land as if it were his." A third informant says: "My father was a farmer and I helped him; he planted corn and the corn was twice my height."
Other memories go back to the period of the Japanese occupation of the island, a time when the people from Umatac were forced to move out of their village homes and settle in their farming areas. Now, people recall the exact location of their temporary housing and working areas. They stress their ability to live off the land without going hungry, as people in other parts of the island did. They single out and praise the knowledge old people had of the mountains and forest, which "they knew as their own home." "Thanks to this knowledge," they say, "the people from Umatac escaped from the Japanese soldiers, in a long march across the mountains, prior to the American reoccupation of the island."

A specific housesite is often referred to as "the place where my father was raised and my father's father." According to a land management staff member when people in a recent survey were asked to express their willingness to exchange their present housesites in the village for land parcels in another area of the municipality, only 3 percent of those in the survey agreed to the land exchange. The person's plea was: "I am not asking for more land, only to stay in my own place." Furthermore, when Umatac was hit by Typhoon Kim on November 9, 1977 and temporary shelter was offered to twenty-two families left homeless, twenty of them refused quarter in surplus government housing in Agat, the reason being they did not want to leave Umatac. A government official said: "These are very closely knit families and they just don't want to uproot themselves from this place" (Pacific Daily News, November 10, 1977). The reaction of these families to the event is consistent with similar attitudes observed by the writer after Typhoon Pamela caused widespread destruction in Umatac in 1976.
Connected with the concept of land having a symbolic value for people it is interesting to note that today, even within the family, land is seldom the topic of everyday conversation. Today, as in traditional times, secrecy about discussing land exists. Private land is considered a family matter. I infer that a person's concern about other people's land is viewed with suspicion and that this is based on past land grabs. People have expressed fear at being cheated; for example, people believe that boundary markers should be strong, such as trees, because people cannot move them. Also, people have mentioned that, sometimes, the boundaries of a given land parcel have been moved at the time of land surveys.

People are reluctant to speak about land, especially in those cases where land is still unsurveyed and undivided as people are often unsure of other people's intentions when dealing with land. I heard a woman who was the administrator for her family say: "I am afraid that, if my brother could override me, he would sell the land. This is what is happening in some families, and I am afraid this is going to happen in ours." I was told that after World War II a resident obtained a land parcel from another relative as an exchange for a small unpaid grocery bill. As informants say, the land is now worth thousands of dollars and they think the one who transferred the land was cheated.

However, despite secrecy, people in Umatac are well informed as to the present ownership of the land parcels in and outside the village, especially those which are considered undivided parcels. People easily recall those transactions which were unusual, or which cause controversy among the family; for example, a piece of land that was sold without any consideration to a former verbal agreement, or land which was sold for
very little money in present times. But, if people are asked about land in the area by an outsider, they are reluctant to talk about any other than their own family land or about land he/she has claim to. For information concerning other people's land, people prefer that information be given by those who own the land, or have claims to it. They are, however, willing to indicate the name of the person who would be most knowledgeable about the land in that family.
NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Smith writes "there is a patrilineal bias in Rotanese intergenerational land transactions and the principle of priority of Male heir's claims (a daughter never receives land at the expense of a son) is the most direct expression of it." (1971:162). Smith enters a set of six normative principles on how a man comes to decisions about the distribution of his land to heirs: (1) equal distribution of inheritable land; (2) priority of spouse's claim; (3) priority of last-married heir's claim; (4) priority of male heir's claim; (5) minimal area of divisible parcels and (6) assignment of a trustee (1972:158-165).

2. Spoehr reports that the youngest receive larger amounts of land for reasons similar to those given by informants in Umatac. Smith found no specific distinction attributed to the kiridu in land matters. He says that some of the characteristics Chamorros in Saipan attribute to the youngest child, in Rota are attributed to the last-married heir residing in the household. He/she has "ultimate claim to one house site. This principle . . . is based on an ethic of service, wherein unmarried offspring remain in the household and render assistance to their parents. By virtue of longer service, the last married heir establishes a claim to the household site or some other sitio" (1972:161).

3. Spoehr writes that the core of Chamorro land can be summarized in the following remark: "'When a Chamorro thinks of land, he thinks of his children, and of how much land he should have to provide for them. This is always uppermost in his thoughts'" (1954:144).

4. Even though people say that in the old days their ancestors were able to live off the produce of the land, they realize today that it is no longer possible to grow what they need for subsistence because of the population increase. Informants say that the old people knew there was a limited amount of land and that the soil conditions were such that the land needed to be rotated every five years (e.g., a plot was worked for five consecutive years and then allowed to lie fallow). Today, the people of Umatac view farming as a supplementary activity but not one from which most of the families in the community would obtain their livelihood.

5. In general housing conditions in Umatac are not suitable to withstand the strong typhoons that affect the island of Guam. In 1975, of the 122 housing units occupied by 123 households only 20 houses (16.3 percent) were made of concrete and only six of them were built with concrete roof slabs. The rest of the houses were either tin (66 units or 54 percent) or wood structures (37 units or 30.3 percent) (Government of Guam, Housing Survey). Most of the present structures have been built after 1940.
CHAPTER VIII
CONCLUSION

As I stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study is twofold: (1) to fill an existing gap in the study of Micronesian societies by focusing on a Guamanian community which has not been studied, and (2) to describe and explain change over time in an island society where traditional elements are still present.

To facilitate the description and comparison I have designed two historical periods: traditional and modern. Within each period I have established a temporal baseline. The traditional baseline period was 1865 and 1899, and the modern one I have designated as being from the end of World War II to the time of my fieldwork (1945-1976). In the study of change in Umatac I have concentrated on the following aspects: social relations, especially kinship relations, the economy, land use and land tenure.

In considering the first aspect the focus has been on social relations connected with (1) stages in the life cycle of an individual (birth, marriage and death); (2) land tenure and land use; and (3) the yearly celebration of the fiesta. Here, existing social relations between people in non-related households within Umatac, or between those in Umatac with non-related households outside the community have been included.

The economic aspect has been studied in terms of the dominant activities by which people have obtained their livelihood, that is,
subsistence (farming, animal husbandry, fishing, _tuba_ making, hunting, weaving, and salt making), and wage activities. The household has been reviewed as the basic economic unit and the involvement of its members in both subsistence and wage activities have been described. These two sets of activities have been examined within the framework of an island-wide economy pointing out an existing relationship between island-wide economic conditions and their impact on Umatac economy.

Land tenure and land use constitute the third aspect studied. As a prelude, the historical development of the land tenure system from traditional to modern times has been presented. Here, concepts of land ownership, degree of control, laws and regulations of the Spanish and American colonial systems have been stated as the framework within which Umatac land tenure and land use systems operate. These findings support a basic assumption stated in Chapter I that the modern system of land tenure as exercised in Umatac is derived from concepts of land ownership that were introduced by the Spanish government during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and that these concepts were in operation between 1850 and 1899. Next, in the description of the land tenure and land use domain in traditional and modern times I have integrated both the ideational and operational levels. Basic components of land tenure included are those explaining the origin of title and access to land rights, the ways land rights are allocated, exercised and transferred, and the value of land (economic and symbolic). Land use has been examined in terms of subsistence activities, economic development and habitation.

From the description, examination and comparison of data on social relations, the economy, land use and land tenure from the viewpoint of
change, we realize that changes have occurred by descending order of
importance in the economy, land tenure and land use, and social relations.
A primary contributing factor to change has been the shift from a modified
subsistence economy to a wage economy which occurs in Umatac as a result
of island-wide changes after World War II. The change is reflected in
new occupations, the disappearance of certain crops and farming techniques,
the laying idle of the best farming lands, a decrease in the economic
importance of land for subsistence activities, the use of money rather
than barter as the medium of land exchange and the increased usage of
land as collateral to secure loans. Concurrent with all those changes
there have been elements which have remained, for example, the importance
attributed to small-scale subsistence activities. Here it is important
to notice that massive changes resulting from economic development similar
to those experienced in the central and northern part of the island have
not occurred in Umatac where on account of environmental conditions the
amount of land favorable for subsistence, habitation and development is
limited.

Changes in both land tenure and land use have occurred both at the
ideational and behavior level and are mostly the result of economic,
political, administrative and demographic factors. Ideologically and mainly
as a result of the decrease in agriculture, people in Umatac admit changes
in their perception of the value of land, the importance of a verbal
agreement, the significance of keeping the land within the family. These
changes are expressed by contrasting present attitudes to those in the
past (old people, or the time before the war). Also, people perceive
that those changes have taken place at a faster pace during the last few
years. In reality the sudden shift in power from Spain to the United States left land matters regarding private ownership and land boundaries of certain parcels unsettled. This condition proved to be a facilitating element in support of government claims to unsurveyed lands. Furthermore, after 1950 the codification of procedures which directly affected the acquisition, exercise and conveyance of land gave people a specific procedure to solve problems of land ownership in cases when the landowner had died without a will. In many instances changes in the traditional manner of land inheritance were introduced. Concurrently, the untested legal title reinforced the process initiated in traditional times of individual ownership. Some of these lands were sold to out-of-Umatac businessmen during the time the island underwent rapid economic change (1950-1974) and I assume the incentive of receiving cash for land led to legal distribution. Finally, demographic changes, mostly as a result of natural growth created the need for new lands for habitation which resulted in changes in land use and actualization of rights to undivided land.

Despite changes in land ownership, as stated above, people's control of their ancestral holdings within the family has been maintained in most cases. The reasons which account for this continuance within the economic, political administrative framework already mentioned are: (1) the predominance of a patrilineal pattern in land transfers within a flexible bilateral system. In some instances within a family land has been transferred patrilineally from the third to the present generation; and (2) the adherence to a flexible criteria followed in land transfers both during a person's lifetime (gift, deed, warranty deed) or after a landholder's death (inheritance or distribution) based, by decreasing order of
importance on sex, amount of land available, age, marital status, residency and sequence of marriage; and (3) the adherence to the traditional system of undivided land.

Regardless of the court procedures established to obtain individual title to the land, many lands especially outside the village have remained undivided under the legal ownership of a deceased traditional landholder. This condition represents a modified continuation of the traditional system of land tenure where rights to land were held by a father and his children, or when upon his death the sibling group kept the land without having it legally divided. This is treated in this study as an adaptive mechanism based on traditional patterns which delay family conflicts, allows for multiple land use and avoids land parcelling. Conversely, this is linked to economic changes. The existence of a large number of undivided land parcels has been possible on account of the decrease in the importance of land for agriculture, the reliance of people's livelihood on wages, and the lack of economic development in Umatac. The decrease in agriculture and people's dependence on wages for their livelihood have lowered the land pressure especially on those lands formerly cultivated and at present left idle; being most of those undivided lands. The lack of economic development in the area has diminished the pressure to have those lands divided for sale to outside investors. In the case of the "village" the continuance of lot size and land use is attributed to the lack of zoning regulations up to 1952, to the inapplicability of some of the regulations after 1952, and/or the preference of people for the village as the main habitation area.
With regard to the impact of change on the social relations aspect of Umatac community, we note that the continuing importance of the nuclear household as the basic social unit has facilitated the fulfillment of kinship obligations especially at events connected with the life cycle of an individual. Furthermore, the importance of the fiesta associated with the preparation and sharing of food in the households has continued despite a decreasing importance in the religious nature of the fiesta. In fact, the importance of the fiesta at the household level has not only been continued but strengthened. Its functional character of reinforcing ties between those people in Umatac and persons outside the community is adaptive to meet present needs and conditions. Finally, within the kindred the persistent criterion followed for gradation of kindred obligations according to specific circumstances, needs, constitutes an adaptive mechanism to changing conditions (e.g., the increasing number of parientes) as experienced in Umatac from traditional to modern times.

Changes in marriage patterns and the consequent decrease in the number of endogamous marriages from traditional to modern times is attributed to increased communication between people from Umatac and those from outside the community. This again is related to economic changes: changes in occupations which take people to work outside Umatac and improvement in the modes of transport and the opening of the road between Umatac and Agat. However, in cases of endogamous marriage the ambivalence of the norms as emically expressed has continually been used to reconcile the actual discrepancy between ideology of preferred marriage and actual behavior. Furthermore, the frequency of marriage to parientes has been continuously higher among landowning families than among landless families.
In conclusion, we can say that in Umatac social relations, economy, land tenure and land-use form an interrelated set of beliefs and patterns of behavior which serve to reinforce each other.

In Umatac, economic change has helped to maintain old patterns of land tenure by taking off the pressure from the land which resulted from natural population growth. As a whole, economic changes were found to more likely affect land tenure and land use than social relations. The environment, by limiting the amount of choices people make concerning land tenure and land use has positively contributed to maintain the social system. The existence of all these elements as contributing factors demonstrated that no one element can exclusively account for changes or for continuity, and that the study of change as well as the study of continuity is a complex one which requires an integrated approach. Also, it shows that a study of a society where land records are available requires both a historical and an ethnographical approach in order to provide for a comprehensive view of the problem under study.
APPENDIX A

FIELDWORK AND DATA ANALYSIS

In the selection of Umatac as the site for my study, my first-hand knowledge of Guam (I lived there between 1969 and 1972) was a decisive factor. I also discussed the choice with Laura Souder, a fellow student and friend from Guam attending the University of Hawaii. Later on, I had the opportunity to talk to Paul Souder, former Director of the Land Management Office in Guam. We discussed the validity as well as the feasibility of the study in Umatac. Furthermore, Sister Cecilia Tudela, herself a Chamorro from Saipan and a resident of Agaña Heights in Guam, was instrumental in making the necessary arrangements for my stay in Umatac with a local family. Previous to my departure from Honolulu I had received word that the Aguon family (Joe and Tita) had agreed I could stay in their home.

I am stressing all these points because they say something about Guam and about the effectiveness of a person's reliance on a network of relatives and/or friends for answering needs or solving problems. It is my belief, based on experience, that in Guam a personal contact is the most effective way to get things done. This in turn engenders reciprocity. Hence, from the very beginning of my fieldwork I experienced and participated in the Chamorro system of reciprocal obligations.

The criteria for the selection of the site for the fieldwork are based on the following factors:

1. The size of the community of Umatac enters within the range which allows for participant observation; that is, it is within the size range which can be studied by one anthropologist within the reasonable time period of little more than a year.
2. From the standpoint of people in Guam, Umatac offers very distinctive characteristics which emphasize the existence of a continuum from the past more than any other village in Guam. Also, available historical and archaeological evidence reinforces this view.

3. The geographical and social boundaries of Umatac are much more clearly defined than in most villages in Guam. Therefore, I felt it would be easier to identify and isolate elements affecting the society in contributing to change and continuity, more so than in a less isolated or less clearly defined village.

4. Umatac is representative of the other villages in the southern part of Guam (Merizo, Taloffofo, Inaranjan) which in general are considered more traditional than villages in any other part of Guam. In the future, a similar study in a northern village might be conducted which should yield interesting comparisons and contrasts.

5. No previous study had been conducted in Umatac.

My fieldwork lasted from August 1975 to October 1976 with a short break in April when I went to Saipan to attend the celebration for the signing of the Marianas Covenant. A few days after my arrival in Guam in early August I drove with a friend to Umatac who introduced me to the Aguon family. We talked about the purpose of my study and the length of my stay in the village. It was agreed I could move to their house the following week. On August 21, I was again welcomed by the Aguons who prepared food for me and the friends who accompanied me. This was my
introduction to Umatac and to Umatac hospitality, and it was through Joe and Tita Aguon and their family that I became acquainted with, and accepted by, the people in the community.

The first event I attended after moving in with the Aguon family was a bela (24-hour wake) which took place on August 22. I was invited by Tita Aguon to accompany her. A bela is attended by the villagers as well as out-of-Umatac people and at this bela I was introduced to Tita's parientes and friends. A few days later Joe Aguon introduced me to Albert T. Topasna, the Commissioner of Umatac. Albert offered me space in his office to work and invited me to the next weekly meeting of all the commissioners in Guam. The meeting was held on August 28 in Agaña. At the meeting I was asked to explain the purpose and nature of my research to Governor Bordallo and to the commissioners and then I listened to their suggestions. This represented the official stamp for my fieldwork.

**Participant Observation**

My stay at the Aguon's household gave me the opportunity to follow the daily routine at home and in the village. As a member of the household I participated in the extensive network of social relations and their corresponding obligations. This led me to interact with a large number of people in different parts of the community. At the numerous events I attended, such as small family gatherings, fandanggo(s), christening parties, etc., I joined the women's group in cooking and shared in whatever task was assigned to them. At the beginning I watched more than worked until I began to acquaint myself with the cooking and food preparation techniques. These were precious opportunities for learning
more about the Chamorro language, social interaction, and cultural norms. The result was not only significant data collected but also an increasing sense of obligation to reciprocate on my part. At times as a member of the household and at other times as an individual, I responded or initiated action which allowed me to reciprocate or to accept other people's reciprocity.

After a little while, as a resident of Umatac, I soon realized that Umatac people are constantly on the move because they have to depend on facilities outside the village -- hospital, shopping areas, government services. A car proved to be a basic necessity on an island with no public transportation. Then, simultaneously, I combined ethnographic techniques (participant observation, interviewing, census-taking) in the community with the collection of data from archival and library sources. This proved to be helpful and allowed for constant cross-checking, generated new questions, and allowed me to see the relationship between the two approaches. At times, I conducted interviews with former residents of Umatac who were now residing in other villages, such as Dededo in northern Guam and about forty minutes drive from Umatac.

**Census Taking**

Prior to taking a census, it was necessary for me to learn the nicknames as well as the names of adults in the community. I did this with the help of some informants. Very often people are better known by their nicknames. Also, when there is more than one person with the same personal name and family name (a frequent occurrence), one way to differentiate them is by either mentioning their nickname or by adding the name of the husband or wife, e.g., Ana is mentioned in conversation
and I want to know which Ana they are talking about, and the answer to my enquiry is Anan Joaquin, after her husband. So my remembering both names and nicknames of the heads of each household was very useful in recognizing people in conversation or when enquiring about them.

A second step was to map the village. I produced a rough sketch with the household locations which I utilized for the census. Later on I obtained a rather complete household map from the Guam Power Authority.

After a short time in the village I began the household census, a painstaking job due to the existence of 123 households. Tita Aguon, Terrie Fejarang (from Mangilao and a former student of mine at the University of Guam), Josefina A. Sanchez and Mae A. Calanda helped me at different stages. Tita was perhaps the most appropriate person for the role of introducing me because she was well-liked in the community and was welcomed into everyone's home. Tital introduced me and in Chamorro explained the purpose of my study. Then I asked the questions for the census and recorded the answers. In addition, I asked three questions concerning subsistence activities. The census taking was a long process, first because it was restricted for the most part to the evening hours when people were home and, secondly, because in most houses visited the people offered us something to eat or drink. This is an expression of hospitality which I could not refuse but it also limited the number of households I could visit in one evening because of the time consumed. Concurrently, the census taking provided an invaluable opportunity for becoming acquainted with the people in the community. Often there was further conversation on subjects unrelated to the questions contained in the census. So while the census took more time than I had anticipated, it
also provided me with invaluable data through the informality of the conversation.

**Genealogical Data**

I had access to genealogies collected in the 1950s in Umatac which was part of some research to ascertain causes of the high incidence of a disease known as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (litiku; the term litiku is used also for parkinsonian dementia). These genealogies were kept at a research unit of the Guam Memorial Hospital. Additionally, I collected genealogies for every male or female head of each household who was not included in the previously cited genealogies. Further information was added from birth, marriage, and death records at both the Office of Vital Statistics in Mangilao and at the Chancery Office of the Catholic Diocese in Agaña.

**Land Data from Land Records**

I was able to obtain access to the research facilities at the Land Management Office. With the help of Terrie Fejarang I recorded the land history for every single land parcel in the municipality of Umatac—a total of 204 parcels of land. This information was combined with data from informants. For the interviews with the informants it was necessary to learn and identify the names of the land parcels as people referred to lands outside the strictly "village area" by their names. Later on, I transferred all the information I obtained from records and informants, to forms I had prepared. This proved very useful for coding the land data for the computer. People at the Land Management Office were very helpful in providing information and in answering questions about the different
types of land transfers. Further information was obtained at the Department of Revenue and Taxation, as some lands had been first registered when the first tax assessment roll was compiled in 1941. Data on housing conditions were provided by the Housing Office which allowed me to use its most recent survey, conducted in the Fall of 1975.

Following Goodenough's methodology (1951:1) and after completing the genealogies and land ownership histories, I correlated the land holdings with the genealogies, tracing each land parcel back to its original owner. In some cases I was able to identify ownership back to the 1800s. This was the first step to illuminate the continuity in land transfers and the patrilineal bias which existed within the bilateral principle of land inheritance.

Interviews

In addition to the informal interviews conducted during the participant observation activities, I conducted more formal interviews. By this I mean that the interview was arranged and agreement occurred between the informant and myself concerning date, place, and topic. Topics ranged from general life in Umatac to specifics of land, marriage, and kindred obligations. In these interviews I used a tape recorder if the informant felt comfortable with this technique; if not, I just took notes. These interviews involved one, two, three, or four persons. With some informants I prepared a set of 3 x 5 cards with one question recorded on each. The informant read the question and the answer was recorded on tape. Informants generally liked this method very much and it proved a practical one in the process of transcribing the tape. Another technique which proved useful
was to play back the tape, and the informant then added whatever information he felt was missing. Female informants were very knowledgeable about nobenas, food preparation, and life cycle events while male informants provided most of the information on land.

Description and Analysis of Endogamous Marriages

In order to elicit information concerning the existing consanguineal relations between a given pair of spouses among approximately 1,113 persons listed in the genealogical charts, I relied primarily on one fifty-year-old male informant. This individual was greatly interested in and especially knowledgeable about genealogies in Umatac. For each pair of spouses he indicated (1) if they were parientes or not, (2) whether the parientes relationship was on the mother's or father's side of either spouse, (3) what type of other genealogical relationship existed, if this was known. If the informant was not sure about a relationship, then he himself went and asked some of the elders in the community or indicated to me the person or persons who were knowledgeable for me to go and ask them. Often the relationship between two spouses classified as being one of parientes was described in the following manner: "both are Quinata," e.g., A and B call each other primos (cousins) or the grandparents of A and B were primos. Often the origin of the relationship was not known. On certain occasions we were able to identify the reason people said that A and B were related by looking at genealogies reconstructed from birth, marriage, and death records. This occurred mainly with people related beyond the third ascending generation. From this tiresome exercise I realized that adults in the community knew in general who is related to whom to the second ascending generation.
The Unexpected

Even though I had been familiar with typhoons in Guam and in Micronesia, I did not expect a typhoon to be part of the fieldwork experience. However, not one but three were experienced during my stay in Umatac. Two of these typhoons were spent at the typhoon shelter (public school) where half of the community gathered. There, we shared food, anxiety, laughter, cooking, praying, and cleaning. The shelter was for three days, on each of these occasions, a microcosm of life in Umatac. Families were sheltered in different classrooms and the arrangement provided for relatives to stay together. People visited parientes (relatives) in the different classrooms. A mass was said by the local priest in the school cafeteria and the children played and laughed as if they were in the middle of San Dionisio street, the main street in the village.

Typhoon Pamela (the strongest one of the three) was a depressing experience as the Aguon residence, and many others in Umatac, were destroyed. I thereafter resided temporarily in Agaña Heights and commuted to Umatac until the house was rebuilt.

Further Archival Research

Upon my return from the field and while spending three months in Spain on personal matters, I did further research on Spanish land tenure and early ethnohistorical material at the Biblioteca Nacional, Archivo Histórico Nacional, and Biblioteca de Cultural Hispánica; all three in Madrid, and at the Biblioteca de la Diputación in Bilbao.
Data Analysis

Upon my return to Honolulu at the end of January 1977, I coded and key punched all the genealogical and land tenure data for the computer. I received advice and help from Michael J. Levin and applied some of his methods. An exception was that the genealogical data were directly punched from the charts I had constructed. A much easier and more economical method is that suggested to me later by Levin which allows the fieldworker to prepare the data for the computer while in the field. The print-out with all the genealogies proved extremely helpful in the analysis of land tenure. For a detailed account of the method see Levin (1975:269-336).

The computer revealed some of the biological relationships between spouses although it was not complete data. Levin's method provides data on biological relations between spouses when complete data for each pair of spouses are entered up to four or five generations. In my case this was not feasible and so the computer analysis showed a certain number of relationships but not completely. Therefore, I relied for the most part on the information obtained from the informants, as I have previously explained.

From genealogical and marriage data on about 1,113 people (18 families), I proceeded to focus on data concerning 374 people from five selected families. I focused on these five families for the following reasons. First, in a preliminary analysis of each of the 18 families I found that the highest rate of endogamy existed among these five families. Secondly, I assumed that by focusing on the patterns of marriage in each of these families I could arrive at a general view of the degree of local
endogamy. Also, these families were among those with a considerable amount of landholdings.

I examined the marriages in the five selected families which had occurred approximately between 1850 and 1960. For each of the 374 people involved I considered two choices: marriage to a pariente or marriage to other than a pariente (from Umatac or elsewhere). Out of the total, 158 people (42.2 percent), including 76 males and 80 females, had selected a pariente for spouse. Next I examined the results of the endogamous choice by sex, residence, and how the relationship for considering it an endogamous marriage was established (e.g., through either the mother or father. From this, I formed certain generalizations about local endogamy and its possible relation to the maintenance of the land tenure system.

The cartographer Clyde Kanehiro compiled partial maps from different scales into a complete map which was the basis from which I developed the concept of the existing continuity in the patterns of land ownership in Umatac from traditional to modern times.
APPENDIX B

HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

An examination of the members in each of the 123 households results in the following groupings:

II. Nuclear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Husband, wife, with or without offspring. The average number of offspring is 4.16 in the 1-32 age bracket</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Husband, wife, resident offspring and kinsmen of either or both husband and wife. The average number of children in this category is 3.07. It includes the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. wife's parientes include: mother, divorced sister, with or without offspring, brother's daughter, nephew, widowed father.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. husband's parientes include: unmarried brothers, a niece and a widowed mother.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. one household includes both wife's and husband's parientes.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Widow, widower, with unmarried offspring and/or other parientes.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Single, divorcee, separated from the husband, with or without resident offspring. The number of offspring ranges from 1 to 5 in the 3-21 age bracket. Included in this category we find the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. two unmarried female siblings with their resident offspring and a male sibling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. an unmarried female with her offspring, her divorced sibling with her offspring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. an 84 year old widow</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Extended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Husband, wife, resident offspring including those daughters separated from</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their husbands, or widowed, and their offspring. The number of grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranges from 1 to 4 in the 1-10 age bracket.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Husband, wife, with or without resident offspring, married son or</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter and their spouses and their offspring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Widower with or without offspring, married son and/or married daughter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and their spouses and offspring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Widow, with or without unmarried resident offspring, with or without</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son, and wife, and their offspring, married daughter, and spouse, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their offspring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Widow with resident offspring and her widowed mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor in the 26-40 bracket</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C
#### SOIL DESCRIPTION AND CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Group &amp; Land Type</th>
<th>Basic Soil Components of Soil Groups</th>
<th>Underlying Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Soil Unit</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rock Kind &amp; Engr. geol. unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silty clay (MI)</strong></td>
<td>Red, granular Atate clay (a Latosol); deep, reddish, mottled, plastic to hard C horizon, pale yellow, olive or gray in lower part; and a truncated Latosol, Agat clay, with a similar C horizon.</td>
<td>Volc. tuff 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silty clay (MI)</strong></td>
<td>10-100</td>
<td>Tuff-congl. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sandy silt (SM)</strong></td>
<td>Chiefly Agat clay (a truncated Latosol) and Aman clay (a Regosol) with some dark grayish brown Lithosols and small areas of rock outcrop, boulders, and cobbles.</td>
<td>Basalt flows 8 and dikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silty clay</strong></td>
<td>Deep, noncalcareous, varicolored, firm, plastic Pago clay, with gray motting below 24 to 30 inches, occasionally flooded, moderately to well drained.</td>
<td>Limesand, limestone, volc. rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Silty clay</strong></td>
<td>10-150</td>
<td>Any except 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peat and highly organic silts (Pt)</strong></td>
<td>Muck. Generally submerged, highly organic soils; silty muck and peat contains 20 to 50% decomposed organic matter.</td>
<td>Limesand, limestone, volc. rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poorly graded sand</strong></td>
<td>Pale brown to white, fine, medium or coarse grained limesand called Shioya soils; contains some dark organic coloring and less than 10% fines in top 6 to 10 inches.</td>
<td>Limestone, volc. rock, sediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artificial fill</strong></td>
<td>3-35</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artificial fill</strong></td>
<td>Limestone, volc. rock, sediments</td>
<td>Mapped as made land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Mechanical analyses did not correlate with other tests which designated the soil to this group.
3. See Engineering Geology tables, and map for descriptions and locations of the rock types.
4. Refers to shape of the soil surface
5. The consistence of the clays ranges from moderately plastic (wet) through friable to firm (moist) to hard (dry).
6. Rock is considered to be material whose hardness renders ineffective a 4 inch jeep mounted auger designed for drilling in earth and saprolite.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Group</th>
<th>Soil Area</th>
<th>Prevailing Gradients of Soil Surface (%)</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Soil Description (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silty clay (M1) in upper part</td>
<td>6 &amp; 6.20</td>
<td>1.15 Gently sloping ridgetops and adjacent swales; includes some steeper slopes near ravine heads.</td>
<td>tens or hundreds</td>
<td>Savannah grassland and herbaceous vegetation with erosion scars, shrubs, and fern; swordgrass dense. Small ironwood trees in many places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy silt (SM) in lower part</td>
<td>7 &amp; 17.50</td>
<td>15.50 Predominantly hilly upland with some small areas of gently sloping ground</td>
<td>tens or hundreds</td>
<td>Savannah; with mixed forest in some ravine heads or parts of valleys not repeatedly burned; undergrowth spiny.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silty clay (M1)</td>
<td>9 &amp; 1.75</td>
<td>1.3 Narrow to moderately wide valley bottoms and alluvial fans</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>Varied locally; mixed forest, secondary thicket and cultivated ground, coconut plantations; open ground and pasture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat and highly organic soils (PI)</td>
<td>10 &amp; 1.72</td>
<td>0-1 Coastal flats and wide valley bottoms</td>
<td>tenths</td>
<td>Open ground and pasture; locally swamp forest or dense growth of giant reeds or other marsh plants where almost continuously ponded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly graded sand, few or no fines</td>
<td>12 &amp; 1.78</td>
<td>1-5 Discontinuous, low, narrow coastal terraces</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>Heavy stands of large reeds (Phragmites karka) and scattered trees (Hibiscus silicaceus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>14 &amp; 0.71</td>
<td>Nearly level Shallow to deep artificial fill extending coastal areas or building up coastal flats</td>
<td>very few</td>
<td>Mostly bare ground with buildings or installations; some scattered vines, shrubs, and thin grasses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Soil Drainage and Erosion Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOIL GROUP</th>
<th>Basic Soil PERMEABILITY (^1)</th>
<th>WATER TABLE</th>
<th>NATURAL DRAINAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corps of Engineers Classification</td>
<td>Soil Unit COEFFICIENT</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silty clay (MH) in upper part</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 to 100 ft below surface; average 50 ft</td>
<td>Slow to medium; rapid on exposed C horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy silt (SM) in lower part</td>
<td>7 (k = 10^3) (near surface) to (10^8) (at depth)</td>
<td>0 to 100 ft below surface; average 50 ft</td>
<td>Slow on concave surfaces; rapid on convex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silty clay (MH) in lower part</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 to 100 ft below surface</td>
<td>Rapid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent and highly organic silts</td>
<td>9 (k = 10^4) to (10^9)</td>
<td>3 to 50 ft below surface; average 5 to 25 ft</td>
<td>Rapid to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly graded sand; few or no fines</td>
<td>11 (k &gt; 10^6)</td>
<td>0 to 1 ft below surface</td>
<td>Medium to slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly graded sand; few or no fines</td>
<td>12 (k &gt; 10^3)</td>
<td>3 to 25 ft below surface</td>
<td>No surface flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly graded sand; few or no fines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5 to 25 ft below surface</td>
<td>Very slow to none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Permeability equations refer to any soil in the corresponding engineering classification, but are for generalized whole profiles and are based upon tests made on similar soils from other areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOIL GROUP</th>
<th>Basic Soil Unit</th>
<th>CORRECTION DRAINAGE</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION DRAINAGE</th>
<th>Subsurface Drainage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silver clay (Mi) in upper part</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diversion dikes needed on uphills sides of excavations</td>
<td>Prevent ponding or channeling of surface drainage</td>
<td>Adequate subsoil drains required for depressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy silt (SM) in lower part</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Diversion dikes needed, Design for maximum runoff</td>
<td>Design for maximum runoff; avoid overflow or ponding</td>
<td>Perched water table in many low areas; seepage from hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silty clay (Mi)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Extensive precautions needed, see Unit 7</td>
<td>Protection costly; design for maximum runoff</td>
<td>Perched water table in many low areas; seepage from hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mi)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Occasional severe flooding, design for maximum runoff</td>
<td>Occasional severe flooding, design for maximum runoff</td>
<td>Seepage in some areas; pumping required below water table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat and highly organic silts (Pze)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Frequent severe flooding, design for maximum runoff</td>
<td>Frequent severe flooding, design for maximum runoff</td>
<td>High water table; sheeting and pumping may be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly graded sand, few or no fines (SP)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Remove peat; design for high water table and flooding</td>
<td>Remove peat; design for high water table and flooding</td>
<td>Remove peat; design for high water table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Subject to typhoon floods and encroaching high seas</td>
<td>Subject to typhoon floods and encroaching high seas</td>
<td>Water table fluctuates rapidly; light sheeting and pumping required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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