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Abstract

Since the 1960s, Guam's tourism industry has emerged as the predominant source of annual revenues in the island's economy. However, as this thesis demonstrates, the origins of tourism can be traced to the formation of touristic discourses in American military writings about Guam and the Chamorro people throughout the twentieth century. Even prior to the official onset of American colonialism in 1898, militaristic writings feminized the Chamorro people as hospitable natives and Guam as a fertile paradise, portraying the island and people as welcoming and inviting of exploration, recreation, and, ultimately, military and economic exploitation. Furthermore, these militaristic writings familiarized the island through processes of mapping and naming—processes which ultimately obstructed military authors' from understanding and appreciating Chamorro notions of culture and land. This thesis demonstrates the construction on Guam of a discourse of militourism in which converged militaristic and touristic imaginations and policies.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Hafa adai! Welcome to the beautiful island of Guam!
(Fujita 11)

Say ‘tropical island’ and you immediately think of white, sandy beaches, swaying palms and magnificent azure waters. That describes Guam perfectly.
(“An Island Lifestyle” 30)

Introducing Militourism

The first of the phrases above is pulled from the pages of a monthly tourist publication called Guam Now, targeted primarily to an audience of Japanese visitors to the island. Guam, the southernmost of the Mariana Islands in the Western Pacific, is today a popular tourist site, attracting more than a million tourists annually. The fact of tourism’s success should come as no surprise given that “tourism is the world’s largest industry” (R. Wood 1).

The second passage above comes from the 1997 edition of Welcome to Guam, a glossy magazine filled with pictures and paragraphs about Guam’s history, geography, people, and climate. Both of these magazines employ paradisiacal language to convey information about places to eat, shop, and rest. These publications also contain maps of Guam’s villages, roads, beaches, and popular tourist sites. After carefully reading the content of both magazines, one gets the sense that the authors of these publications are familiar with Guam’s overall environment and landscape, as well as with the indigenous Chamorro inhabitants of the Mariana Islands. Like tour guides, these tourist brochures “offer familiarity with the local environment” (Gurung, Simmons, and Devlin 113) and “ready solutions to the problems of what to see, how to get there and how to deal with the
locals on arrival” (109). The rhetoric employed by these two magazines also appears to be homogenous—that is, one would be hard pressed to match the above two quotes with their respective publications. Yet there is at least one major aspect that distinguishes Welcome to Guam from Guam Now.

Unlike Guam Now which “welcomes” a Japanese and English speaking tourist audience, Welcome to Guam speaks to another visiting crowd—the United States military. Military installations on Guam, an unincorporated territory or colony of the US, currently harbor Navy and Air Force personnel and dependents as part of the US military stronghold in the Western Pacific. According to a Department of Defense survey of military personnel stationed in Guam in 1995, the number of active duty service members residing on island at that time was 5,509 (35). Welcome to Guam is just one of several magazines which are provided to military families during their tour of duty on the island in order to educate them about the peoples and places which make up contemporary Guam. Despite Welcome to Guam’s assertion that it is “in no way connected with the Department of Defense,” it showcases letters of welcome from various military commanders on the island, as well as numerous articles about military objectives and historical overviews of military installations such as Naval Activities, formerly known as Naval Station, situated in the village of Sumay (4). There are other publications which appeal to US military audiences, yet continue to deny any involvement with military policies and interests in Guam. Perhaps these journals dismiss the fact that the information of various military discourses intersect, parallel, or contradict each other whether they are published by the Department of Defense or by private organizations.
The increasing presence of military discourses in so-called non-military tourist publications about Guam indicates the pervasiveness of twentieth-century militarism. In this thesis, I employ a definition of militarism as elaborated by Bob Aldridge and Ched Myers, two journalists interested in issues of nuclearism in the Pacific. In their book *Resisting the Serpent: Palau's Struggle for Self-Determination*, they view militarism as not only the obvious manifestations of organized violence, i.e., the dozens of wars currently raging around the globe, the huge standing armies, or the proliferation of nuclear arms. We mean also the steady militarization of economics and politics (and even more dramatically geopolitics), the hegemony of military establishments in the division of technological labor and genius, and the subservience of social thought to ideologies of 'national security.' In fact, so ubiquitous and monopolizing are those complex, interlocking systems, that we might legitimately refer to militarism as the true 'colonial master' of the modern era, under whose *de facto* control more and more peoples have fallen prey. (xx)

This thesis will demonstrate some of the military's "complex, interlocking systems" of control as they contribute to the ideological formation of Guam's tourism industry.

*Assignment Guam*, a military magazine, evidences how these "interlocking systems" work in the context of tourist and militarist propaganda in Guam.

Similar in content and format to *Welcome to Guam*, the military magazine *Assignment Guam* denies its connections to the Department of Defense, claiming that it is "in no way connected with the U.S. Navy or the U.S. Air Force" (1). Yet this would appear to be contradicted by the publication of the welcoming remarks from two high-ranking military officials. The first commentary comes from the commander of the Naval forces in the Marianas and the second is written by the commander of the 36th Air Base Wing at Andersen Air Force Base. Martin E. Janczak, Rear Admiral of US Naval Forces
Marianas, greets his military audience by stating that Assignment Guam “has been created by both Navy and Air Force personnel to help you prepare for your tour on Guam and to introduce you to the many organizations and individuals on island who can assist you in your adjustment once you arrive” (2). Commander of the 36th Air Base Wing, Colonel John M. Deloney, refers to Assignment Guam as a publication in which “the Air Force and Navy have combined their resources and knowledge to assemble this informative, helpful guide to make your family’s move to Guam as easy as possible” (4).

Furthermore, the publication features a section entitled “Units” which explains the duties of various squadrons located on Guam. Take a look at the following mission statement under the “Units” section which discusses the duties of the 36th Air Base Wing, one of Andersen Air Force Bases military squadrons in the village of Yigo. The anonymous author of this article declares that:

- the wing’s goals are: provide deployed warfighters with support that maximizes operational effectiveness; provide infrastructure and support necessary to sustain both peacetime and wartime strategic airlift; promote the military and political importance of Andersen’s strategic location and its unique advantage as a U.S. territory; and continue to improve the quality of life for every member of Team Andersen. (74)

The militaristic details of this passage, which include references to “warfighters,” “strategic airlift,” and “Andersen’s strategic location,” attest to the magazine’s promotion of US military activities in Guam. Other articles in the magazine focus on recreation and travel, suggesting that the military, at least in the case of Guam, is composed of peoples who are interested in activities such as snorkeling, hiking, shopping, and other touristic endeavors in addition to their military responsibilities in the regions of Asia and the Pacific.
The writings contained within the pages of these magazines—which differ little from what might be found in a travel guide—point to the ways in which military personnel and their dependents can adjust their lifestyles while on Guam. Found between the pages of these periodicals are the kinds of information necessary for tourists as they make their way around the island. Just as in a typical travel guidebook, basic centers of food, rest, and transportation are always included in these brochures. Despite their touristic contents, journals like Assignment Guam and Welcome to Guam ultimately fail in their attempts to disguise their militaristic intentions. They fail because of the blatant presence of military discourse in these writings, as evidenced in the numerous articles and photographs about the US military on Guam. One can go as far as to argue that today these publications, through their use of both paradisiacal and military rhetoric about Guam, promote tourism on the one hand while also reinforcing the rubric of US colonialism on the other.

The military has played a significant role in the formation of tourism industries not only in Guam. The military’s tourism is also present in Pacific Islands like the Marshalls and Hawai‘i where militarism and tourism are built on different and competing military strategic legacies of American colonialism and nuclearism. As Bob Aldridge and Ched Meyers argue, “Nowhere else in the world is the process of military colonization so advanced and persistent” than that of the Pacific (xxi). Indeed, there is an urgent need to examine French, Japanese, Australian, British, and, especially, American military constructions of tourist infrastructures and ideologies and how they continue to impact the lives of indigenous peoples of the Pacific. This thesis is a modest attempt at critiquing the interlocking systems of militarism and tourism in twentieth century Guam. This common
ground between discourses of militarism and tourism is what Teresia K. Teaiwa refers to as “militourism.”

Teaiwa’s position on militourism begins with her article “bikinis and other s/pacific n/oceans” in which she poses the question, “What does the word bikini evoke for you?” (87). This question guides Teaiwa’s historical narrative of US nuclear testing on Bikini atoll in the Marshall Islands during the 1950s, including a feminist and psychoanalytical critique of the “sensational two-piece bathing suit” fashioned by French designer Louis Reard (91). Teiawa argues convincingly that the bikini swimsuit, with its proliferation in commercial sales, as well as in a profusion of images found in the Western mass media and in the tourism industry, nearly silences the Bikinians’ colonial experiences under the US. A few of these colonial experiences include the displacement of Bikinians from their native home and the serious long-term health effects of radiation, both due to the US nuclear testing program. As Teiawa comments, “[t]he bikini bathing suit functions as a token of triumph (a fetish for Western Europe and the United States) over the threat of castration by enemy nations, and as psychic protection against the horror of their own destructive powers.” These, according to Teaiwa, “visually [embody] and [deny] both sexual and nuclear chaos” (94). Teaiwa’s analysis of the varied meanings of the bikini--at various times signifying the people, the atoll, the nuclear tests, and the swimsuit--as sites where military and tourist discourses intersect should be of value for those interested in formations of militourism in the Pacific and elsewhere.

In this thesis, rather than expanding upon Teaiwa’s feminist critique of nuclearism, I intend to examine other forms of militourism. In this pursuit, I examine a history of
discourses--primarily military in origin--which not only portray the people and island of Guam in essentially touristic ways, but which also contributed in various ways to the shaping of today’s tourist industry on Guam. If journals like Welcome to Guam are used today to accommodate military peoples and their lifestyles to Guam’s environment, how did earlier groups of military personnel adjust their lives to distant, often unfamiliar, places like Guam? How have American authors enframed i taotao tano’, or the people of the land, in touristic ways? Can there be found a continuity in the tropes of hospitality or paradise in these writings?

I explore these questions throughout this thesis. My purpose is to examine the ways in which American discourses, particularly in military documents about Guam, construct and essentialize the indigenous Chamorro people and the island’s landscape as touristic. As Pacific literary critic Paul Lyons notes, “writing is touristic (and tourist-making), proceeding through a sequence of socially organized quick-perceptions” (36). Lyons outlines three “socially organized” examples of tourist writing as they relate to the literary, the anthropological, and the commercial. Touristic writing, argues Lyons, “is ‘literary’ through its interaction with the generic conventions regulating the artful representation of actual sights and events, anthropological in its scientific emphasis on cultural difference, and commercial in its commodified relations to objects and audience” (36). I am particularly interested in how American travel writings and military documentation construct a strategic militourism about Guam through seemingly non-touristic scientific, literary, and militarist representations of the Chamorro people and the island’s landscape. American militourism is strategic since it--through its public display of
nuclear submarines, carriers, and bombers in places like Guam and the Western Pacific—ultimately protects American and foreign economic interests in the island, as well as in the neighboring islands of Micronesia. But even prior to American constructions of militourism in Guam, the heterogeneity of tourist discourses have genealogies that extend back to early European perceptions of the Pacific.

Magellan’s Colonialism

When the Portuguese navigator, Ferdinand Magellan, journeyed into the Pacific as the first European explorer in 1521, he opened up the Pacific to future European explorers who would bring with them foreign diseases, economic exploitation, and Christianity. Magellan’s entry into the Pacific also initiated the encounter with “faraway places that marked the era now known to us as the Age of Discovery” (Helms 211). These “faraway places” were places not like the West, and were imagined as geographically belonging to the East. Speaking of medieval Christian conceptions of the Other, Mary W. Helms argues that the “East” for Europe “was a fearsome place--immense and wild, a place of Edenic paradise forever lost to man” (217). And as folks like Magellan mapped “new” lands and charted navigation routes in the Pacific there grew for Europe and Europeans “an expanded sense of space as its western horizon achieved a greater clarity and definitiveness and receded to a greater distance from the homeland or, perhaps better said, acquired a definite distance from the homeland” (Helms 223). Robert Nicole, in his thesis, Extending Orientalism to the Pacific: The Myth of Tahiti Revisited, complements Helms’ argument on medieval Christian perceptions of the Other. As Nicole writes, “[t]he emerging Western Christian discourse of the Middle Ages played a crucial formative role
in establishing this discourse of difference” (42). The discourse of difference between Pacific Islanders and Europeans was first articulated on the beaches of Guam.

Magellan’s landfall in the island of Guam in 1521 was the first cross-cultural encounter between Pacific Islanders and Europeans. It must have been an incident riddled with chaos and confusion since both the Chamorro people and Magellan’s crew did not comprehend each other’s languages and customs. Because of the Chamorro people’s “hospitality,” Magellan and his crew’s lives were saved from the starvation which they were facing. More than an encounter, one could say that Magellan’s landfall in Guam was the starting point of the island’s tourist industry. Robert F. Rogers, in his 1996 history of Guam, Destiny’s Landfall, claims that Portuguese explorer Ferdinand Magellan did not land in the bay of Umatac, as indigenous Chamorro folklore asserts. Instead, Rogers posits that Tumon Bay, located in the center of Guam’s western coastline, was the actual site “where Magellan had first dropped anchor in the Pacific” in 1521 (Rogers 55). If Tumon Bay, Guam’s “hotel row,” was indeed the place where Magellan first beached in his voyage into the Pacific, then perhaps Magellan’s landfall can be interpreted as the beginning of the tourist industry in Guam.

This liminal encounter between Chamorros and Spaniards began the process by which Europeans and Pacific Islanders would view and represent each other through their own cultural lenses. The concept of othering, argues Nicole, entailed for the Europeans a shared symbolism between the Medieval Church and “the Classical world... of white/black contrast but with a wider range of connotations. White was associated with good, purity, the spiritual world and Christ, while black was evil, diabolical, carnal and
satanic” (42). Magellan’s crew experienced their reality of this polar symbolism when several Chamorros (men, women, or both--I am not sure) “stole very quickly the small boat called a skiff which was fastened to the poop of the captain’s ship” (Pigafetta 60).

This instance of representing the Chamorro people as the “evil” other was reinforced by Magellan’s naming of the islands as “the Islands of the Thieves” (Pigafetta 61). This invention of the Islands of Thieves, as Nicole says of the process of naming, was an “attempt to domesticate, to control and codify an unknown and feared Other” (Nicole, 36). Surely “[t]he mixed crew of Spaniards, Basques, Italians, Portuguese, Frenchmen, Greeks, and even an Englishman” aboard Magellan’s ship, the Trinidad, may have misunderstood the intentions of the Chamorro people (Rogers 5). Perhaps the borrowing of the skiff was a Chamorro form of chenchule, a network of reciprocation still practiced today, in return for the feeding of Magellan’s sick and dying crew. Initially, the Chamorro people were represented positively as a hospitable people for the provisioning of food which saved the lives of Magellan and his crew. Ultimately, however, the Chamorro people were perceived negatively as thieves, perhaps as sinners to the medieval Spaniards, for what they understood as a violation of one of the biblical commandments. What was censored out of this account we will never know. There was one thing, however, that was not erased.

In Antonio Pigafetta’s eyewitness account of Magellan’s contact with the Chamorro people, he records in 1521 an instance where Europeans on board the Trinidad requested Chamorro flesh for consumption. Pigafetta writes that “the Captain’s sick men ask for the entrails of the enemy dead” (60). This little-known event underscores the
politics of cannibalism in the Pacific and elsewhere. David Spurr addresses the meaning of
cannibalism as it pertained to sixteenth century European understandings of America’s
indigenous peoples. He remarks that “[t]he word *cannibal* derives from *Carib* or *Caribes*,
the West Indian tribe encountered by explorers in the sixteenth century” (147).

Cannibalism, argues Spurr in his reading of André Gide’s *Voyage au Congo*, is “a word
which entered the modern European languages as part of the colonization of Africa . . .
the New World” and, I would add, the Pacific “whose history recalls the fear of being
consumed by the object of conquest” (148). Perhaps the sick sailors aboard the *Trinidad*
were indeed “consumed by the object of conquest” as they could no longer (spiritually,
physically, or mentally) persist in what was already a tedious and trying journey into the
Pacific.

Pigafetta’s representation of cannibalism in which the European becomes the
cannibal evidences an often unheard of or purposely edited version of cannibalism
discourse. This account of non-natives consuming native flesh does not easily fall on the
assumption that Europeans are obsessed “with . . . Pacific Islanders as cannibals,” as
Marianna Torgovnick asserts (189). Indeed, the discourse of cannibalism does not only
occur in “notoriously active” places like the Marquesas, Fiji, and Papua New Guinea
(Gibson 267). The discourse of cannibalism in the Pacific began rather with Europeans in
Guam eating the Other, the Chamorro people. One wonders how Europe would have
responded to accusations of European cannibalism in the Pacific. This instance of
European cannibalism is rarely referred to in studies of cannibalism. This demonstrates
European attempts to produce a literature of the “wicked” Pacific Islander while at the
same time concealing their own sense of otherness as Europeans. Other Europeans would follow Magellan into the Pacific and produce a literature of difference that would later fuel tourism as "the quintessential industry of difference" (Hollinshead 335).

Constructing Pacific Tourist Ideologies

Descriptive labels associated with the Pacific such as paradise, utopia, and Eden would occupy the dream-like minds of European explorers, missionaries, and traders abroad. So-called savages, cannibals, and primitive peoples would also occupy the nightmares of these Europeans venturing into places not of the experienced, but of the imagined. Today, many tourism industries in the Pacific privilege place over peoples, emphasizing the supposed unchanging European characterization of island beaches and weather as paradiacal while portraying Pacific peoples as homogenous tokens of tourist exploitation.

One notable European writer whose works have been applied by authors in shaping images of a paradiacal Pacific is the French philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau. In a Europe heightened by the era of eighteenth century Romanticism and urbanization, Rousseau’s ideas of peoples surviving with nature’s offerings demonstrate his romanticism on the one hand. On the other hand, Rousseau’s very romanticization serves in some ways as an escape from ongoing tensions and struggles in Europe with overpopulation and urbanization. He theorized the notion of the existence of a "natural man," supposedly living in harmony with nature, free of the corrupting influences of civilization. Euro-American writers would later characterize Pacific Islanders as "noble savages" according to Rousseau’s theorization. Take for instance "the first European visitors to Polynesia"
who, argues Bernard Smith, "tended to view the natives as nobles savages" (5). The
"noble Tahitians" were, as Smith notes, "identified closely with the tropical luxury of their
island" (42). "The land, in short, was like Paradise before the Fall of Man, and the people
lived in a natural state of innocence enjoying its bounty," writes Smith (42).

The "noble savage" would hold its ground until increasing arrivals of
European missionaries, traders, and explorers in the nineteenth century would witness
massive depopulation, disease, and conflict among Pacific Islanders due to European
contact. The rupturing of an idyllic and timeless paradise would cast the ignoble savage as
debased and dangerous. Christian thinkers in particular "found any kind of belief in the
natural virtue of pagan savages repugnant and did much to spread the belief that the native
peoples of the Pacific in their natural state were depraved and ignoble" (Smith 5). The
term ignoble savage described islanders corrupted by influences of civilization, and thus in
need of salvation (from missionaries) and in need of guidance (from government). The
articulation of the ignoble savage idea justified the necessity of colonial rule.

**Reading Orientalism in the Pacific**

These European images of savagery in the Pacific can be read today as a part of a
larger orientalist discourse which, as Edward W. Said has demonstrated, situates the
Orient as the exotic, romantic, inferior, and unchanging Other. Orientalism, writes Said, is
that which "can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with
Orient, dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it,
by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for
dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (3). By examining
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various American writings about Guam, one notes the apparent authority, conclusiveness, and homogeneity of their observations. At certain points of discussion in this thesis, I situate these writings within the contexts of nineteenth century American exploration, early twentieth century military expansionism, and World War Two, as well as within the Cold War and post-Cold War eras. It would appear to the uninformed reader that the body of depictions of Guam and of the Chamorro people represent the reality of an hospitable people on a paradisiacal island. These authoritative representations of Guam and its people rarely included a sense of Chamorro agency, and as with the Orient, exhibits Guam as the ultimate passive and malleable Other (Teaiwa 92). Said's analysis of power relations inherent in orientalist discourses will be of use in this thesis as I examine the production of American knowledge systems on Guam. I will be using Said's critique of orientalism in a broad sense as it can be applied to studies of culture and colonialism almost anywhere in the world, especially within the East/West binary.

Quite often, the discourses about which I will be talking fall within the genre of travel writing, generated by outsider sources and authors such as whalers, missionaries, anthropologists, governors, and others who in one way or another surveyed Guam's landscape and people. As Houston Wood writes on the significance of travel literature, "[w]hile eighteenth- and nineteenth-century scientists and philosophers wrote to establish classification systems for indigenous peoples worldwide, it was journalists, travel writers, novel and short story writers who provided the concrete illustrations for popular readerships of how" Pacific Islanders "behaved" (74-75). This corpus of literature called orientalism, Said argues, has shaped a distinct Western epistemology of the East, the Third
World, and the Orient. In the case of Guam, the body of knowledge produced about
Guam which emphasized the hospitality of the Chamorro people and the pristinity of the
land would have the effect of validating the authority of colonial rule. As Said writes, this
orientalist production of knowledge is “the voice of Empire, which is itself a system of
rules, codes, and concrete epistemological habits” (Said 196).

These “voices” of Europe and America would echo worldwide as colonial powers
began their spread of empires over indigenous peoples. Sugar plantations in Hawai‘i,
nuclear testing programs in the Marshall Islands and French Polynesia, and the combat of
World War Two in the “Pacific Theater” are just a few examples of European and
American colonialism in the Pacific. The histories of Euro-American violence and
economic exploitation of indigenous Pacific Islanders demonstrate the aggressiveness of
these colonial powers. As Masao Miyoshi writes on the Western colonization of the Third
World, “[w]ith few exceptions, non-Western nations were confronted by a profound crisis
of identity” in which “their separate traditions--histories and geographies, as well as moral
and religious systems--had to face the choice (in actuality, hardly a choice) between
surrender to the all consuming Western ‘universalism’ and resistance to it at the risk of
forcible conquest” (40). As a result of colonialism, places like the Mariana Islands were
subject to the imposition of new languages, religions, and beliefs.

Rather than implying that orientalism is simply a collection of discourses, I would
argue that orientalist discourses support concrete colonial policies. As Robert Young
points out in his read of Said’s Orientalism, “Orientalism as representation did have to
encounter the ‘actual’ conditions of what was there, and that it showed itself effective at a
material level as a form of power and control” (129). Further, orientalism constitutes various forms of expression. One of those forms is the “touristic,” which has its origins in expressions of travel and tourism.

Throughout this thesis I want to expound on the shared meanings of travel, tourism, and tour of duty which produce a touristic discourse. One of these shared significances is the implication of violence within these words. Take travel for example. The “Old English word travel,”” writes Diller and Scofidio, “was originally the same as travail meaning trouble, work, or torment which in turn comes from the Latin tripalium, a three-staked instrument of torture” (19). Euro-American travel writings can thus be “linked, etymologically, to aggression”—in the Pacific and elsewhere (Diller and Scofidio 19).

It is only during the modern era that the hardships of travel have been lessened. No longer do travelers visiting strange frontiers have to endure long voyages of ocean navigation. In a world increasingly connected by airports and harbors, mechanized modes of transportation, such as ships, airplanes, and trains, now assure the “safe” transit of travelers to and from places near and far. Today, with the availability and affordability of various modes of travel, the promotion of the tourism industry has reached unforeseen heights. As David Zurick claims, “travel became an industry and travelers properly became tourists” (118). Tourists generally seek leisure, relaxation, and a “new” environment away from their homelands. But what are the consequences involved for those whose homeland is the tourist destination? How do they define and understand tourism?
Some find tourism to be more than the pursuit of travel for purposes of rest and relaxation. Hawaiian scholar and activist, Haunani-Kay Trask, for example, views tourism in Hawai‘i to be “an insidious form of cultural prostitution” (22). “Tourism,” Trask continues to say, “has appropriated and prostituted the accomplishments of a resurgent interest in things Hawaiian” while “Hawaiian women . . . are marketed on posters from Paris to Tokyo promising an unfettered ‘primitive’ sexuality” (22-23). If tourism is a vehicle for the commodification of culture as Trask implies, then perhaps tourist hotels can be viewed as the places where this commodification occurs.

Samoan novelist, Albert Wendt, describes hotels as a “frightening type of papalagi structure”1 (80). These buildings, Wendt argues, are the “embodiment” of “the cultivation/worship of mediocrity, a quest for a meaningless and precarious security based on material possessions, a deep rooted fear of dirt and all things rich in our cultures, a fear of death revealed in an almost paranoiac quest for a super hygienic cleanliness and godliness” (80). Tourism is indeed a form of neo-colonialism, especially when its facilities are managed by foreign corporations. Because tourist industries depend on the commoditization of various cultural dances, historical sites, indigenous artwork, and languages (usually in the forms of greetings like “hello,” “goodbye,” or “come again”) they directly violate the sanctity of those cultural beliefs, practices, and attitudes. Few people seem to be listening seriously to these and other indigenous oppositions to tourism.

---

1Papalagi is a Samoan term for European.
In the mainstream scheme of things, the colonial connotations of tourism remain obscured, partly because the industry is frequently praised as the new global economy of "undisputed economic importance" (R. Wood 3). Yet many deny interpretations which argue that tourism "prostitutes" indigenous cultures. Furthermore, tourist industries, at least in the case of Pacific Islands, play on tropes of the touristic such as native hospitality and island paradise. These are examples of the key tropes promoted by tourist industries in their advertisements for sun, surf, and sand. Tourism is the modern fusion of the "Western fascination with the exotic and the primitive--a preoccupation traceable at least to eighteenth-century Europe--and thus represents the continuing legacy of Orientalism" (Linnekin 217). Late nineteenth-century American travel literature about Guam incorporates the touristic as a key theme, although they were not militouristic in form as the island was not yet a colony of the US. Military personnel during their tours of duty on Guam throughout the twentieth century would follow in the steps of their predecessors and create the discourse of (American) militourism.

**Militourism’s Tourism**

As long as Guam’s political sovereignty remains under US rule, the word tourism is interchangeable with the term militourism. The fact that the government of Guam abides by most of the rules and regulations of the US federal government evidences the island’s political, social, and economic links with America’s legislative, executive, and judicial systems. These links are thus far inseparable, but are currently under negotiation between the government of Guam and the federal government through the Chamorro people’s petition for a commonwealth status under the US. Industries such as tourism
indirectly rely on the military's presence on Guam, as militarist institutions, policies, and warfare technologies supposedly protect the Chamorro people and the lives of tourists from "enemies," whomever they may be in the minds of military strategists. Further, there is a strong military sub-text in numerous contemporary travel promotions about Guam which emphasize that the island is American in its commercial makeup--with restaurants like McDonalds and Pizza Hut--and, more importantly, American in its memorialized role as a strategic "stepping stone" during World War Two. As David Stanley explains in his 1992 edition of *Micronesia Handbook*, a tourist handbook to Micronesia’s peoples and islands, "You have in your hands the original travel guidebook to the ‘American Lake’" (1). One will not only find "crashing waterfalls, seldom-visited jungles, and languorous villages" (201) in Guam, writes Stanley, but also "[t]hree large 14-cm Japanese guns" which "are perched in a row up a concrete stairway and along a short trail behind the community hall on the north side of Piti Catholic Church" (226). As Stanley’s examples illustrate, Guam’s tourism can be cast as militouristic in nature and vice versa as both discourses work to produce the Chamorro people and the island into an American military tourist venue.

The discourse of militourism in Guam is thus primarily a twentieth century construct by military personnel and their concerns for American notions of recreation, militarization, exploration, and economic exploitation. It is important to note that the supposed order and peace attached to militouristic writings (i.e., the "friendly native") continue to elide the nature of American colonialism in Guam. That is, the image of happy, hospitable Chamorros seemingly implies that the people are satisfied with their
colonized status. Furthermore, whether in times of war or peace, the literature generated by military personnel in Guam continues to be read as touristic. In fact, the US military has continued to employ touristic propaganda of strange, exotic, and distant lands for the purpose of recruiting men and women in the armed forces. These types of touristic propaganda are demonstrated in the following texts which advertise adventure as a strategy for enlisting recruits:

**ACTION? YOU SAID IT! RIGHT NOW! TRAVEL? SURE! CHINA, JAPAN, HAWAII, PHILIPPINES, GUAM, WEST INDIES, ADVENTURE? OH MAN!**

**HERE IS YOUR OPPORTUNITY YOUNG MAN. TRAVEL. THE OPPORTUNITY OF A LIFETIME. YOU HAVE STUDIED, READ, AND THOUGHT ABOUT FOREIGN COUNTRIES. NOW IS YOUR CHANCE TO SEE THEM. NOW IS THE TIME.**

**THOSE AMERICAN TOURISTS. ENLIST AS ONE OF THE 50,000 MEN FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE. PERSONALLY CONDUCTED TOURS FOR SOLDIER SIGHTSEERS.**

(qtd. in Diller and Scofidio 19)

The first recruitment ad originally came from the US Marine Corp Recruiting Publicity Bureau in 1914. The second and third ads were published respectively by the US Army Recruiting Publicity Bureau in 1917 and the Army Recruitment Advertisement in 1919. All three slogans evoke colonialist meanings of travel, tourism, and tour of duty. They publicize a voyeuristic opportunity for specifically male “soldier sightseers” to visit “foreign countries.” They promote the discourse of foreign places to be “studied, read, and thought” by an American public in an American educational system. And there is the US empire building itself not on the so-called qualities of liberty, democracy, and freedom, but rather on misleading objectives of “travel” and “adventure.” Incentives to enlist into
the armed services for motives of travel and adventure disguise the violent realities of war, combat, military service, and imperialism. "Contemporary tourism," Diller and Scofidio explain, "evolved from heroic travel of the past, the roots of which are undoubtedly entangled with those of the earliest territorial conflict: after all, mobility has always been a key strategy of war" (20).

Contextualizing Melville's Typee

In this thesis, I will discuss two processes of producing militourism in Guam. They are what I will refer to as the familiarization and feminization of Guam’s Chamorro people and landscape. The workings of familiarization, or interpreting the unfamiliar in terms which are comfortable to the author, writes Hayden White, “can only be tropological in nature, for what is involved in the rendering of the unfamiliar into the familiar is a troping that is generally figurative” (5). When an author describes peoples and lands in feminine language he or she casts them in terms accessible to and manipulable by a variety of capitalist, literary, tourist, scientific, and militarist agendas; for whatever the author determines as feminine becomes the supposedly weak(er) (sex) subject of inquiry and investigation. The act of feminization occurs in the creation of tropes which utilized feminized descriptions and representations. The discursive processes of familiarization and feminization are crucial factors in the development of tourist literature, as well as tourist development.

Examples of familiarization and feminization can also be read in works of American literature. I want to provide a few examples of how Herman Melville’s Typee, for example, written in 1846, developed a touristic gaze which has since been extended to
American visions of Guam (see fig. 1). *Typee* chronicles Melville’s stay of less than a month with the Te Enata (who are never addressed by this indigenous name in *Typee*) of the Marquesan Islands. The story of Melville’s real-life residence is told through the fictional lenses of the beachcomber, Tommo, in the valley of Taipi. From his Taipi
experiences, Melville learned about some of the Te Enata's cultural practices and beliefs which he later utilized in the writing of this book. *Typee*, a captivity narrative novel, talks about Western perceptions and contestations of “cannibalism” and “conversion,” as well as about the formation of Pacific island and islander tropes. It is about cross-cultural contact, and, more importantly, it is about early constructions of the Other in the Pacific. This is an important book in the white American literary canon.

While Melville was certainly not the first to write about the Pacific in paradisiacal ways, among Americans his legacy is notable. As Gibson notes, “[w]ithout Melville, American nationalizing currents might well have reached their limit on the eastern Pacific shores of California and Oregon in the 1840s” (388). Gibson credits Melville for having “permanently fixed the Pacific in the national consciousness” (388). Furthermore, while images of the Pacific which Melville developed and shaped in novels such as *Typee*, *Omoo*, *Mardi*, and *Moby-Dick* were critical of colonial intrusions in the Pacific, they still promoted feminine tropes of virgin lands, hospitable natives, and paradisiacal lifestyles.

Melville’s work also draws attention to issues of power, including considerations of race, gender, and class issues, as well as to what Toni Morrisson has called the “recognition of the moment in America when whiteness became ideology” (Morrison 15). This is not to say that Melville’s work has only recently gained attention. Melville’s novels have “been no less interesting” to critics of today “than he ever was to those who propounded the Great Tradition” (Jehlen 2). Given the ways in which this work is read and taught, a deconstruction of *Typee* demands more than a consideration of its literary aesthetics. *Typee* is one of many American novels which “blended and adapted the theme
of paradise first proclaimed by European explorers and writers” (Gibson 380). The parallels between Melville’s stereotypical islanders and Guam’s Chamorro people did not occur coincidentally and, moreover, continue to flourish in contemporary tourist writing. *Typee* can be discussed as part of the larger American colonizing project which in the late nineteenth century was extended to Guam. Roger J. Bresnahan, an author concerned with orientalism and the American literary imagination, writes “[a]lthough Melville’s intention is to debunk popular conceptions of the Pacific . . . he must evoke those stereotypes in order to do so” (8). Further, Bresnahan warns his audience that Melville’s ironic use of images of savages and cannibals in *Typee* still allows for the “possibility that the reader will fasten on them [stereotypes] and fail to note the author’s subtler intentions” (8). I, too, am accountable for focusing attention on Pacific stereotypes in this thesis in my attempt to “debunk” the negativity attached to such systems of racial classification.

Here, I want to examine *Typee’s* rhetorical processes of familiarization and feminization as a precursor to some of the kinds of discourse analysis this thesis will attempt to demonstrate. In this context, *Typee* can be read as a touristic novel whose impact goes far beyond the literary imagination. Melville himself has been described by Arrell Morgan Gibson as “one of America’s foremost Pacific pioneers and frontiersmen” (387). The rhetorical processes used by Melville to familiarize and feminize the indigenous people of the Marquesas are similar to those found in later American writings about Guam.

My analysis of *Typee* will demonstrate that American travel literature about Guam represented and understood the indigenous Chamorro people within the parameters of
islander and island tropes partly developed by Melville, as well as by other noted writers such as Robert Louis Stevenson, James Michener, and Jack London.

**Feminizing and Familiarizing the Te Enata and Taipi's Landscape**

When Tommo and Toby “jumped ship,” they were escaping the vigorous discipline of ship decorum in the hopes of finding the valley of the Happar, a supposed place of “gentleness and humanity” (Melville 92). Instead Tommo finds himself entering Taipi, a valley of so-called cannibals. This escape from “civilization” afforded Tommo an opportunity to explore, reconstruct, and re-name the landscape of the Marquesan Islands. But before Tommo’s curious gaze could venture into the valley of Taipi, he was cautioned by Toby, who like a modern tour guide, warns Tommo that “if you are going to pry into everything you meet with here that excites your curiosity, you will marvellously soon get knocked on the head” (Melville 85). Still, Tommo maintained his touristic gaze here and there, describing the landscapes of the Marquesan Islands as romantically alluring.

“Perched” above the valley of Taipi, Tommo depicts a place pleasing to the eyes of the tourist:

> From the spot where I lay transfixed with surprise and delight, I looked straight down into the bosom of a valley, which swept away in long wavy undulations to the blue waters in the distance. Midway towards the sea, and peering here and there amidst the foliage, might be seen the palmetto-thatched houses of its inhabitants glistening in the sun that had bleached them to a dazzling whiteness. The vale was more than three leagues in length, and about a mile across at its greatest width.

> On each side it appeared hemmed in by steep and green acclivities, which, uniting near the spot where I lay, formed an abrupt and semicircular termination of grassy cliffs and precipices hundreds of feet in height, over which flowed numberless small cascades. But the crowning beauty of the prospect was its universal verdure; and in this indeed consists, I believe, the peculiar charm of every Polynesian landscape. Everywhere below me, from the base of the precipice upon whose very verge I had been
unconsciously reposing, the surface of the vale presented a mass of foliage, spread with such rich profusion that it was impossible to determine of what description of trees it consisted.

But perhaps there was nothing about the scenery I beheld more impressive than those silent cascades, whose slender threads of water, after leaping down the steep cliffs, were lost amidst the rich herbage of the valley.

Over all the landscape there reigned the most hushed repose, which I almost feared to break, lest, like the enchanted gardens in the fairy tale, a single syllable might dissolve the spell. For a long time, forgetful alike of my own situation, and the vicinity of my still slumbering companion, I remained gazing around me, hardly able to comprehend by what means I had thus suddenly been made a spectator of such a scene. (Melville 90-91)

Here Tommo mathematically records the topography of the valley by measuring the depth and width of it. His body is positioned hierarchically at an altitude where the valley is “below” him. This grants Tommo the ability to make such a keen and far-reaching observation. Even the valley’s geographical makeup conforms to Tommo’s expectations as the slopes “[unite] near the spot where he [laid]” (Melville 91). Tommo is in control.

Furthermore, his descriptions of the valley reflect his control. The landscape is feminized with familiar English words which relax Tommo’s masculine gaze, such as “bosom,” “dazzling whiteness,” “crowning beauty,” “silent cascades,” “slender threads,” and “enchanted gardens” (Melville 90-91). The land appears to be untouched, innocent, and alluring for it contained “a mass of foliage, spread with such profusion” where waterfalls were “lost amidst the rich herbage of the valley” (Melville 91). But this description does not stop here. Tommo “[universalizes]” the scene to portray the “peculiar charm of every Polynesian landscape” (Melville 91). These images convey the common tropes employed by the tourist industry: every native land in the Pacific is supposedly beautiful, spacious, comforting, and inviting. The land is also portrayed as
free for the taking because according to Tommo’s description it appears to be hardly used, especially when one considers the vast amount of “rich herbage.”

The tropes of femininity do not only apply to island landscapes. They also apply to the Te Enata people. The most explicit case illustrated by Melville is in the character Fayaway, Tommo’s object of desire. She is the mythic utopia so commonly found in Euro-American writings. It is as if Melville named Fayaway to convey how “Fa[r]away” he was from home and how Fa[r]away utopia is from the minds of his American readership. Tommo breaches this distance between Fa[r]away and the US in his portrait of Fa[r]away as paradise found: “The easy unstudied graces of a child of nature like this, breathing from infancy an atmosphere of perpetual summer, and nurtured by the simple fruits of the earth; enjoying a perfect freedom from care and anxiety, and removed effectually from all injurious tendencies, strike the eye in manner which cannot be portrayed” (Melville 134). Here the summers are endless, nature’s “fruits” appear to serve for the needs of Fa[r]away, and there are no evident problems whatsoever. Tommo’s touristic imaginations continue. Fa[r]away and Kory-Kory, the generic female and male servants, extend their hospitality to Tommo:

Here I [Tommo] often lay for hours, covered with a gauze-like veil of tappa, while Fayaway, seated beside me, and holding in her hand a fan woven from the leaflets of a young cocoanut bough, brushed aside the insects that occasionally lighted on my face, and Kory-Kory, with a view of chasing away my melancholy, performed a thousand antics in the water before us. (Melville 163)

The notion of hospitality as evidenced in Tommo’s accommodations places Pacific Islanders in a position of eternal servitude, a servile position perpetuated by the tourist industry. What emerges is an essentialist characterization of Pacific peoples made possible
through the process of feminization. Another example of Tommo’s way of constructing the Te Enata as feminine, inferior, and malleable is through his familiarization of them as “American.”

All along, Tommo defines the Te Enata through his American lenses. This gaze feminizes the landscape and people of Te Enata, making them vulnerable to colonial and economic expansion. Now Tommo prepares the Te Enata to cope with Euro-American ways of living. Towards the end of the novel, as Tommo prepares to depart the valley of Taipi, he is confronted by Marheyo, a Te Enata man who provided him with a place to stay. Tommo, Marheyo, Farraway, and Kory-Kory are on the beach, and Tommo wants to leave with the kanaka, Karakoee. The scene is climactic. There is tension in the air as Karakoee negotiates with the Te Enata to release Tommo to him. This is the perfect time for Melville to make his point. And he does:

[Marheyo] placed his arm upon my shoulder, and emphatically pronounced the only two English words I had taught him ‘Home’ and ‘Mother.’ I at once understood what he meant, and eagerly expressed my thanks to him. Farraway and Kory-Kory were by his side, both weeping violently; and it was not until the old man had twice repeated the command that his son could bring himself to obey him, and take me again upon his back.

(Melville 328)

The words “home” and “mother” initially signify Tommo’s return to his home and mother. Yet another read tells otherwise. These are the only two English words that Tommo taught Marheyo. The words that echo Tommo’s feminization of the Te Enata also speak to Victorian female domesticity. As Trinh T. Minh-ha states, this process of feminizing “Home” and “Mother” is concerned with the “naturalized image of women as guardians of tradition, keepers of home, and bearers of Language” (15). Tommo’s English language
instruction confines Marheyo, a man, to the so-called spaces reserved for women--home
and mother.

**Typee's Militourism**

In *Typee* the ports are occupied by the French, and Tommo demonstrates the
significance of ports for military use in the Marquesan Islands: “This island [Nukuheva] is
about twenty miles in length and nearly as many in breadth. It has three good harbours on
its coast; the largest and best of which is called by the people living in its vicinity
‘Tyohee’” (Melville 44-45). Again, in this example Tommo maps Nukuheva. Now his
purpose is to inform the reader of the whereabouts of the harbors in Nukuheva. He even
appears to provide an indigenous name for one of the bays. The importance of knowing
the location of these harbors is revealed in the comments of Tommo’s captain of the
*Dolly*. Speaking to his crew about the liberty of shore leave, he remarks that “you may
stand some chance of escaping them [the ‘bloody cannibals’] though, if you keep close
about the French encampment, and are back to the ship before sunset” (Melville 73).

Similarly, the ports in Guam are occupied and used by the US for their strategic
value. Chamorro lawyer Michael F. Phillips, quoting Vice Admiral Forrest Sherman of the
US Navy in 1945, writes that “‘the Navy Department considers the Marianas, and
principally Guam, as our major naval operating post in the western Pacific’” whose
colonizing project consisted of “‘the maximum use of the natural facilities of the island, of
the harbor, of existing roads’” (7). Apra Harbor, for instance, is located in the southern
end of Guam and is occupied by the US Navy. The Chamorro people refer to this place as
either the village of Sumay or Naval Station. Wire fences surround this base and armed
sentries allow entrance only to military personnel, dependents, or visitors, except during military festivities open to the public. This is precisely the safe military neighborhood to which Tommo alludes. These parallels thus drawn between the ports of the Marquesas and Guam illustrate the ease with which an established military presence, especially in the areas of ports, charges itself with the safety of visitors. In the sense that the military opens up and protects the entry and exit points into islands like the Marquesas and Guam, and provides areas of safety and refuge, its relationship with tourism is exhibited.

The Following Chapters

I open chapter two with an introduction to Chamorro culture in the Mariana Islands. I will discuss basic Chamorro notions of culture and meanings, looking at the values attached to i familia, the family, as well as to other important cultural characteristics. The purpose of this historical introduction is to show how the Chamorro people work with the land through farming, hunting, and fishing in ways beneficial to Chamorro familial networks. Later, in chapter three, I will juxtapose these general views of Chamorro understandings of land against American perceptions of the island of Guam.

Chapter two also includes a historical overview of American colonial expansion on Guam. It explores American fascinations with the mythic frontier and considers the policy of Manifest Destiny as an integral element in the exploitation of indigenous peoples "West" of the US. Indeed, Manifest Destiny is the historical process that makes possible American orientalism in the Pacific. I then outline the genealogy of American colonialism in Guam beginning with the US Naval administration of the island from 1898 to 1941, and from the end of World War Two in 1944 to the present. I will present examples of
American colonial policies and practices to complement my discourse analysis of American travel literature about Guam that will follow in chapters three and four. Such concrete examples include the Treaty of Paris which established political boundaries between Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands, as well as the Naval Security Clearance Policy, terminated only in 1962, which prohibited travel into and out of Guam without the official consent of the US Navy. I conclude this chapter with a historical narrative of the development of the mass tourism industry on Guam in the 1960s. Rather than dating the start of the tourism industry in the 1960s, I instead suggest that the American enframing of Guam as touristic began with discourses, imaginations, thoughts, and creativity that started prior to 1898, but flourished with the increased arrival of American settlers to the newly-established colony.

Chapter three discusses the beginnings of tourism in Guam by examining the ways in which Americans familiarized themselves with Guam’s landscape. As Americans began traveling to Guam in the nineteenth century, they often familiarized themselves with the unfamiliar in what Anthony Pagden refers to as the principle of “attachment” (34). Guam’s landscape, jungle, mountains, rivers, and beaches would be renamed and represented in ways which reflected American understandings, rather than Chamorro ones, of the island’s geography. In ways similar to European representations of the New World in the fifteenth century, American travelers in Guam throughout the twentieth century consistently used “familiar concepts to describe what was strange,” yet “the results were often misleading” (Jones 10). The concepts vary, but the main point is that those tropes—American names, adjectives, metaphors, and cliches—were usually inappropriate and
culturally insensitive ways of describing Guam. American travelers employed the knowledge they knew about American and Pacific landscapes to help "assimilate the unknown into the known" (Pagden 24).

The American familiarization of Guam's landscape would ultimately result in touristic representations of the island. Unlike the rhetoric of the "frontiersman" commonly associated with the America's westward expansion in the nineteenth century, a different frontier rubric developed in the Pacific. The rhetoric of paradise and a lush frontier, for example, would occupy almost two centuries of American thought about Guam and would, as Pagden argues, "[end] with an act of possession" (34). Today, many American military personnel boast of knowing the "interior" of Guam's landscape--its rivers, falls, mountains, and valleys--more so than the indigenous Chamorro people. It is a boast reinforced with an archive of photographs, articles, maps, and other American mediums which represented Guam.

Furthermore, in this archive of materials, there is a strong presence, I would argue, of "sexual and gendered metaphors in which the feminized colonies . . . were to be penetrated, raped, silenced, and (dis)possessed" (Stoler 32). Guam's landscape would be ultimately "portrayed as passive and female, prone to the masculine penetration of the West" (Manderson and Jolly 7). This is not to say that the landscape of Guam is feminine. Rather, the methods of representation chosen by American travelers cast the island of Guam in ways similar to such stereotypical tropes of women as virginal, manipulable, and vulnerable. Thus, the feminizing of Guam's landscape can be understood, writes Anne McClintock in her articulation of gendered spaces in Imperial Leather, as "the eroticizing
of 'virgin' space . . . for if the land is virgin, colonized peoples cannot claim aboriginal territorial rights, and white patrimony is violently assured as the sexual and military insemination of an interior void” (30). Similarly, in the case of Guam, descriptions of untouched lands suggested a place open for economic and colonial exploitation.

Chapter three will also explore some of the differences in the ways in which Americans and Chamorros viewed Guam’s landscape. While Chamorros see Guam’s landscape as a place of work and basic survival, some Americans view Guam as a place bountifully filled with fruit and vegetables. To some Americans, Guam is place where work is rarely needed. For them, paradise is a reality in Guam. As this chapter discusses, such paradisiacal descriptions have subtler meanings.

As complement to chapter three’s focus on the representations of Guam’s physical environment, chapter four will deal with the representations of Chamorro people. In this fourth chapter, I pay attention to how Chamorro people were figured in the imaginations of American travelers and military personnel in Guam. I want to demonstrate how our people were constructed as the feminine Other and, thus, in the process, were essentialized as hospitable natives. Despite the portrayal by some early explorers of the Chamorro people as thieves or savages, Guam was still often visited as a port of call in which European and American travelers could obtain much needed food, water, rest, and relaxation. In many travelers’ accounts, Chamorros were portrayed as a supposedly happy people quick to “serve” visitors food, shelter, and company. The trope of hospitality is one of the key features of tourism in Guam.
Chapter five discusses Chamorro responses to Guam’s tourist industry, especially as centered in Tumon Bay. I want to discuss how Chamorros view tourism. A few Chamorros oppose the construction of hotels and other tourist projects for various reasons. Perhaps the strongest critique of tourism is that it is not a stable and culturally sensitive economic industry. For instance, the building of hotels demands the importation of foreign laborers who often settle on Guam with their families. Surely tourism brings in revenues, but much of these monies are spent on expanding roads and on constructing housing developments and schools, among other institutions, for the interests of laborers and other outsiders who already outnumber the indigenous Chamorro population. And although some Chamorros criticize the effects of tourism, Guam’s public community largely favors the promotion of the tourist industry.

Here I want to show how tourism has shaped popular consciousness in Guam to the point of acceptance, non-contestation, and normalization. I want to end this chapter with some thoughts on the infrastructures of tourism which have been either constructed or supported as a result of militaristic activities in the World War Two and postwar eras. I want to argue that tourism is, in fact, a form of neo-colonialism in Guam which was constructed by the imaginations of American travelers and military personnel; the writings of these travelers and military personnel have helped to strengthen American colonial policies in Guam.
Chapter 2
As I Turn the Pages

As I Turn the Pages

Hungry fingers
feed
searching eyes
that rummage reams of text
between the lines
map the margins,
you’ll never find
recording
of Chamorro minds.

Translate
all you want,
archival
old Spanish
new English
some French, German, Russian, even
the rarely-talked-about Kanji.
You’ll learn of the flora and fauna
mountains
rivers
streams
and valleys,
that beche de mer
in Chamorro
is balati,
but,
you’ll never
find recording
of Chamorro thought.

In the drama
of what is called,
“The History of Guam,”
severed [sic] from
sister homeland,
Northern Marianas,
the stage is set:
sleepy
colonial
island,
Nanyo, extension of Nippon,
and
bastion of American democracy.

One of the many scenes
is played:

Foreign actors walk in
float in fly in bomb in
inseminate into
the passive props.

Enter, the props:

docile
indolent indios
tawny-skinned
muscle-bound
robust
thieving
ignorant
natives,
but ...
"they sail a great canoe!"

I’ve read that script,
I’ve scanned those books,
I’ve turned the pages
one by one
forward
backward,
I’ve turned those pages
looking
sensing,
“Now, if those scholars,
learned men and women,
wrote,
‘And in the end ...’
in one final gasp for life ...
the last Chamorro died,' then, who am I who know my self to be Chamoru, and how is it I sit here thinking?"

--Cecilia T. Perez

The History of Guam: Chamorro Notions of Land and Life

For centuries before the sixteenth century arrival of Spanish navigators, the Chamorro people resided in an archipelago known today as the Mariana Islands. Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores, a Spanish Catholic missionary to the islands, named the chain after Queen Mariana de Austria of Spain in 1668. The Marianas consist of fourteen islands with Guam as the southernmost and Farrallon de Pajaros as the northernmost. Saipan, Tinian, Rota, and Guam are the most populous of the fourteen islands. The indigenous Chamorros of the island chain are also referred to in our language as i taotao tano,' which literally means "the people of the land."

---

1 I opt to use the word, "Chamorro." This is the official spelling for both Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas. The term, "Chamoru," is often used in Guam to signify indigenous activism and proper pronunciation. I respect the intentions of this new spelling. However, I will use the former spelling for now because it is more widely known and employed by Chamorros and non-Chamorros alike.
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As the term *taotao tano'* reflects, land is central to our identity as indigenous Chamorros. Elaborating on the importance of land to *taotao tano'*, the late Chamorro governor of Guam, Ricardo J. Bordallo, stated:

Guam is not just a piece of real estate to be exploited for its money-making potential. Above all else, Guam is the homeland of the Chamorro people. That is a fundamental, undeniable truth. We are very profoundly "*taotao tano'*--people of the land. This land, tiny as it is, belongs to us just as surely, just as inseparably, as we belong to it. No tragedy of history or declaration of conquest, no legalistic double-talk can change that fact. Guam is our legacy. Is it for sale? How can one sell a national birthright? (qtd. in Phillips 2)

Governor Bordallo’s words reflect a general relationship to the land which rings true throughout the Mariana Islands. Chamorro oral traditions attest to our long-standing and inherent claims to these islands. According to our oral traditions, we did not come from south or southeast Asia as anthropological, linguistic, and archaeological studies might suggest. We came from “our’ earth. The oral tradition of Puntan and his sister, Fu’una, tells of Guam being the origins of our humanity. In *Hestorian Taotao Tano*': History of the Chamorro People, a history textbook published by the government of Guam, the authors convey that the origin of the Chamorro people rests in the legend of Puntan and Fu’una. They write:

They [the Chamorro people] believed that all life began in Guam and spread to the rest of the world. This belief is contained in the legend of Puntan and Fu’una. Puntan was a powerful being who lived before there was an earth or sky. Before he died, Puntan gave all his powers to Fu’una and told her what to do with his body. He wanted her to turn his eyes into the sun and the moon and to make his eyebrows into rainbows. He told her to use his chest to make the sky and his back to make the earth.

Fu’una did as she was told. When she was finished, she was amazed by the beauty she created. But the world was empty, and Fu’una was very lonely. So she used her brother’s power to turn herself into a large rock which fell to the earth near a beautiful island. The rock split
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open and out came hundreds of people who looked just like Fu'una and Punta. Some of the people sailed away to other lands, others stayed on the island and named it Guahan. (Hestorian 37)

The legend of Punta and Fu'una, along with presenting an indigenous view of the genesis of our people, also reflects something of Chamorro notions of home and land. The relationship between the earth and the human body, for example, as demonstrated in spreading of Punta's body parts, can be read in the topography of Guam. Certain villages of the island of Guam, for instance, are named with connotations of the body. The village of Barrigada on the eastern coast of Guam means "flank," while the village of Toto means "to lie on one's side." On the southern end of the island, the village of Agat (also spelled Hagat) translates to "blood." Also, the capital of Guam, Agaña (also spelled Hagat-ña), means "his or her daughter," while just north of Agaña lies the village of Tiyan, which means "stomach." The island of Guam, in the very naming of villages, can be seen to be a body from which other Chamorro bodies originate. The Chamorro people's centrality to land can be read and understood within the linguistic and social meanings illustrated in various village names.

The Chamorro people's land might thus be interpreted as an extension of their own bodies, and activities such as farming and fishing are considered important aspects of Chamorro life. While Chamorros resided in a particular village, they usually maintained a

---

2 There are other versions of this legend. According to Chamorro scholar Laura Souder, "The basic components" of this legend "are similar in all accounts" (Daughters 248).
separate ranch, or lancho, often located in a different village which they would visit during the week. Chamorros planted fruits and vegetables, and also raised cattle or pigs on their lancho. Chamorros were proud to have tillable agricultural lands, and despite the hard work involved, farming resulted in produce to be shared among families. Chamorros value land for its rich soil makeup, and not necessarily for its beachfront location. Those who lived near beaches were usually fishermen and women. Periodically, Chamorros from the interior of the island traded their produce and cattle for fish from Chamorros living in places along the coastline of Guam.

This trading of goods still occurs today, but not only for vegetables or fish. Now the trade network extends to laundry soap, clothes, Spam, and other valued goods. Practiced and valued among many Chamorros, the Chamorro term chenchule describes this network of trade and reciprocity which might be activated at the time of a christening, typhoon, funeral, marriage, or any other important occasion. For instance, when a Chamorro family provides chenchule in the form of labor or in the form of material goods, the family at the receiving end is obligated to give back even more labor or goods at a time of need in the future. The Chamorro custom of chenchule extends back to our origins as a people.

From the time of Chamorro oral traditions of birth and life, Guam has been framed as the home of the Chamorro people. While I have no problems with Chamorro origin traditions, I do, however, have problems with how Guam has come to be represented among larger audiences. All too often outsider nations and scholars portray Guam as the only island in the Marianas worthy of attention. Even this paper participates in this
discourse with its focus on American colonialism in Guam, a focus framed by the different colonial histories of Guam and the neighboring Mariana Islands.

Indeed, in the Mariana Islands history, the islands have been politically and imaginarily divided by colonial powers. For example, the different flags of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI) and Guam appear on shirts, caps, newspapers, truck tailgates, paintings, maps, and a host of other mediums which symbolize supposedly two different communities. These representations (i.e., the “Guam” Olympic Team) produce images which attempt to distinguish Guam from the CNMI and vice versa as if there are two kinds of Chamorro people. Culturally speaking, many Chamorros are united by extended families throughout the islands. However, in political circles, division, rather than unity, prevails.

Guam is a territory of the United States while the Northern Mariana Islands have formed a commonwealth with the US. Spain, Germany, Japan, and the United States have all contributed to the maintenance of these colonial boundaries. From the mid-sixteenth century up to the Spanish-American war in 1898, Spain had controlled the Marianas. The US then took political possession over Guam through the Treaty of Paris. The northern Mariana Islands, on the other hand, were sold by Spain to Germany who governed the islands until the end of World War One. Thereafter, Germany sold the islands to Japan, and up until the end of World War Two in 1944, Japan governed the northern Mariana island chain under the authority of a mandate from the League of Nations. It was only until after World War Two that Guam and the Northern Marianas would be united under a single colonizer, though still treated as two separate political entities. By 1944, Guam
had already experienced almost half a century of US colonialism under the rule of the US Navy.

The Last Chamorro Died

Middle of the spring semester, 1997. I am in O’ahu, land of the Hawaiians. I woke up just a few minutes ago. As usual, I am late for class. I live on campus at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. This is why I take my time moving to and from classrooms, libraries, and food places. Today, there is no time. My legs move quickly as I try to eat an apple without choking on it. It is Thursday morning, I think. The class starts at 10:30am. My watch says 10:28am. The course is called Pacific Islands History II. Dr. David Chappell is the instructor. I do not think he likes people who are tardy as these are the folks who interrupt his lectures. Forget the quick pace. Run. I now feel the heat of the pavement slowly penetrate the soles of my shoes. I enter the classroom sweaty and find my seat. Class begins. This apple is sour.

Halfway through Dr. Chappell’s lecture someone in the class raised a question. It was probably about US nuclear testing in Micronesia. Or was the question about tourism in Hawai‘i? Perhaps the topic was about how indigenous Pacific scholars define “culture.” Actually, I forget the exact details of that discussion. A few minutes later, a haole woman raised her hand. She sat three chairs to my right. She was probably in her early fifties. I hardly saw her face, or the faces of others a few chairs down the aisle. However, I saw her two hands maneuver up and down and side to side as if she were composing a symphony. She spoke and articulated her thoughts eloquently. On the surface, she seemed well-versed in the historical and anthropological literatures of Micronesia. I
listened carefully to every single word she said. For about five minutes, she talked about tourism in Guam. As she expressed her voice resonant with the thematics of empire, silence filled the room. From my side of the class the air thickened. There was an apple burning rapidly and furiously inside me.

As I far as I recall, she commented on a few things that troubled me. She said something to the effect that, “I visited Guam once. I drove around the island and all I saw were McDonalds restaurants, concrete buildings, and paved roads. I also saw a Polynesian cultural performance at the Pacific Islands Club hotel in Tumon Bay. I tell you, I saw no Guamanian culture. There is no native culture that exists in Guam. All I saw were Polynesian dances and artwork.” Before she uttered her last words, several thoughts crossed my mind. I thought, “should I cuss at her in Chamorro? In English? Should I stand up and throw my chair at her? Or should I, like a ‘civilized’ native, critique what she just said?” I came close to cussing at her and I could not throw the chair across the room because it was too bulky. Instead, I replied, “you know, I find your comments to be very offensive. I am a Chamorro and so is my friend, Erwin Manibusan, seated to my left. We are the indigenous people of the Mariana Islands.” From there, I continued to point out flaws and misconceptions in her comments about Chamorro culture. I explained that the term, “Guamanian,” is used today to identify residents of Guam, whether or not they are indigenous Chamorros. I also told her that outsiders in Guam use the term “Guamanian” to legitimize their presence as “locals.” It was like referring to the Maoris of Aotearoa as “New Zealanders.” I turned to my left and asked Erwin if he was alright. He replied, “are you alright?” I told him that I was, yet to this day I am still
bothered by the comments made by that woman. Her words about the Chamorro people were definitely “not alright” with me.

At the opening of this chapter, I quoted Cecilia T. Perez's poem, “As I Turn the Pages,” as a way of introducing readers to my concerns regarding Chamorro culture, American colonialism in Guam, and the historical development of Guam’s tourist industry. Cecilia T. Perez is also one of my friends. But it is not because I know her that I chose her poem. I believe that her poem reflects the political activism ongoing in Guam, and also indicates the emerging field of Chamorro creative writing. I have been to some of their poetry readings. Their messages are about protecting our language and identity. This has much to do with contemporary Chamorro survival. Many of them are passionate and determined writers. I like that kind of maturity and vision. In this manner, I want to share some of Perez’s energy as illustrated in her poem for this thesis, since many of its themes relate to issues of concern here.

One of the Many Scenes is Played

Referring to what was written in Perez’s poem and to what was said in my classroom encounter, this chapter intends to examine long-held views of Chamorro culture and history as “extinct.” This chapter addresses culture in ways which favor Jean and John Comaroff’s definition of it as a contested space of signifying practice--culture as “a matter of argument, a confrontation of signs and practices along the fault lines of power; that it is possible to recover from fragments, discord, and even from silences, the raw material with which to write imaginative sociologies of the past and the present” (18). A discussion of colonial empires in the Mariana Islands will follow thereafter with particular
attention paid to American colonialism in Guam from 1898 to present. I will end this chapter with a history of tourism in Guam, particularly as it pertains to Tumon Bay.

When that haole woman said that "there is no native culture that exists in Guam," she echoed the rhetoric of cultural genocide that has been written of the Chamorro people by outsider sources for almost 400 years. Her understanding and articulation of the Chamorro people's demise participates in the discourse of the fatal impact historiographical theory. This theory portrays Pacific Islanders as passive agents, mere "props" as Perez would say, of European colonial desires and demands. As articulated in Alan Moorehead’s *The Fatal Impact*, Pacific Islanders would become victims in their own lands in cross-cultural encounters between Pacific Islanders and Europeans.

Relying on the chronicles of Euro-American explorers, novelists, missionaries, and other travel writers, Moorehead’s thesis examines the “first contact between the white man and the inhabitants of that uncharted ocean: Tahiti, ... Australia ... and, finally, the south polar regions” (1). He defends the “charting” of European intrusion into the Pacific and laments colonial rule over indigenous peoples of the Pacific. In Moorehead’s discussion of the British settlement of Australia in the early 1800s, for instance, he appears to have anticipated the supposed demise of the aboriginal population in favor of European settlement and economic exploitation. He writes:

At last, after half a century of relentless effort, the country [Australia] was being forced to conform to the European pattern. Everywhere around the new settlements the native bush was being torn down and replaced by English farms where European crops and plants were being made to grow, and even English oaks and elms were beginning to appear... The aborigines fell back steadily before this invasion. They could not conform, they did not know how to adjust themselves to the new
Rather than focusing on Aboriginal reactions to European “progress,” Moorehead’s book offers a totalizing narrative of European conquest and Aboriginal defeat. The fatal impact theory has not only gained credence in Moorehead’s work, but in many histories of the Chamorro people as well. Historians have often written of Chamorro culture and history in ways similar to that of Moorehead’s depiction of the Aborigines in Australia. As Pacific historian Greg Dening argues in his study of indigenous Te Enata culture and Te Aoe (outsider) intrusion in the nineteenth century Marquesas, the Te Enata’s “culture needs to be defined in terms of their own metaphors and their own particularity. To dispossess them of that is a reductionism that cannot be validated” (281). A similar case can be made for historical studies of Chamorro culture. This need for an analysis of indigenous metaphors and meanings is an important void in studies of the Marianas and elsewhere, especially when remarks like those of my fellow classmate, such as “there is no such thing as Chamorro culture,” resonate in histories of the Mariana Islands.

Since the time of Magellan’s voyage into the Pacific in 1521, numerous accounts have lamented and continue to lament the supposed tragic loss of a Pacific Islander community in the Mariana Islands. This discourse of Chamorro cultural genocide was triggered by the violence accompanying Spanish colonization in the Marianas. As we saw in Chapter 1, from the start of contact, at Magellan’s landing in Guam in 1521, incidences of violence against the Chamorro people occurred. But Magellan’s landfall was not the “official” beginning of Spanish colonization in the Marianas. A few decades
after his “discovery” of Guam, in January 22, 1565, Spanish Captain-General Miguel Lopez de Legazpi dropped anchor and claimed ownership of the Marianas on behalf of the Crown of Spain. Chamorro historian Pedro C. Sanchez argues that the Chamorro people at that time had no understanding of law nor of the power of the written word in European international contexts. Sanchez writes that:

The Captain-General [Legazpi] made no effort to consult the Chamorros, to inform them of his action, nor to discuss the effects such action would have on them. The Chamorros could not have realized that Legazpi’s proclamation was merely the beginning of a Spanish era on Guam that would last for the next 333 years. (31)

The Chamorro people may not have understood the implications of foreign settlement and rule. Surely, Chamorro responses to Spanish colonialism varied. However, at least some had a firm understanding that Spain was an invader bringing neither peaceful trade nor a peaceful religion.

Outbreaks of violence occurred between Spanish settlers and Chamorros who refused to be subdued. During Magellan’s encounter with Chamorros in 1521 and Legazpi’s in 1565, instances of Chamorro resistance occurred. Sanchez recounts one example of a Chamorro revolt. He notes that while Legazpi’s crew was supplying themselves with water for their trip to the Philippines, they were attacked by several Chamorros (Sanchez 32). Sanchez argues that perhaps their attack was an act of “revenge for Magellan’s killing of seven islanders in 1521” (32). Like most European colonizers who refused peaceful forms of negotiation, Legazpi retaliated with force. In what Sanchez refers to as an act of intimidation, Legazpi burned several houses and hanged several Chamorros (Sanchez 32). Legazpi’s treatment of the Chamorro people
would be typical of Spain’s methods of pacification. Quoting Legazpi’s explanation of his retaliatory violence, Sanchez writes that “[t]he attack . . . was to ensure ‘that when Spaniards, vassals of his majesty, anchor there another time, the natives shall give them a better reception’” (32). Throughout the initial Spanish occupation of the Marianas, the Chamorro people were not all so inclined to provide “better reception,” or hospitality as we now know it, to outsider populations.

As an outcome of rising tensions between the Spanish and the Chamorro people, there resulted, Sanchez explains, the Chamorro-Spanish Wars. They began in July 23, 1670 after the Spanish “arrest of several [Chamorro] people of Agana who were accused of killing a native convert while he was cutting wood for making crosses” (Sanchez 40). Sanchez’s account of the Chamorros, possibly men, who resisted Legazpi’s intrusion and takeover tells much about the history of the Chamorro-Spanish wars during its beginning phases. The dominant historiographical theme at that time privileged Chamorro men as bearers of power while Chamorro women, despite being the centers of a matrilineal society, were marginalized in comparison. However, another historiographical assertion prevailed which noted that the wars were indeed long and damaging, lasting nearly thirty years.

The Chamorro-Spanish Wars escalated two years later with the death of Padre Louis Diego de Sanvitores in 1672 at the hands of Chief Matapang and Hirao, two Chamorro men from Tumon. Sanvitores was the Jesuit priest who advocated and ultimately supervised the establishment of the Spanish settlement of the Mariana Islands for purposes of the Catholic conversion of our people. This was a difficult task for
Sanvitores and the Church as the Marianas proved to be a colony far from Spain. For these early Spanish colonists, writes Maria Teresa Del Valle, "[u]nity in the far-flung Spanish overseas empire was expressed in religion and language, loyalty to the king, and bureaucratic centralization...which made operation of the government very difficult especially because of the vast distances involved" (14). Under the supervision of Father Sanvitores, Del Valle continued, “theocratic rule was established” in the Marianas (18). Sanvitores died in the waters of Tumon Bay, Guam after having baptized Chief Matapang’s daughter against his expressed wishes. Sanvitores’ death signaled a change in Spanish policies concerning the Marianas. Prior to his death, the Jesuits governed the colony in the Marianas, including charge over the Spanish garrison. With the death of Sanvitores, however, the Spanish military assumed control of the colony, and their attentions turned toward the pacification of the Chamorro people in wars which would last until the end of the seventeenth century.

Even prior to those years of violence, factions had emerged between Chamorro leaders who sought new forms of political power with the Spanish government and others who were vehemently opposed to Spanish intrusion. Spanish colonialism was never totalizing. Chamorro familial clans rivaled each other from Guam to Saipan, some opposing Spanish rule, such as Chief Matapang of Tumon, Guam, and others cooperating with Spanish officials and priests, such as Chief Quipuha from Agaña, Guam. Some Chamorros from lower classes, such as the manachang, sought alliances with the Spanish, while some from chiefly positions, such as the matua, opposed the new and competing forms of power. Although the Spanish destroyed much of this particular Chamorro class
system, certain practices reflecting notions of hierarchy still remain today in the forms of 
respetu, or respect, and i familia, or the family. Read one way, the outcome of the 
Chamorro-Spanish Wars demonstrates the survival of the Chamorro people under difficult 
conditions. However, the canonical story of the Chamorro-Spanish Wars emphasizes 
Chamorro factionalism and instability, leading to outright Spanish conquest and Chamorro 
ruin.

The Spaniards succeeded in sending back messages of triumph to their homeland, 
and narratives of heroism and martyrdom emerged from their conquest (see fig. 2). For 
example, Father Francis X. Hezel, a prolific historian of colonial discourses in Micronesia, 
and Marjorie G. Driver wrote about eighteenth century Spanish colonialism in the 
Marianas, arguing that

[t]here was a quaint nobility in the axiom of Spanish imperial policy of the 
day that maintained that ‘a king holds some states because he needs them, 
and others because they need him’. This principle, which was invoked 
often enough to justify retaining Spanish interests in the Philippines, was all 
the more applicable to the Marianas (149).

Further, Spanish documents told of the supposed demise of the Chamorro people. 
Colonial literature of this nature would dominate the discourses of the Marianas for almost 
four hundred years and has formed the canon of Chamorro historiography. These 
accounts described the supposed annihilation of Chamorro men by Spanish soldiers, 
followed by the alleged Spanish insemination of Chamorro women, the outcome of which 
was the creation of a new, “hybrid” race of people. The Chamorro people became 
subjects of historical inquiry, but with their subjectivity limited to passivity and malleability 
under Spanish colonialism, as well as American rule.
One contemporary historian likened the Spanish invasion of the Marianas to that of a (European) male raping a (Native) female. In the 1970s, renowned Pacific historian Douglas L. Oliver wrote of the Marianas that “[t]he rape of Oceania began with Guam... Guam’s fate was already sealed” (334). Oliver’s application of the gendered metaphor of “rape” is characteristic in narratives of both the Western feminization of the Pacific and the Spanish “fertilization” of the Chamorro people. The Pacific, and in this case, Guam, has often been perceived by a male-dominated West as the feminine Other. In Oliver’s account, Guam is the passive woman who submits to foreign male intrusions. This
imagery is repeated in Perez's poem, "As I Turn the Pages," in which she portrays the scene in which "Foreign actors walk in / float in fly in / bomb in / inseminate into / the passive props" (5). Perez describes the Chamorro people as they have appeared in our canonical histories. In these accounts, the Chamorro people are viewed as "props" who are "docile / indolent indios / tawny-skinned / muscle-bound / robust / theiving / ignorant / natives" (Perez 5). Perhaps these are the orientalist depictions evoked by Oliver when he wrote that Chamorros were "transformed . . . so thoroughly that their Micronesian heritage was barely discernible" (338).

Another history book published in 1984 replays the scene of Chamorro tragedy and foreign triumph. In Protest and Dissent in the Colonial Pacific, Pacific historians Peter Hempenstall and Noel Rutherford write that "[t]he Ladrones, or Mariana Islands as they were subsequently called and of which Guam was geographically a part, also supposedly witnessed one of the worst campaigns of colonial genocide anywhere in the world. . . .to virtual oblivion of pure-bloods" (98). I do not think Hempenstall and Rutherford's use of "supposedly" tones down or gives doubt to phrases like "the worst campaigns of colonial genocide in the world" and "virtual oblivion." Despite writing a history which supposedly exemplifies J.W. Davidson's paradigm of islander agency, their history of the Chamorro people is not about the survival of the Chamorro people. Indeed, there appears to be no Chamorro agency here. Instead, their history of the Chamorro people is "a sorry tale of brutal extermination and demoralization of a mild island people" (Hempenstall and Rutherford 101). The Chamorro people are erased from the pages of Euro-American history because, as Hempenstall and Rutherford declare, "[w]hat failed them [the
Chamorro people] in the end was the absence of any centralised organization to coordinate responses to the Spanish” (102). Hempenstall and Rutherford’s history of the Chamorro people perhaps demonstrates the extent of liberalism.

Perez’s poem, “As I Turn the Pages,” critiques what foreigners have labeled as the supposed “end” of the Chamorro people. Written recently in a time of intensified Chamorro cultural awareness and resistance to colonial hegemony, “As I Turn the Pages” subverts the prevailing narrative of Spanish conquest in the Marianas. Perez’s voice adds another voice, an indigenous voice of resistance, to those foreign pages. Paraphrasing the literature which depicts a dead Chamorro race, Perez writes that “‘Now, those scholars, / learned men and women, / wrote, / ‘And in the end ...’ / ‘in one final gasp for life ...’ / ‘the last Chamorro died’” (5-6). Learned scholars, perhaps well-versed in the Spanish literature of the Marianas, continue to uphold accounts of Spanish conquest and Chamorro demise.

One such scholar is Father Francis X. Hezel. In a 1998 article entitled “New Directions in Pacific History: A Practitioner’s Critical View,” Hezel states that “there is no surviving oral tradition” in the Mariana Islands (105). But Hezel’s assertion of an alleged dead Chamorro oral tradition clashes with contemporary Chamorro views of orality. Chamorro historian Laura Souder, for example, counters Hezel’s inaccuracy, arguing that “[a]lthough we [Chamorros] have no written literary tradition, our legends, proverbs, and songs evidence a rich oral folklore” (Daughters 19). The oral tradition to which Souder refers traces back to Chamorro creation accounts, as well as to memories of World War Two and to present day storytelling traditions around kitchen tables and barbecue pits.
But there is an evident continuity in the ways in which outsiders view the Chamorro culture. Our people’s supposed demise has led most scholars to believe in the authority of earlier Spanish accounts as representative texts of Chamorro culture. These outsider discourses continue to be sources of knowledge for many Chamorros and non-Chamorros interested in our culture and history.

This kind of knowledge that bemoans European conquest and native submission has even greatly influenced some Chamorros to the point of accepting the so-called death of our people. Robert Tenorio Torres, for instance, a Chamorro literary critic, writes in his master’s thesis on Chamorro literary traditions that “[t]he pre-contact lineage of Chamorros had become extinct” (16). And in a 1996 documentary entitled Chamoru Dreams, Chamorro film-maker Eric Tydingco, in his search for “authentic” Chamorro culture, asks at one point in the film, “so what are we?” Tydingco’s question of the demise of the Chamorro people is echoed by another in which he asks, “Guam’s been colonized for over four hundred years . . . how much real Chamorro history can be left?” These are questions which plague contemporary struggles to understand Chamorro culture and identity (see fig. 3). Some have come out against such misconceptions of Chamorro cultural survival in statements of those such as Torres and Tydingco. Vicente M. Diaz, for example, locates the rhetoric of Oliver, Hezel, Hempenstall, Rutherford, Torres, Tydingco, and others within the dominant “theme of destruction of a proud Chamorro society at the hands of foreign agents and institutions” (“Simply Chamorro” 31). Diaz’s work urges others to read Chamorro historiography in ways which respect Chamorro agency in resistance to and adaptation to colonial institutions and ideologies.
To narrate the stories of Chamorro cultural survival will require, as James Clifford argues, “[resisting] deep-seated habits of mind and systems of authenticity” (246). The fatal impact theory, as spread by writers and historians such as Moorehead, Hezel, and others, is one such “system of authenticity” which has affected the Chamorro people. Addressing audiences of ethnographers and historians, Clifford adds that “[w]e need to be suspicious of an almost-automatic tendency to regulate non-Western peoples and objects to the pasts of an increasingly homogeneous humanity” (246). The works of Oliver, Hezel, Hempenstall, Rutherford, and Torres are just a few accounts which “regulate” and reinforce misconceptions of a dead or dying Chamorro culture whose past and present are manipulated and controlled by foreign influence.

The Chamorro people exist today despite the fact that credentialed scholars continue to argue otherwise. The theme of tragic demise, as I will argue in Chapter 4, plays an important role in the formation of tourism on Guam. Given the “absence” of the Chamorro people, Guam’s tourist industry looks to other Pacific island cultures for
"authentic" traditions suitable for commodification. Writing on Guam as if its people were a blank slate, American travelers and military personnel have relied on the tropes of hospitality and paradise in fantasized representations of the Chamorro people. By focusing on these tropes as cultural descriptions, these writers enframe the Chamorro people and our landscape in ways which ultimately privilege forms of American hegemony over our indigenous belief systems and practices. Such processes of the American familiarization and feminization of Guam take precedence over past and present Chamorro ways of knowing.

Bastion of American Democracy

American fantasies of lush islands, white beaches, and sunny days commonly identified with the Pacific differ greatly from mainstream definitions of the "frontier," described by American historian Frederick Jackson Turner as an area "at the hither edge of free land" (qtd. in Faragher 33). Many Americans, like Turner, had come to know the frontier as a wilderness whose native people and landscape were to be conquered by heroic and exploratory white men. This frontier of American economic expansion extended from America's east to west coasts. Arrell Gibson describes the American frontier as a "territory situated beyond the line of settlement, awaiting the altering application of pioneer initiative and ingenuity to exploit its resources" (3). This exploitation of resources, as Ronald T. Takaki's elaborates, was based on "penetration into the 'virgin land'" of western America (265). The West, argues Takaki, was an

... arena where white men could test the limits of their republican asceticism and experience regeneration through violence against Indians, where they could find raw material and expand the market for goods
manufactured in the East, and where they could take possession of Indian lands and advance themselves through land speculation and agricultural production. (265)

The exploitation of Indian lands also incorporated, argues Gibson, the “saga of American nationhood” which “transformed it [the frontier] from wilderness to a functioning component in the nation’s economic, social, and political life” (3). As a frontier-border of the US empire in the Pacific, Hawai‘i, Samoa, Guam, and the Philippines would figure into the saga of American nation building in ways which would directly benefit the US military, thus indirectly promoting the economic, social, and political aspects of American nationalism to which Takaki refers.

The history of American colonialism in Guam is primarily a militaristic one. The island of Guam was acquired for its harbors and lands which suited the various needs of the US Navy. As a result of the Spanish-American war, the Department of the Navy, on the authority of President William McKinley, governed the Chamorro people from the periods of 1898 to 1941, and after the Japanese occupation of Guam from 1944 to 1949. McKinley assigned naval officers to serve as governors in charge of the island’s affairs—legal, social, and political. Over the years a long succession of Naval governors ruled over Guam and the Chamorro people through executive orders. These orders, argue Laura Souder, “dictated appropriate standards and acceptable behavior for the people of this newly acquired territory” (Daughters 33). Once again, the Chamorro people had to adjust to another colonizer’s ways of living. The so-called “appropriate” and “acceptable” standards set by the US Navy were not so appropriate for the Chamorro people. Rather than trying to live with the Chamorro people on our terms, the Naval governors imposed
what they thought were “proper” forms of hygiene, discipline, and order. In her critique of the Naval administration, Souder writes that the so-called democratic naval orders “proclaimed who could marry whom; when church bells could ring; what language would be used; and prohibited whistling and spitting, particularly of betel nut spittle as the unsightly splotches of red offended the delicate wives of naval officers during their afternoon strolls” (Daughters 33). Because of the radically-different standards set by the Navy, the Chamorro people, asserts Souder, “began to readjust their perceptions of themselves” (Daughters 33). The Chamorro language and customs were demonized and degraded by the Naval governors, and the Chamorro people were forced to adapt or resist to the commands of the Naval governors. But unlike the Spaniards who warred with the Chamorro people as part of their pacification project, the US Navy attempted more subtle disciplinary forms of control.

The Naval administration’s rule over Guam prior to World War Two in 1941 is often recollected nostalgically by elder generations of Chamorros as a time of supposedly peaceful collaboration between the Chamorro people and the US Navy. The story of the pre-war totalitarian Naval government in Guam has been often overshadowed by the violence which has been associated with the Japanese occupation of Guam in World War Two and the subsequent “liberation” of the island by American Armed Forces. In her study of the pre-war Naval administration of Guam, Chamorro historian Anne Perez Hattori argues that in order to maintain hegemonic control over Guam, US Navy officials “found it advantageous to represent the Chamorro people as incapable of self-government” (“Bodily Harm” 15). And as Souder has also elaborated, this infantilization
of the Chamorro people allowed Navy governors to enact various laws which policed almost every aspect of Chamorro life. In implementing their wide-ranging policies, the Naval government, asserts Hattori, “imposed . . . American Protestant norms of social propriety upon Chamorro families” (“Bodily Harm” 24). These Naval policies attempted to “re-shape” Chamorro bodies and minds, as Hattori reminds us. Yet, as she observes, the resulting Chamorro reactions differed from those desired by governors who sought the “Americanization” of the Chamorro people. Hattori reveals that these American activities . . . were coopted by the Chamorro people and placed into new social contexts. Many of the ‘team’ exercises brought clan members into a new activity organized under existing cultural structures. Through baseball and other games, Chamorros have unified new generations of clan and kin in further ties of reciprocity. What this seems to suggest is the ability of local agents to manipulate, and ultimately control, the consequences and significances of a substantial number of colonial projects. (“Bodily Harm” 42)

Hattori’s read of the ways in which Chamorro clans indigenized American activities are revealing not only in the sense that it disturbs standards of individualism and materialism associated with sports and games, but also because it suggests multiple ways of interpreting Chamorro responses to colonial programs. Both Hattori’s and Souder’s demonstration of indigenous Chamorro reactions to naval discourses are important considering that the canonical histories of Guam “overlook the Chamorros’ involvement and active participation in America’s colonization of Guam” (Governing Guam 51).

Perhaps the most offensive outcome of American colonization in Guam has been the land pillaging which occurred immediately following the end of World War Two (see fig. 4). After three years of Japanese occupation in Guam from 1941 to 1944, America
Fig. 4. Map from Robert F. Rogers, Destiny’s Landfall (Honolulu, 1995) 231. Shaded areas are lands used by the US military and federal government from 1950-1990.

“liberated,” or recaptured, the island of Guam through force. Most of Guam’s architectural and agricultural landscapes were destroyed by the American “softening” campaign. This campaign included numerous American air raids over the island of Guam in an attempt to bomb and, thus, “soften” and destroy Japanese defenses prior to the American infantry invasion. After the American invasion on the beaches of Asan and victory over the Japanese Imperial Army, the post-war era entailed a period of rampant
military land takings. In the process of alienating land from the Chamorros, the US military also deprived us of an important part of our livelihoods and cultural heritage. Generations of Chamorro families would seemingly be displaced forever from their villages or from their lanco. Today, the military retains one-third of the land in Guam despite the fact that it “actually uses only 25 percent of its land holdings” (McHenry 177).

Regarding the theft of Chamorro lands after World War Two, Chamorro activist and lawyer, Michael Phillips writes that

When the Navy was again put in charge of island affairs, the appointed governor immediately began condemning huge tracts of land, including whole villages. The U.S. flattened portions of Guam during the intense bombing, and now the naval government began changing the landscape of our island to suit its needs. The military occupied 52,000 acres of privately held land. . . . The military did not allow the citizens to rebuild their homes or otherwise use their land despite the fact that the military was neither using the land nor paying rent. (7)

In villages throughout the island—such as at Sumay in the south of Guam, at Yigo in the north, and at Tiyan in central Guam—the US military confiscated land for its military installations. Bases such as Naval Station, a naval ship support and repair facility; Andersen Air Force Base, an installation serving the B-52 bombers; and Naval Air Station, another airport suiting the needs of the US Navy consumed large portions of Guam’s terrain. Other military structures included Naval Magazine, a weapon storage facility in the village of Santa Rita and a Naval communication base in the village of Dededo. Many of these villages were places of prime agricultural land, and the Chamorro families removed from these lands were poorly compensated, or were deprived of compensation altogether. Some of these Chamorro families were relocated to villages like Santa Rita,
Sinajña, Agat, Dededo, Talofofo, Yoña, and Barrigada (Sanchez 255). In an essay examining the economic development of Guam, Chamorro business person Anthony Leon Guerrero argues that the post-war era was a difficult time for many Chamorro families because of their forced adjustment to the loss of agricultural lands to the US military.¹

Leon Guerrero writes that

Farming was not allowed on any large scale; it would not have been possible anyway, because of the widespread devastation and the loss of the island’s best farmlands to the new military bases. Without access to their lancho, Chamorros were forced to seek other ways to make a living. This was the beginning of their economy’s rapid transformation from subsistence agriculture and bartering to a system of wage employment and monetary exchange. (91)

As Leon Guerrero points out, the loss of land to the military literally forced Chamorros to enter the budding American capitalist economy on Guam. But these lands were alienated not only for strategic militaristic purposes. Some lands were taken for their paradisiacal value, a term once foreign to the Chamorro people.

As part of the military’s role in maintaining “morale” for its soldiers during the post-war era, the US military branches of the Navy, Army and Air Force developed recreational facilities for its dependents in Guam. For example, the Guam United Servicemen’s Organization (USO) officially opened in 1949 in the village of Piti. Even

¹ While many Chamorro families were not involved in cash-earning jobs before World War Two, there were a few families who prospered from a monetary based economy. Examining pre-war economies of Guam, Leon Guerrero remarked that “[d]uring the early American Period, a number of . . . privately owned businesses formed in Guam, and many of them prospered. Many, though, were operated by immigrants who were allowed by the Navy to remain in Guam for various reasons. One outstanding exception was the Ada Soap Factory, which manufactured a type of lye soap called ‘saltwater soap’ because it worked well in saltwater” (87). During the post-World War Two period, the Ada family continued to make soap in view of a few emerging business-oriented families, such as the Calvo, Leon Guerrero and Perez families.
before the USO was formed, a “Navy’s chief’s club” had served military personnel immediately following the American re-occupation of Guam (Gisclair 29). The beach upon which the USO stood belonged to the former Naval Station (now Naval Activities). Although the USO allowed public access to its facilities and the beach in 1985, almost forty years after it opened, the organization, wrote Sgt. Todd Gisclair, was “above all” for “the military member” (28). Furthermore, in places like Tumon Bay, once an agricultural and fishing community, the military requested land for recreational use.

This was not the first attempt to make use of land in Tumon, as military personnel have often frequented the beaches there. Since 1914, an Elks Club, composed of military personnel and other American citizens stationed on Guam, formed in Agaña, along with “a beach house used for picnics, located on Tumon Bay” (Ferris 4a). In 1924, an unknown author of an article entitled “Elk’s Recreation Building” wrote about the significance of the Tumon Bay location, stating that its “beach is one of the finest on the Island. There is practically no coral in the sand and the water, even at low tide, is deep enough to afford excellent bathing” (5). The author further outlined the area’s paradisiacal features, noting that the Elk’s clubhouse “is situated in the midst of coconut and federico palms and other tropical plants and the rocks and caves in close proximity make the place very picturesque as well as providing shade and quiet places for retreat” (5). After the war, Tumon Bay was once again visited by the military. One Chamorro elder, however, was not pleased with the military appropriation of land in Tumon and elsewhere in Guam.
My grandfather, Juan Lujan, recounted the story of a Chamorro elder, Tun Juan Unpingco, who refused to give up his land in Tumon Bay. My grandfather said that Tun Juan was a “strong willed” man who, upon a request by military soldiers that he surrender his land for “militaristic” purposes, openly replied with a shotgun in one hand, “first come, first dead” (Lujan, J. Personal interview. 2 January 1998). Tun Juan’s story is echoed by Michael Phillips who recalls that “John Unpingco stood in front of U.S. military personnel and their bulldozers with his gun and refused to leave his family land in Tumon. Rather than risk an embarrassing story, the U.S. military retreated and allowed Unpingco to keep his land” (7). But acts of resistance like that of Tun Juan Unpingco did not stop the push of military personnel for recreation on the beaches of Tumon Bay.

High-ranking military officials, such as naval governor C.A. Pownall, advocated the confiscation of certain lands in Tumon Bay for the recreational use of military personnel. In a letter addressed to the Guam Congress in 1948, Governor Pownall wrote “[f]ollowing the reoccupation of Guam, land in the Tumon Bay area was taken and used for the essential requirements of the Armed Forces of the United States in prosecuting the war” (1). Pownall also specifically sought the condemnation of beaches in order to “provide adequate swimming facilities for the personnel of the Air Force and Army stationed on Guam” (3). To justify these land taking policies, Pownall argued that “[t]o provide adequate athletic facilities for the personnel of the Armed Forces on Guam is of direct concern to the local Government in effecting law and order, harmony and morale”

---

2 Tun and Tan are terms of respect used when addressing male and female elders.
The use of these beaches exclusively for military personnel has been noted by numerous authors. Robert Rogers, for example, described that “[a]n Air Corps area was set up on Tumon Beach” which “was off-limits to Chamorros” (200). Benigno Palomo, a Chamorro educator, also wrote that “[m]uch of the beachfront” in Tumon Bay “was reserved for military use, one part for officers and another part enlisted men” (5c).

The pre-war and post-war acquisition of lands in Tumon Bay for recreational purposes demonstrates the concrete militouristic intentions of the US military. Over the years the military provided a different view of land. While Chamorros worked the land as farmers or worked the sea as fishers, some of the military personnel stationed in Guam worked their sun tans as they lined the beaches of the island. Most notably before World War Two, not many Chamorros placed value on beaches as “sandy soil wasn’t good for farming” (B. Palomo 5c). Yet Chamorros slowly began to realize that land was not only valued for its agricultural use, but also for its capitalistic potential. It was a slow and gradual realization, recalled Bert Unpingco, former director of the Guam Visitor’s Bureau. Unpingco noted that “‘[t]he word tourism was foreign to Chamorros and islanders and no one knew how Guam could benefit from tourism’” (qtd. in Borja 10a). During the post-war era, the capitalization of the coastal lands for touristic reasons was perceived as an alternative to a subsistence economy for certain Chamorro leaders. This was a viable decision at the time considering the fact that the US military had displaced numerous Chamorro families and clans from their farmlands and villages. During the late 1960s the monetary value of beaches and beachfront property in Guam slowly escalated, especially along the shoreline of Tumon Bay. As Benigno Palomo points out, Tumon Bay “was
developed and became the most sought after property in Guam for hotels, condominiums, restaurants and so forth” (5c). A large-scale civilian tourist industry, however, was not allowed to develop as a major part of Guam’s economy until the repeal of the naval security clearance act of Guam in 1962.

In August 21, 1962, then president John F. Kennedy discontinued use of what was officially titled “The Guam Island Naval Defensive Area and the Guam Island Naval Airspace Reservation.” Commonly referred to as the Naval Security Clearance, this policy had prevented any travel into and out of Guam without the permission of the US Navy. The northern Mariana Islands were included in the security clearance, with the exception of Rota. All peoples, vessels, and airplanes had to go through a naval security check if they wanted to enter Guam’s airspace and territorial lands and seas. The military defended this policy as a way of protecting the postwar Guam economy from exploitation by outside investors. But another explanation, one related to military considerations, has been offered by Donald F. McHenry. According to McHenry, Kennedy abolished the security clearance primarily because the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) had ended their covert training institution in Saipan (57). McHenry notes that the CIA had a base in Saipan from 1951 to 1962 to train “Chinese nationalists who still believed Chiang Kaishek’s forces would recapture the mainland and, reportedly, later for training Vietnam advisors” (57). The barrier preventing travel into the Marianas had thus been necessary in order to survey and restrict traffic entering and exiting the area. Furthermore, particularly in the period prior to World War Two, the Naval security clearance requirement was “meant to shield the land and airspace over Guam from spies and saboteurs from the
surrounding Japanese-held islands in Micronesia" (Governing Guam 123). By controlling traffic into the islands, the US Naval government "intentionally kept Guam's economy almost entirely dependent on U.S. military expenditures. It kept outside businessmen from coming into the island and deterred any kind of economic development" (Governing Guam 123).

Whatever the reason for the removal of the security clearance requirement, it resulted in major changes to Guam's economy. As the unidentified author of the article entitled "White House Explains JFK's Rescission of Guam Entry Ban" in the Guam Daily News commented in 1962, Kennedy's actions "will . . . remove a major hindrance to the growth of tourism and will provide the territorial government with the opportunity to attract long-term investments, a necessary element in the economic development of the island" (5). Furthermore, the elimination of the security clearance can be seen as a factor leading to the increase of immigration into Guam in order to fulfill the labor needs of the tourist industry. As the authors of Governing Guam, a history textbook published by the government of Guam, assert, the development of Guam's tourist industry "brought about the migration and the population explosion that has rocked the island in the last 30 years" (123-124). The Chamorro people now comprise less than half of the total population in Guam. Because the US federal government, and not the government of Guam, controls immigration to the island, the influx of immigrants continues on a rapid scale.

Of the many participants involved in implementing the large scale hotel development of Tumon Bay, a few people, corporations, and agencies stand out. For instance, the Guam Visitor's Bureau was created by Governor Carlton Skinner in 1952.
But Skinner’s creation did not flourish until a decade later with Kennedy’s removal of the security clearance. The 1960s was a time for thinking out the possibilities and problems associated with tourist development. More people were concerned with the possibility of making Guam, following Hawai‘i, the “next American tourist island in the sun” (Pray 7). Reports circulated which instructed Chamorros on the making of a tourist industry in Guam.

The Department of Interior, which was and continues to be Guam’s political link to the US executive branches, actively encouraged the development of tourism in Guam. In a 1966 report on the “existing air transport services” in Guam, the Department of Interior suggested tourism as the most feasible economy for the island. Representing Guam’s environment in the paradisiacal language of tourism, the Department of Interior wrote that “the climate is pleasantly tropical; bananas and breadfruit grow with little effort . . . and fish may be easily obtained often without more than walking off-shore and casting a net” (viii). Moreover, the US Department of Interior report argued that Guam was an ideal place for touristic activity since Guam’s “dry season, from December through April, coincides with the peak winter tourist exodus from more northern areas,” such as Japan (48).

The Interior report also stressed the importance of “exploiting” the Chamorro culture and landscape. Referring to other Pacific islands such as Hawai‘i and Samoa, Interior officials remarked that “each of these islands must develop the means to exploit their uniqueness and attractions if tourism is to flourish” (ix). The significance of the Department of Interior report was not only its attention to the paradisiacal aspects of
island nations, but its attempt to "exploit" island cultures, such as those in Guam. Furthermore, the promotion of tourism was not necessarily pursued for the benefit of the Chamorro people. Instead, the Interior explicitly stated that the report's "policies along the lines here suggested are in the long-term interest of the United States" (53).

These long-term interests of the US, as noted in the report, include the economic interests of American corporations, such as Pan-American airlines which began operating in Guam in 1935 and which was protected from foreign competition as the US specifically sought "U.S.-flag competitive service between Guam and the United States" (48).

Looking to the future, the Department of Interior predicted that tourism would be the economy of the late twentieth century and that Guam as a port of entry would serve the needs of tourists trafficking between continental Asia and the Pacific region. In fact, as Guam's tourist industry developed, phrases such as "Guam USA: Gateway to Micronesia" and "Guam: Where America's Day begins" have been advertised in magazines and television commercials to indicate Guam's touristic significance, often disguising the island's militaristic missions. Labels such as these which advertise Guam as a "safe" American port often camouflage the fact that the island is a colony of the US.

In a letter dated September 13, 1997 to the "Voice of the People" section in the Pacific Daily News, Ben Garrido rebutted that '[i]f you want Guam to be continually known as Guam, U.S.A., where America's Day Begins, then let there be a reality to the symbol of freedom, because now it's Guam, Where U.S. Colonialism Begins" (23). But the construction of the tourist industry in Guam was never solely the responsibility of the Department of the Interior, Naval governors, and American corporations. Indeed,
Chamorro leaders actively pursued the idea that tourism was the “new sugar” of the Pacific.

In 1963, just a year after John F. Kennedy removed the security clearance, Guam’s governor, Manuel F. L. Guerrero, administered Executive Order 63-10 which formed a tourist advisory board within the Department of Commerce (Pray 7). Guerrero was an ambitious promoter of the tourism industry and he sought to “sell” Guam’s environmental beauty and strategic location in the Western Pacific. In an address to the Department of Interior, Guerrero stated that “‘[t]he unmatched beauty of Guam’s beaches and seas, woodlands and plateaus, and her natural position as a crossroad for Pacific transportation and communication, add up to a tremendous potential for tourism’” (qtd. in Sanchez 346). During Guerrero’s term as a governor, he inaugurated the new airport in the village of Tamuning on March 5, 1966. Originally constructed as a runway for the Navy, the federal government began sharing space with the new Guam International Air Terminal as civilian air traffic increased with the rise in tourist visits. Governor Guerrero, with the advice and experience of Rex Wills, a former tourist consultant from the Hawai’i Visitors Bureau, initiated aggressive tourist campaigns abroad. Paul Borja, in an article on the genealogy of the tourist industry in Guam, noted that Wills “started to communicate with tour operators in the Philippines, Japan and Taiwan to describe the beauty of Guam” (8a). Other aggressive tourist campaigns ensued following Guerrero’s gubernatorial term. Soon, people in places like Japan found out that Guam was a place to relax and unwind. Chamorros like Bert Unpingco, who managed the Guam Visitor’s Bureau in the 1970s, “set about to increase Japanese trade to Guam by inviting travel writers and tour operators...
to visit the island” (Borja 8a). By 1971 hotels like the Cliff Hotel, the Fujita Tumon Beach, Continental Travelodge, the Hilton Hotel, and the Guam Dai Ichi Hotel were already built or near-completion. Some of those lands where hotels stand today were formerly possessed by the federal government after World War Two. Sponsored by R. F. Taitano, Resolution No. 416 of the Guam Legislature outlined the Federal government’s land taking in Tumon Bay. The document read:

the Department of Interior, as heir to certain Department of Defense land acquisitions, owns Lots Nos. 5140-1, 5137-5, 5137-3-R-2 and 5137-2-1 four contiguous lots lying between the Tumon Bay Road and Tumon Beach, which lots are the last Federal land holdings in Tumon Bay, one of Guam’s most beautiful beaches, and the site of all currently proposed resort hotel construction. (n. pag.)

Rather than returning those lands to their indigenous owners, the Department of Interior handed over those “lots” to the government of Guam “for the commercial exploitation as another such hotel site” (n. pag.). The Department of Interior did not return lands to its original owners as this act would have triggered law suits against the US by Native Americans, Hawaiians, and other indigenous peoples whose lands were seized by the US. Thus, the Department of Interior returned lands to the government of Guam, understanding that the local government would serve as a mediator of land settlements. As some Chamorro families sold their lands in Tumon and as the government leased out lands to private businesses, by 1985 Guam’s tourist industry had proven itself to be the most profitable sector of the economy, generating up to 200 million dollars annually. A few years later in 1988, the number of tourists reached over 585,000.
As I Turn the Pages

As I turn the pages of material on the formation of Guam’s tourism industry, I am overwhelmed by what appears to be a well planned and globally encompassing project. Before and after World War Two, the US military played an important role in distinguishing which lands and, more significantly, what kinds of (paradisiacal) lands could be exploited for future use by the tourist industry. Although many military planners innocently viewed their construction of beach clubs, such as the USO in Piti and the Elk’s club in Tumon, as merely recreational destinations for their personnel and dependents, they unwittingly designated some of the sites upon which the tourist economy would later be built. In addition to the post-war seizure of lands in Tumon by the military, the Elk’s club also helped focused public attention to the beauty of Tumon Bay’s beaches and jungles, now the island’s tourist hub. In 1984, the USO, situated on one of Piti’s beaches, was awarded the Most Outstanding Local Promotion of Tourism by the Guam Visitors Bureau, signifying its active participation in raising a tourist consciousness among military personnel stationed on Guam (Gisclair 29). The military was indeed an active participant in locating tourist sites. In the post-war era, Chamorro leaders were swarmed and engulfed by an infiltration of outside business people interested in building hotels, swimming pools, restaurants, and other tourist oriented businesses.

Indeed, the Chamorro people appeared to be at the whim of “liberating” military forces and avaricious business people. The implementation of a tourism economy by island leaders and dispossessed farmers was a quick response to the unresolved, and seemingly unresolvable, land alienations associated with post-war Guam. Chamorro
leaders in Guam did not want another war and, thus, appeared to go along with the expectations of the US military and the private sector, assuming their leadership was for the overall benefit of the Chamorro people. They were wrong. As illustrated in the actions of the US Department of Interior and the US Navy, the federal government made several moves to secure investments for American corporations, as well as Japanese investors, in Guam. Further, these businesses were already familiar with large scale tourist developments, unlike many Chamorros who were transitioning from an agricultural society to one interdependent with a monetized economy.

The haole woman I encountered in class was right when she said that Guam relies heavily on the tourist industry. Her visit to the Pacific Islands Club hotel in Tumon Bay which later fueled her insensitive comments about the Chamorro people was indicative of the power of Euro-American knowledge. Further, her words illustrate the colonial characteristics of Guam’s tourism industry, ranging from the dispossession of indigenous lands to the commodification of culture. In actuality, her words suggest the need to confront and criticize the tourist industry, and this chapter has hopefully provided some support in this direction. This chapter has focused on Chamorro notions of culture, histories of Spanish and American colonialism in Guam, and the historical development of the tourism industry in Tumon Bay. I now turn to the ideological formations of tourism in Guam.

As I noted earlier, the idea of militourism did not begin with President Kennedy’s removal of the Naval security clearance in 1962. Rather, the genealogy of militourism in Guam can be traced back to the arrival of American travelers and military personnel to the
island. The literary works by these travelers to Guam have generated a prolific discourse of militourism to the point where anyone writing about the Chamorro people and our island in touristic ways can participate in it. In other words, one does not have to be affiliated with the US military, or with the tourist industry, to promote militourism. For, as I see it, militourism draws simultaneously on military and paradisiacal rhetoric for the purposes of advertising tourism and promoting US interests in Guam. Chapter three will problematize this genealogy as it pertains to descriptions of Guam's landscape.
I’ve lived my whole life near the jungle.
To other Northerners, I live in the jungle.
and much of my consciousness, conscious or not, dwells in the jungle education of my familia.

As a young girl, not even yet a teen, I’d ride our dirt bike fearlessly and confidently on jungle trails, navigating through thickets of tangantangan, suffering only from silly scratches and bug bites.
Throughout my life, I’ve walked along these forested trails, sometimes forging new tracks known only to me and i taotaomo’na.

In the jungle, I’ve sought solace from stressful moments and conversed calmly with empathetic spirits. The jungle never fails me.
It wraps me in warmth, surrounds me in security, envelops me in its energy.

My mother has her own trails, not too far into the jungle.
Where she’d always take one or two of us to pick donne’ for finadenne or lumot for the Nativity.

And my brother, Tom, has his many trails, known to none of us, where barked the binadu and roamed the babui, and where he’d often spend an entire day,
armed with only a machete and a gunnysack, 
picking pickles and avocados, papayas and mangoes 
from the tall trees of our ancestry.

For me and my family, 
the jungle has an awesome intensity 
not definable in acreage or square footage, 
not quantifiable in pounds of produce provided. 
Its power lies in its antiquity, 
it's immeasurability, 
it's infinity.

--Anne Perez Hattori

Jungle Trails: A Chamorro Familial Landscape

Just as this chapter examines the ways in which American travelers familiarized
and feminized Guam's landscape for military-strategic and touristic purposes, so is it 
important to understand how Chamorros view our island's landscape. Anne Perez
Hattori's narrative poem, "jungle trails," demonstrates how Chamorros look to the jungle
for fun and food, among other things. At a younger age, Hattori reminisces of riding a
"dirt bike" in the jungle. She also recalls her mom's familiarity with where certain plants
for consumption or decoration can be found, such as donne', a hot pepper used in sauces
and soups, and lumot, a green moss used to decorate nativity scenes. Even her brother,
Tom, knows where to go in the jungle if he or his family is hungry for food. Her family's
knowledge of the jungle, or "jungle education" she posits, is neither one of colonial
conquest nor one of economic exploitation. Hattori "maps" and re-names the jungle on
her and her family's terms rather than on terms employed by outside corporations or the
military. Written within the past year, Hattori's mixed language poem recounts a tale of
one Chamorro family's familiarity with Guam's northern jungle. For the grown-up Hattori
in the poem the nearby jungle is a place of “solace from stressful moments” where she can “[converse] calmly with empathetic spirits,” such as the taotaomo’na, the people of before.

In an article critical of US Naval discourses in Guam, Hattori addresses the military naming of the jungle she refers to in this poem. She concludes by saying that “[I] have lived almost all of my life on a lush piece of land named Potts Junction, right by Ritidian in the northernmost part of Guam. Potts Junction [is] that little slice of land sandwiched between Anderson Air Force Base and Naval Communications Station” (“Bodily Harm” 42). Hattori, representative of her generation of Chamorros who did not experience Naval rule and, thus, were not conversant with the names of former Naval officials, goes on to comment that “despite growing up there, I never learned who or what this ‘Potts’ was” (42). But Templin Potts, a past Naval governor of Guam, is more than a name. Hattori argues that Potts and the thirty-two Naval governors who ruled Guam from 1898 to 1941 “were all essential pieces of a larger colonial apparatus” called the United States government, which in the case of Guam ruled through the US Navy (“Bodily Harm” 43). Of this “colonial apparatus,” I will ask, what are its mechanisms of power that made possible the imposition of foreign names on indigenous Chamorro lands?

Today, for instance, there is a breakwater located off the coast of Piti, one of the villages in the central part of Guam, named after Captain Henry Glass of the US Navy. Glass is the Naval officer who “officially” claimed Guam as a possession of the US from Spain in 1898. North of Piti, the village of Asan has a hill named after Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Fleet during World War Two. And in the village of
Dededo in the north there is Tanguissan beach, a portion of which was re-named “Bare Ass Beach” by military personnel. Just a short walking distance away from Tanguissan, there is a fresh water spring called Hila’an that has been re-named “Lost Pond” by military personnel. The examples abound. I continue to ask: what are the ways in which American imaginations mapped and re-named Guam’s jungles, valleys, mountains, and seas? How did American travelers in Guam familiarize/feminize the unfamiliar?

**The Jungle has an Awesome Intensity: Nineteenth Century American Accounts of Guam’s Landscape**

Since the inception of a Spanish missionary colony in Guam during the late-sixteenth century, the island’s location in the Western Pacific has been most noted for its harbors: later European and American whalers, traders, and explorers stocked up on food and caught up on rest. American travelers who temporarily visited Guam viewed the island’s harbors for these particular purposes. Of much note to these Americans were not only Guam’s harbors, but also its jungles and overall landscape. Before American military personnel were stationed in Guam in 1898, the sight of the island’s jungles served as “intense” sites of relief for most of these American travelers. After voyaging to Guam from distances as far away as Hawai‘i or the Philippines on ocean voyages which took at least several months, American travelers were relieved by the sight of land and the possible acquisition of food and supplies. This sense of relief was evidenced in American travel writings about Guam which evoked dense descriptions of the island’s jungles. Numerous adjectives such as “luxurious,” “heavy,” and “thick” were used to describe the plant life on Guam in often paradisiacal ways.
Writing on such "semiotics" of landscape description, W. J. T. Mitchell has argued that these semiotic features of landscape, and the historical narratives they generate, are tailor-made for the discourse of imperialism, which conceives itself precisely (and simultaneously) as an expansion of landscape understood as an inevitable, progressive development in history, an expansion of 'culture' and 'civilization' into a 'natural' space in a progress that is itself narrated as 'natural.' Empires move outward in space as a way of moving forward in time; the 'prospect' that opens up is not just a spatial scene but a projected future of 'development' and exploitation. (17)

This was the case in Guam. Nineteenth century American whalers, traders, and military explorers inscribed Guam's landscape into American narratives of Manifest Destiny. Guam was another frontier, among others like Hawai‘i, Philippines, Samoa, and America's West coast, that supposedly needed to be "tamed" and "controlled." But, as Mitchell has cautioned, the outward movement of an empire like America "is not confined to the external, foreign fields toward which empire directs itself; it is typically accompanied by a renewed interest in the re-presentation of the home landscape, the 'nature' of the imperial center" (17). As American travelers confronted unfamiliar places such as Guam, this "re-presentation of the home landscape" to which Mitchell alludes can be revealed in these traveler's varied expressions of cultural and social anxiety. This anxiety was best reflected in the travelers' attempts to familiarize the unfamiliar by making reference to words, phrases, or ideas commonly known in their metropolitan centers as substitutes for what was already named, spoken, or thought of by the indigenous Chamorro people of Guam.

As these American travelers slowly imposed their systems of knowledge onto the Chamorro landscape, so, too, was there the gradual re-naming of certain parts of the
island through what Anthony Pagden has called the “principle of attachment” (34). What was fundamental to these writings was their careful attention to detail in terms of what the island of Guam could “offer” for future capital and military encroachment. American travelers used the knowledge they knew about Pacific and American landscapes to help, argued Anthony Pagden, “assimilate the unknown into the known” (24). The American familiarization of Guam’s environment ultimately resulted in touristic representations of the island. The American rhetoric of paradise and tropes of a lush frontier colonized Guam’s landscape for almost a century and “like every process of discovery . . . [ended] with an act of possession” (Pagden 34).

Mary Louise Pratt discusses these acts of possession in the context of travel writing. In her Imperial Eyes, she examines the ways in which European naturalists and travel writers since 1750 familiarized the interiors of Africa and South America for the purposes of economic exploitation. Pratt argues that travel writing as a cross-cultural event was imperial when there was an economic or political agenda involved. Through an analysis of American documents, this chapter will demonstrate the continuity of discourses of familiarization and feminization. In this light, when the authors enframe Guam’s landscape as familiar and feminine in ways similar to that of a naturalist’s description of plant life, s/he produces what Pratt calls “‘empty’ landscapes, meaningful only in terms of a capitalist future and of their potential for producing a marketable surplus” (61). Pratt identifies three stylistic patterns associated with the “monarch of all I survey” scene. First, she argues, in this pattern of writing one finds the estheticization of the landscape in which descriptions are “ordered in terms of background, foreground symmetries” (204). The
second stylistic pattern of the “monarch of all I survey,” asserts Pratt, is the writer’s search for a “density of meaning,” akin to what I have been calling familiarization (204). “Density of meaning” points to terms which refer, writes Pratt, “explicitly to the explorer’s home culture” (204). Finally, Pratt’s third characteristic of enframing landscapes is the “mastery predicated between the seer and the seen” (204). Authors who evaluate scenery with an estheticized attention to detail and with an objective to make the unfamiliar seem familiar are the so-called masters of enframing landscapes. American travelers assume that they are mastering Guam’s landscape. I will show how these rhetorical processes work in twentieth century writings about the island.

This chapter will also show that the American feminization of Guam’s landscape was, foremost, an attempt to infiltrate, explore, and possess the knowledge of the island’s physical environment. Quite often, scientific, historical, and travel writings about Guam produced gendered narratives of the island’s landscape. As military authors wrote about the island in the twentieth century, they shaped the discourse of militourism which familiarized Guam as American and feminized the island as paradisiacal. Guam’s landscape would ultimately be “portrayed as passive and female prone to the masculine penetration of the West” (Manderson and Jolly 7).

As feminist scholars Phyllis Turnbull and Kathy Ferguson have similarly noted of feminization discourses of Hawai‘i, the island landscape has been frequently “coded as a soft, feminine, welcoming place, waiting and receptive” (98). The feminization of Guam occurs discursively in militaristic writings which encode the island “as seductive female, as places of pleasure. . . . as a weak female needing manly protection from a dangerous world;
it is a feminine place awaiting the masculine other to know her and use her” (98). This feminization of Guam’s landscape results in what Anne McClintock, in her articulation of gendered spaces in *Imperial Leather*, refers to as “the eroticizing of ‘virgin’ space . . . for if the land is virgin, colonized peoples cannot claim aboriginal territorial rights, and white patrimony is violently assured as the sexual and military insemination of an interior void” (30). Thus, the discursive feminization of Guam and its people validates colonial intrusion and perpetuates the militouristic gaze. The so-called American “insemination” of Guam began in the nineteenth century with the arrival of whalers and traders.

A Mariner’s Paradise: Pre-colonial Conceptions of Guam’s Landscape

The repetitive focus on Guam’s availability of vegetation and livestock for American travelers of all sorts produced a dominant discourse of exploration for American audiences abroad which essentialized the island’s jungles as “fertile,” “dense,” and “luxuriant.” For example, Isaac Iselin’s published account of his visit to Guam in the early nineteenth century entitled *Journal of a Trading Voyage Around the World, 1805-1808* was one of the earliest examples of American perceptions of Guam’s environment. Upon arrival on Guam, Iselin wrote that “[t]he land in sight is low, very pleasing, verdant, and thickly covered with wood” (82). While filling his casks with water for the remainder of his journey, Iselin noted that “after a short walk” Guam’s landscape appeared “very fertile and looks verdant. Cocoanut trees are abundant, as also the lima, breadfruit and plantains, some rice, maize and sugarcane is also cultivated” (83). Comments like these were common in these writings. The point I am making is that these kinds of descriptions enframed Guam’s landscape in such a way that a feminized island is rendered accessible to
an explorer’s gaze. Acts of familiarization also accompanied the explorer’s gaze. One such example took place amidst the pages of Amasa Delano’s account.

In his *Narrative of Voyages and Travels in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres*, Delano, a seaman, wrote of his venture into waters just off the Mariana Islands in January 21, 1801. As he approached the islands, he had with him only a vague idea of the names and locations of the Mariana Islands since “these islands are laid down very erroneously in the best charts we have” (405). Although Delano later commented that “[I] am at a loss what their names are, and shall give them none, as I do not consider myself authorized,” he, through his familiarization of the islands, still can be seen naming several of the islands (405). Delano had described earlier that one of the Mariana Islands appeared “in shape much like a high round loaf of bread” and two others “like two ships at a distance” (404). At the time of logging in his entry, one wonders if Delano’s anxiety was more about hunger for food or caution for a possible confrontation between his vessel and “two ships at a distance” (405). Whatever the case, Guam was a safe haven, continued Delano, where “if any vessel should be very much distressed on account of scorbutic complaints, it may haul to the southward latitude of 12° north, and run down for the island of Guam, where it may get suitable refreshments without much difficulty, as the islands affords fruit, vegetables, and water, which can be procured very conveniently” (405). Of the unmentioned islands in the Mariana arc, Delano noted that one of them “was green and very fertile round the volcano; but the other parts of it appeared to be very barren indeed, and nothing but high craggy sharp rocks” (405). Delano’s attention to the “barren” appearance of this unidentified island did not threaten the “fertile” value of the
island primarily because it was unpopulated. Referring to this island and another one, he remarked that “[w]e did not see any signs of inhabitants on either of them” (405). Perhaps the consistent reference to islands in terms of population reflected a particular way of looking at land. Unpopulated “fertile” islands implied the need to be settled, populated, and exploited for their minerals or resources. Guam was indeed a safe haven for whalers and traders alike as another Delano made clear in 1846. American whaler Reuben Delano noted that his crew “remained at this island [Guam] two weeks, during which time we took in a fresh supply of excellent water, fruits in abundance, and fresh provisions of good quality” (37).

Almost a decade later, in 1855 Richard Jeffry Cleveland on board his vessel wrote of his reaction to Guam from waters off Agaña’s shores, once again replicating Guam’s “green” landscape. Closing in on Agaña’s Bay, Cleveland commented that “the town of St. Ignacio de Agam [sic] was presented to our view, making a very pretty appearance; the white houses contrasting with the beautiful foliage of the trees, by which they were shaded, and the distance beyond having the appearance of a dense forest of the most luxurious growth. . . . even to the water’s edge” (213). Men were not the only onlookers upon Guam’s landscape. Eliza Williams, a Protestant wife of a New England whaler, stopped over in Guam in March 6, 1860 (Lowe 267). She kept a diary entitled One Whaling Family in which she logged her journal entries (Lowe 267). Richard Barrett Lowe, a former Naval governor of Guam, wrote about Williams’ experiences in Guam adding that she “was one of New Bedford’s most brilliant conversationalists, and many a group of church women were fascinated by the stories she was able to recall from her
voyages" (268). William’s entry on Guam illustrated her encounter with Spanish elite families she resided with, including her descriptions of Chamorro Catholic novenas and other religious events. Although William’s eye was attuned to Christian motifs on Guam, she was also able to play the role of amateur geographer, describing the island as “beautiful and green, and quite large” (Lowe 269). She familiarized Guam in her likening of carabao carts to “the emigrant wagons I have seen at home” (Lowe 270). These American perceptions of Guam’s “dense” vegetation and “abundant” fruit already contained imperially charged meanings as America sought to become the new military and economic power of the world. Sea narratives such as those of Cleveland and Williams suggested of places in the Pacific accessible to economic exploitation, settlement, and military control. These American traveler accounts, I argue, explored Guam’s landscape in ways which familiarized and feminized the island. These resulted in the formation of a discourse which I am terming “militourism” to exemplify the US militaristic possession and touristic mapping of Guam’s varied lands—its harbors, valleys, beaches and jungles.

Indeed the knowledge gained by these American nineteenth century narratives ultimately served to answer an American writer’s question, “[I]s it [the Mariana Islands] an important group?” (Dawson 656). Actually, the question comes from Eugene, one of the fictional characters in Edward Walter Dawson’s novel entitled The Isles of the Sea published in 1886. Eugene’s notion of importance probably had to do with the economic potential of the Mariana Islands, or “Ladrones” as Dawson called them (656). In a dialogue concerning the Marianas, Dawson wrote that “they [the Chamorro people] have totally disappeared” (657). With the “disappearance” of the Chamorro people in
Dawson’s mind, he then continued to describe the Marianas, now composed of settlers from Mexico, Spain and the Philippines, in ways similar to that of geographers, botanists, and capitalists (657-58). The ability of authors such as Dawson to erase Chamorros from the landscape of Guam can be read as part of the feminizing project, representing the “depopulated” island as a passive, available, and enticing space. Of the island’s geographical makeup and agricultural production, he wrote that “[t]he islands are of volcanic formation, extremely rugged, and in some places barren and waste. In the fertile parts, however, they produce cotton, sugar, rice, indigo, cocoa, corn, tobacco, and nearly every species of intertropical products” (Dawson 658). As if his descriptions were not enough evidence of American economic interests, another one of Dawson’s characters, the Professor, stated that the plants “are well watered” and asked if “[t]he climate is very fine” (658). Dawson’s narrative affirmed this question positively and added furthermore that the Mariana Islands “can boast of some fine forests” (658).

Dawson’s fictional portrayal of Guam’s “fine forests” had a historical reality to it. His dialogue was echoed in the February 1886 publication of the journal of Naval Lieutenant Robert Lee-Wright Browning in The United Service, a publication whose subtitle read “The Only Magazine in the United States Devoted to the Interests of the Military, Naval, and Civil Service” (iii). The journal, entitled “The Cruise of the U.S. Sloop-of-War ‘Vincennes,’” recorded Browning’s circumnavigation of the globe from 1833 to 1836 (iii). In Browning’s short and speedy visit to Guam he observed that “this island [Guam] furnishes everything that a luxuriant soil in a tropical climate can produce, we, though truly in need of much, being destitute of vegetables and fresh meat for weeks,
got no more of its abundance than two pigs, eight fowls, and a hundred oranges, which we collected on the beach in a great hurry" (204). Of course much attention was paid to the amount of produce Guam's ranches could supply these American travelers as their search for provisions for their next voyage was deemed a necessity. Yet the consistent focus on the availability of food on Guam produced a dominant discourse of exploration for American audiences. This discourse essentialized the island's jungles as "fertile," "dense," and "luxuriant," and furthermore made possible later imperial acquisitions.

Joshua Fillebrown Beane, an American whaler, published From Forecastle to Cabin in 1905 which recounted his voyages around the world's oceans. Beane's preface indicated his, as well as America's, sea voyaging politics at that time in the early twentieth century. Echoing the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny, he wrote, "[I]n the year 1600, several Nantucket people were standing upon a hill watching a lot of whales sporting in the sea, when one of them remarked: 'There is a pasture green, where our children's grandchildren will go for their bread'" (vii). Beane had an objective for publicizing his journal entries of green pastures and whaling adventures. It was not fame or fortune he sought. Rather, Beane looked for the approval of his book by America's youths as an indication of his journal's value. Of this desire to spread the knowledge of American empire building and expansion, he remarked, "[M]y object will have been accomplished if I succeed in interesting boys of nine, nineteen and ninety years, and if the girls of corresponding ages take kindly to my work, then shall I have been rewarded beyond my fondest hopes" (viii). Beane may have indeed interested young American minds in colonies like the Marianas (still under Spanish rule when Beane arrived) as the islands appeared to afford some of the
greenest "pastures" an increasingly urbanized America would see. In Saipan, Beane was amazed at the island’s supposed plenitude of meats and vegetables as evidenced in his comment, "[T]he island seemed to be a mariner’s paradise, for fresh beef and pork ran wild in the mountains, and could be had at a very low price. Chickens and ducks were numerous; cocoanuts, limes, lemons, watermelons and bananas were abundant" (251). As Beane voyaged southward to the island of Guam, he continued to picture the Mariana Islands in paradisiacal ways. Beane personified Guam as a "woman," noted in his opening statement, "[G]uam smiled enticingly" (268). Like the islands of Saipan and Tinian, Guam, too, was a paradise of bountiful fruits, vegetables, and meat. Beane also had a poetic style of writing which was "alluring" and "feminine" in its own way to the literary reader. Consistent references to abundant food supplies, verdant lands, and fragrant aromas indicated his feminization of Guam.

Just as Beane feminizes the Marianas, so, too, does he familiarize the island chain. Beane’s work was part of the larger discourse which, asserts Anne Farrar Hyde, used "particularly American qualities" to familiarize lands west of America. In the nineteenth century, America’s western frontier, argues Hyde, "looked like nothing Euro-Americans had seen before" (8). Hyde explains that as explorers, tourists, artists, and railroad builders employed "aesthetic standards and imagery borrowed from Europe and imposed on the eastern part of the nation, they attempted to describe the Far West in language familiar to Americans who could afford to travel" (10). But, she argues, "[b]y the 1890s a century of cultural change and of far western exploration permitted Americans to see the value of the unique landscape. Artists, writers, and railroad promoters celebrated the
particularly American qualities of the western scene” (10). Bean’s work exemplifies this trend of familiarization.

Beane’s paradisiacal writing became more touristic in tone as he highlighted the tourist-native relationship so typical of the tourist industry. At the village of Sumay, Beane guided his reader with ease and relaxation from a beach to a hammock and to a “refreshing” drink much to the likings of a contemporary tourist guide (269). Recalling this experience with his peers, Beane remarked, “[W]e stretched ourselves upon the white sand of the beach. We lolled in the hammocks of the people, with their ready permission, for there were two or three of these indispensable articles of furniture swinging at every dwelling. We drank the refreshing milk of the green cocoanut, and did not refuse the sweet toddy which was generously offered” (269). Beane’s short residence in Guam must have been an exciting read for his audience. The Marianas’ warm climate, the white sandy beaches, the islands’ “horn of plenty,” and the so-called hospitable and lazy Chamorro population gave credence to Beane’s portrayal and promise of an imaginary place where America’s “grandchildren will go for their bread” (vii). Beane’s promise of bringing back Pacific green “pastures” was firm enough to conclude that from “this wonderful island [Guam], where nature has outdone herself in providing all that is required for the subsistence of an indolent people, we went on board almost convinced that we should be content to dwell there forever” (269).

In the Jungle: The Twentieth Century American Enframing of Guam’s Landscape

As I looked through my sources, one individual stood out as perhaps one of the prime movers for promoting the settlement and exploitation of islands in the Pacific. He
was an Army soldier who tried to “convince” American audiences to tour the Pacific Islands. In the beginning, his objectives seemed to be solely militaristic in nature. That mission would change. General Joseph Wheeler of the US Army was an officer who appeared to enjoy his military duty in the Pacific. His account of his visit to Guam in the early 1900s mentioned few instances of discomfort or pain. In January 14, 1900, Wheeler was ordered by the US War Department to provide an ethnographic survey of the capital of the Philippines, Manila. Two days later, Wheeler received another order. Thomas H. Barry, an Assistant-Adjutant-General, instructed Wheeler to inspect the Naval administration in Guam, as well as to survey the landscape. Wheeler came to Guam because of military-strategic reasons. In Special Order No. 16 addressed to Wheeler and dated January 16, 1900, General Thomas Barry wrote that “Wheeler is hereby directed upon reaching Guam to delay a sufficient time to investigate conditions existing there, the administration of the United States officer in charge, the work accomplished and in contemplation, and the public advantages the island affords by reason of location and physical features [sic]” (Wheeler 5-6). Arriving in Guam on Tuesday, February 6, Wheeler, an Army officer, paid particular attention to Guam’s harbors, locating the safe and dangerous harbors by latitude and longitude. He described the widths of the entrances surrounding numerous bays, the depths of water near reefs and inside harbors, as well as other navigational data which pertained to the needs of an expanding US Navy. To this effect Wheeler revealed that Apra harbor’s “general conditions” (which, at that time, was not as heavily militarized as it is today) “are very favorable to the establishment of a coaling station and landing place for large vessels” (50). Among the other duties assigned
to Wheeler was a visit to governor Leary to review his general orders and the various disciplinary laws which were imposed on the Chamorro people. While touring Guam, an island whose cartographic shape he likened to "the sole of a shoe," he was greeted by Chamorros whom he thought were "very cordial and friendly" (16). Wheeler explored the island's geography and referenced whatever land he thought was "virgin." For instance, Wheeler noted that Agat, one of Guam's southernmost villages, was "quite fertile" (28). Writing about the general landscape of the island, he observed that "its area may be stated at about 150 square miles, one-half of which, it is estimated, is susceptible of cultivation. Nearly all of the land is still virgin soil, my information being that only 1 per cent is now under cultivation" (8). Perhaps Wheeler visited only "1 per cent" of the so-called virgin island and, as a result, noticed only "1 per cent" of Chamorro ranchers working the land for agricultural purposes. Nevertheless, Wheeler's account of Guam's environment was used to inform military policy makers on the strategic significance and economic potential of the island.

Other early twentieth century writers, whether they be journalists, scientists, educators or military personnel, familiarized and feminized the island's landscape. For instance, William Edwin Safford, a botanist and assistant to the first Naval governor of Guam, declared that the island "may be compared roughly to the shape of a human footprint (the right foot), with the heel north-northeast and the toe south-southwest" (46). Later, geographer Jay Earl Thomson said in 1931 that the island reminded him of "the sole of a human foot" (258). Whether or not Guam was portrayed as a "footprint," the point of the matter was that the island was familiarized from its coastline to its interior, from its
beaches to its valleys. Talking about this Western tradition of exploring non-European lands, David Spurr, author of *The Rhetoric of Empire*, argued that the “gaze of the Western writer penetrates the interiors of human habitation, and it explores the bodies and faces of people with the same freedom that it brings to the survey of the landscape” (19).

This chapter will soon demonstrate how American travelers, especially military personnel seeking recreation, mapped Guam’s caves, valleys, rivers, beaches, and hills to the point where familiarization was not necessarily a remedy for anxieties felt in a place distant from one’s origins. These writers familiarized the unfamiliar not only as a way of possessing landscapes, but also as a way of relieving stresses felt by being in a place far from their homes. Guam, a territory now approaching one hundred years of US colonization, was allegedly familiarized, feminized, and totalized as “America” by curious onlookers ranging from the tourist to the botanist to the soldier to the missionary.

One of those spectators was Mary Augusta Channell, a missionary of the American Board in 1901, who just had to see islands like Guam in order to fulfill her curious expectations of an island paradise. In 1902, Channell published an article in *The Independent*, what Chamorro scholar Robert Underwood has called “a much-read journal in the early part” of the twentieth century (4). Entitled “A Bit of Guam Life,” Channell’s account employed and emphasized paradisiacal adjectives in describing the island’s landscape. Picturing Guam’s jungles, she wrote that within them reside “wild, with luxuriant, tropical foliage, immense palms and ferns, and unfamiliar shrubs bearing red, yellow or white flowers; vines hiding the pathway; and numberless parasites, all of which would delight the heart of a botanist” (607-8). The adjectives “immense” and “luxuriant”
supposedly described a bountiful jungle and, thus, a subliminal environment, invoking Rob Wilson’s notion of the sublime as “a representative American trope” (36). While at the Agaña river, Channell further feminized Guam’s environment as she equated the beauty of the land with the beauty of Chamorro women. Accentuating the process of feminizing the island, she wrote that “the quiet water reflecting the green foliaged banks is a pretty picture, the beauty of which is heightened [sic] by the native women in all varieties of dress” (609). Here Channell objectified the beauty of several unnamed Chamorro women she saw alongside the Agaña river. The women’s beauty supposedly complemented the beauty of the jungle, Channell asserted. Had she not mentioned that the women were washing clothes they, as timeless inhuman figures, would have been portrayed as the landscape (609).

A journal published locally in Guam entitled The Guam Recorder sought to resolve such issues. Beginning in March 1924 under the editorial supervision of William W. Rowley, identified by Robert Rogers as a “blacksmith and former sailor on the Yosemite,” The Guam Recorder was notably one of the few sources of written information about American perceptions of Guam’s histories, politics, cultures, and economics (147). With this ensemble of ethnographic and historical information, The Guam Recorder pledged to educate American communities in Guam and on the US mainland. The editorial staff also included Lieutenant Commander P. J. Searles, German archaeologist Hans Hornbostle, and former Marine turned business person, William G. Johnston (Rogers 147-148). Although initially owned by Rowley, he sold the publication to the US Navy in 1933 for monetary reasons influenced by America’s economic slump in the 1930s (Rogers
In the foreword to Evelyn and Frederick Nelson’s history of Guam entitled *The Island of Guam*, their editor, Mary S. McCutcheon, quotes historian Paul Carano’s impression of *The Guam Recorder* as “‘in all likelihood, the most highly respected and the most valuable publication in Guam prior to World War II’” (vi). One of journal’s values was its ability to help adjust—through processes of familiarization and feminization—military personnel and their dependents to Guam’s living condition.

Unkadoc, a “Well Known West Coast Columnist,” contributed an article in September of 1932 which sought to resolve the conflicting images of a beautiful Guam Paradise, on the one hand, and a problematical Paradise on the other (98). Entitled “Doxnooze” (as in Doc’s news or Doc knows?) with the subtitle, “Guam—Go There Happily,” the article also addressed certain issues that were perhaps raised by military personnel on assignment to Guam, the “Island of Inconvenience” (98). The author’s odd name, Unkadoc, was probably a pseudonym for someone who was critical of the military and did not want to be charged with accountability pertaining to the article’s content. Unkadoc’s piece echoed the feelings of some military personnel stationed in Guam during the early 1900s who “felt that they must have committed some dire wrong that trespassed somewhere, and were being sent for a tour out in the Pacific for punishment” (98). These military personnel, not cited by the author, who were stationed on Guam in the early twentieth century accused the US military of punishing them by not having American “conveniences,” such as “water and sanitary appliances in the home” (98). Unkadoc was against this assertion arguing that such views only resided “in the imaginations of the
disgruntled” (98). This author proceeded to outline several “disgruntled” views of Guam by early military settlements.

Unkadoc wrote about the island's hot weather and asserted that “a trip to far away Guam was to send one so far that the mind could not grasp it” (98). So to comfort the lives of incoming military personnel whose destination was Guam, the “penal colony,” Unkadoc articulated his (or her?) paradisiacal interpretation of the island. He assured his audience that “it is certain that most folks who went out there [Guam] learned to like the peaceful serenity, the calm life, and air of contentment that soon wended [sic] itself into their lives” (98). Elaborating on the Americanization of Guam which, among other so-called civilized advancements, included the establishment of schools, water pump facilities, and the implementation of electricity, Unkadoc guaranteed that Guam provided “all the comforts of American suburban or city life” and that “there was no reason why anyone should not desire, nay, demand, a cruise to beautiful, lovely, Guam” (99). As Unkadoc’s article came to a close, it read more like a tourist guide. Unkadoc expressed the view that Guam’s environment remained “natural,” without the “lights and the people and the bustle and the hurry and things” associated with places like Broadway or Market Street (99). Guam’s humidity, which was a problem for some travelers, was dismissed, asserted Unkadoc, for the island had “a wonderful climate” (99). When the topic of typhoons came up in the article, Unkadoc casually told his audiences in Guam and America, “[b]ut there is nothing to worry about. . . . Guam is just as easy to live in as any town here” (99). Unkadoc continued to direct his audiences’ gazes to golf courses, beaches and exclusive American recreational organizations, such as the Elks’ Club (99). His point was that
Guam’s environment was to be explored through various means of recreation. Unkadoc wanted his readers to “go out there with the idea in mind that you are going to like and love Guam” because, he reminded, “[t]he happy families in Guam are those who adjust themselves” (99). Those who did not “adjust” themselves to the above touristic standards, Unkadoc wrote without explanation, “hypnotize themselves from the beginning that they are martyrs” (99).

With articles like those of Unkadoc, The Guam Recorder became one of the early military-owned journals noted for shaping the discourse of militourism in Guam. Despite literature which briefly argued that Guam was not a viable place for economic exploitation, mass scale development, and settlement, military paradisiacal writings about the island argued otherwise. Jay Earle Thomson, a geographer who wrote Our Pacific Possessions in 1931, examined Guam’s exportation of copra, or dried coconut meat, to places like China and Japan, but concluded that “[c]ommercially speaking, Guam is not very important” (250). Others like Junius B. Wood of The Guam Recorder remarked in 1935 that Guam’s “industries and land holdings must be small. Big industry and large scale agriculture would bring an unfortunate change in the condition of the people” (211). The irony of economic advice, especially pertaining to agriculture, was that those same writers were already advertising the tourist industry in their very own publications. Junius B. Wood, for example, commented in his article, “Guam—The Beautiful,” that the island “has all the beauties and charms of the tropics and few of their ills and annoyances. Life should be easy for those to whom it is home and it could be a restful paradise for any who want to escape the noise and dirt and struggle of the busier outside world” (211).
Furthermore, what was ironic about statements which discussed the agricultural potential of Guam’s lands was that in post-World War Two Guam the military possessed most of island’s farmland for strictly military strategic use.

The US military, represented through publications like The Guam Recorder, became an indirect supporter of Guam’s tourist industry, an economy not yet physically constructed but already imagined as real and applicable to military personnel living on the island. The visual images generated by numerous articles which focused on a wide range of topics such as the botany, history, anthropology, geology, geography, and climate of Guam often raised some aspect associated with tourism, whether it be an instruction for how to get to a cave or a paradisiacal description of a valley.

The most blatant instances of tourist imagery in The Guam Recorder originated in military travel writings about the island. In an article entitled “My Impression of Guam,” Sidney R. Burnap, Jr., a resident of California who visited Guam in the early 1930s, recalled, upon entering Apra Harbor, “when I first saw the heavy vegetation of Apra harbor shores. I thought of the word so often used in tropical novels--‘lush’” (339). In “Beyond the Sunset,” written in 1940, James Butler feminized the scenery of Guam, “a jewel set in a sapphire sea, the gem of the Pacific,” as if she were a generic woman decorated in jewelry (140). Butler wrote that “[t]he real beauty of Guam lies in her emerald hillsides made greener by everlasting summer, her wavering palm fronds kissed by trade winds, her clean, shining beaches continually courting the ebb and flow of tides, her flower-scented groves and tinkling leafy lanes that cast haunting shadows of tranquility” (141). Another example which emphasized the malleability of the island came not from a
male author, but from a woman. Mrs. O. Quande, the wife of an unidentified military husband, who wrote the article, “My Cruise in Guam,” in which she described the island in terms familiar to her, and that alluded to jewelry and food. Mrs. O. Quande’s first impression of Guam in 1941 was that it “resembled a huge emerald stone, sparkling with dew. The majestic, feathery, palms were dancing gracefully in the cool morning breeze, the mountain tops floated fluffy egg white clouds full of liquid sunshine. Now and then a bit of the overflow fell from these clouds” (301).

These works complemented each other as they strengthened and solidified instances of familiarization and feminization. Each acted in almost uniform fashion to produce orientalist images of Guam’s landscape. Foremost among the reasons for such near conformity in the discourses of familiarization and feminization was the fact that because Guam could be shaped and reshaped by American imaginations this evidenced the island’s “feminine” malleability that supposedly justified its subordination, domestication and control by male authors.

In certain cases, the island of Guam was literally reshaped into a place that was familiar, yet still troubling and unpredictable like the feminine other. In the monthly section called “Curious Things About Guam,” the unidentified author, L. N. L., presumably a geologist or someone interested in this field of study, discussed the volcanic and limestone formations throughout the island of Guam. This author’s article appeared under this segment of The Guam Recorder in 1934 not necessarily because of his or her explanation of rock formations, but because of the author’s humor and curiosity. L. N. L. started the article with a reference to Perry Scope, “[t]he Recorder’s humorous staff"
writer” (222). For Perry Scope, Guam was an island in his imagination which was supposedly going to break off from the continental shelf and sink into the ocean (see fig. 5). Quoting Scope’s rendition of this idea, L. N. L. remarked that “[G]uam is the island they [American travel writers?] tell you about, that is built like a toadstool, bigger at the top than it is down under; it is supposed to taper off, until nobody knows but that it peters out before it got to the bottom of the ocean, and probably ain’t fastened onto the earth at all, only just standen there in the water”’ (222). This was Scope’s way of familiarizing how the ocean floor supported the island of Guam. It was a humorous joke, L. N. L. wrote, “made all in fun” (222). But there was nothing funny, remarked L. N. L, because this idea “has caused a well defined notion in the minds of many of the inhabitants of Guam that the Island is a rocky mushroom that might topple over under the influence of an unusually violent earthquake” (222).

As the previous example reflects, even in 1934, after thirty five years of the American military occupation of Guam, military personnel and the alleged “many inhabitants of Guam” familiarized the island’s landscape, but not always with the effect of easing anxieties. L. N. L. took Scope seriously for “this is an important idea to all of us who live on the Island, because if this should happen it would be disconcerting, to say the least” (222). By reviewing the geology, geography, and seismic activity of the island of Guam in the following paragraphs, L. N. L. supported Scope’s “humorous” island formation thesis through scientific documentation with the claim that “[c]onjecture on this point . . . is reassuring after the various elements that enter into the geological formation of the island have been considered” (222). Of course, Scope’s idea and L. N. L.’s
scientific discussion of it was invalid for those with a general comprehension of geology and plate tectonics. But it was a valid story published in 1934 so audiences “may obtain a better knowledge and understanding of the Island and the interesting things it contains” (L. N. L. 222, see fig. 6). Were there competing discourses which challenged these writings?

The discursive processes through which Guam’s landscape was both familiarized and feminized went largely uncontested in the written sources coming out of Guam. The writings of The Guam Recorder, for example, reflected the military’s interest in the cultural assimilation of the Chamorro people to a dominant American culture. Then the only publication out of Guam, The Guam Recorder not only contributed to, but also
Fig. 6. L. N. L. calls this rock, “Hooligan Rock,” because of “its resemblance to that famous comic strip character” (223). Illustration from L. N. L., Curious Things About Guam: The Physical Geography of Guam.” The Guam Recorder Dec. 1934:222-223.

proliferated, the discourses of militourism. The Chamorro people, for the most part, did not actively participate in the production and dissemination of such materials. Prior to World War Two, much of the Chamorro population of Guam was not literate in the English language, and this can be attested to in the numerous complaints aired by Naval governors throughout the pre-war period. Furthermore, few activities aside from military-sponsored baseball games and parades encouraged Chamorro and American fraternization. As political scientist Robert Rogers argues, “on the whole a cultural and racial gulf remained between the Americans and the Chamorros” (123). There were, of course, a few elite Chamorro families who frequented military events and activities. The “cultural and racial gulfs” Rogers points to, however, helped reinforce American audiences in Guam
and abroad of *The Guam Recorder*’s assumed status as an authoritative and uncontested source of information on the histories of the Chamorro people. Not only did contributing writers like Naval Lieutenant Commander K. C. McIntosh become “experts” on issues of Chamorro history and culture, but they also advocated the exploration and “discovery” of Guam’s interior valleys and jungles. Through writings such as McIntosh’s which appeared regularly in *The Guam Recorder*, audiences were consistently reminded of the so-called privilege of the American traveler who could supposedly venture here and there in Guam’s interior without interference. In 1925, McIntosh re-published an article in *The Guam Recorder* which had previously appeared in *Asia*. It was entitled “The People of Beforetime,” a racist interpretation of Chamorro history which argued, among various issues, for the demise of the “pure blood” Chamorro (3). Raising the issue of exploration, the opening paragraph of McIntosh’s article read, “For twenty-four years Americans have been living on Guam. Though from end to end it measures only about thirty miles and from side to side about nine miles in the widest part and six in the narrowest, there are places in it which have never been seen by an American and possibly never by any white man” (3).

As if curiosity for probing Guam’s interior was not enough excitement for military individuals, the island’s seas offered alternative venues for exploration. In the article, “I Dive,” written in 1934 by F. D. Brunton, the author discussed the trials and errors associated with trying to put together a dive suit from scratch. Brunton intended to view the coral and fish life in one of Guam’s unspecified harbors or channels. This interest was sparked by a 1932 *National Geographic Magazine* articles about deep sea diving written
by Dr. William Beebe, entitled “Wonders of the Sea” (Brunton 226). Along with the aid of several “adventurous spirits of Guam,” Brunton had put together a diving suit based on the information contained in Beebe’s article (226). After the second dive attempt, Brunton succeeded in viewing the marine life of the ocean floor. Of this undersea experience which combined the Western traditions of “discovering” lands and slaughtering animals for sport, Brunton wrote,

Thus, in the Island of Guam, so often described as a country far distant from the rest of the world, I found a new land, perhaps never before seen by the eyes of man, filled with new wonders as beautiful as one may find anywhere, filled, if one seeks that far, with as many thrills as one may find on an African big game hunt, where one may see wild things in their natural haunts, and all of it no farther away than the coral reef surrounding the island. (227)

Brunton’s exploration of the sea floor was such an accomplishment that it sparked the organization of a diving club in December 1934. Regarding the genesis of the dive club, Brunton commented that “[t]his is the first time anything has been said about this new sport in public, and it is believed a few more [members] will be added to the club’s membership, now that the wonders of the depths have been discovered in Guam, and found to be so interesting” (227). Publications about diving clubs ceased a few years later not because of the lack of “thrills” in a faraway island. Rather, the journal came to a complete publication halt due to the Japanese Imperial Army’s invasion of Guam in December 8, 1941. The Guam Recorder’s last issue was published a month earlier in November, according to Robert Rogers, and indicated no official notice of an impending Japanese invasion (162). Nonetheless, signs of an impending colonial power takeover could be read on the picture of the November issue of The Guam Recorder. Robert
Rogers remarks that this illustration “showed the [USS] Henderson departing [Guam] full of American families with the word Aloha alongside” (162). In anticipation of a possible Japanese invasion of Guam, the US shipped out its dependents a full month before the actual takeover of Guam. These military families were the last American “tourists” to visit Guam for a short time, while others who remained on the island were killed by the Japanese Army or taken as prisoners of war and relocated to concentration camps in China, Japan, and the Philippines. From December 1941 until the American reoccupation of Guam in July 1944, the island remained under the imperial control of Japan.

Re-seeding the Island: Post-War Militourisms

America’s return to Guam came as a result of intensive bombings which were devastating to the Chamorro people’s homes and lancho. Due to the wartime environmental destruction wreaked upon Guam’s landscape, in 1947 the US military deposited tangantangan seeds throughout the Mariana Islands (Rogers 205). The re-seeding of the Marianas took place in order to reforest the island, and in the process, mask the mass destruction of lands which were bombed by Navy planes and ships. Of course, the seeds also served to prevent the erosion of soil in certain areas of the islands. But for American military dependents, these seeding campaigns intentionally or unintentionally brought back “fertile” images of the island of Guam.

The planting of tangantangan might perhaps be read metaphorically as the return of the American militouristic project. In the post-war militarization campaign of the Marianas, troops who had never known of the islands were quickly educated on the social and cultural makeup of the Chamorro people and their lands. One of the materials used to
educate returning military personnel about the Marianas was a booklet called Meet the Marianas: A Pocket Guide, a tourist-like guidebook. Published by the US War Department, this small pamphlet was distributed among soldiers in the mid 1940s. Short and to the point, this thirty-two page booklet contained information on the Chamorro culture and the overall geography and climate of all the Mariana Islands. It provided brief summaries of the colonial histories of the Marianas, beginning with Spain in 1521 and ending with the US. Further, the pocketbook warned troops of unexploded bombs, polluted water, and other things associated with the aftermath of air raids and jungle warfare. The compilers of this military document also warned soldiers to be wary of “Japs”—not only soldiers, but also “civilians” (Meet the Marianas 12). The guidebook demonized the Japanese people, reflecting perhaps the general state of Japanese-American race relations at that time. They cautioned, “[t]o American soldiers who have seen Japs only in battle, or who know them for their deceitful methods of making war, the Japanese civilian may be something of a surprise. He turns out to be a human being, and may even be a rather likeable person” (Meet the Marianas 12). Likeable or not, the military cautioned its personnel that “[a]t no time will you ‘fraternize’ with enemy civilians” (Meet the Marianas 12). Aside from the “inhumane” depictions of the Japanese, Meet the Marianas was a source which continued to familiarize the island of Guam.

Focusing soldiers’ gazes from the region of Micronesia to the Mariana Islands, the booklet stated, “[L]ook over the map of the Pacific. Its myriad islands remind you of the polka-dot curtains in the kitchen back home. . . . Among these tiny islands are the fifteen Marianas, our island stepping-stones to victory” (Meet the Marianas 4). The entire region
of Micronesia was feminized. The phrase, "polka-dot curtains in the kitchen back home,"
alluded to the domesticity of American housewives. To familiarize soldiers with the
expanse of the Mariana Island chain, referred to as the "island stepping-stones,"
illustrations were produced which juxtaposed a map of the island archipelago alongside a
map of Florida's coastline (see fig. 7). Illustrations like these served to help ease forms of
stress and anxiety which were heightened by the fact that these soldiers were far from
home, surrounded by remnants of death and destruction left by the war. *Meet the
Marianas* reminded soldiers that they were on "American soil," supposedly safe from
danger. The islands were also portrayed as an extension of America's military and
economy. Soldiers were told, for instance, of the economic importance of the islands.
For a place whose total square miles amounts to a size "a littler larger than Los Angeles,"
the US invaded the Marianas because, argued Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, the
islands were the ""key which will unlock the door to Japan, the Philippine coast, and to
China"" (*Meet the Marianas* 4). Obviously the "key" was American made, if not owned,
since at that time, the US controlled Guam's shipping lanes, as well as monopolized what
goods could or could not be imported into the island. References to things familiar back
home, however, did not stop at the "stepping-stones" of Micronesia. Animals such as the
fruit bat which reside in the jungles of Guam and which are prized as delicacies among the
Chamorro people must have startled the makers of this tourist-like military guidebook.
The authors felt compelled to prepare their readers for possible encounters with this
unfamiliar jungle animal. Elaborating on the strangeness of fruit bats, the book declared,
"[D]on't blame Japanese beer if you see flying foxes hanging from the trees like tiny
Tarzans. They are really fruit bats” (Meet the Marianas 27). And when soldiers were not drinking beer, performing their duties, or running into fruit bats, Meet the Marianas urged them “to go swimming,” “to go hunting,” and “to go fishing” as means of recreation (28-29, see fig. 8). Although this pamphlet did not strongly promote earlier paradisiacal images of Guam’s landscape, it played an important role in familiarizing soldiers with an important island chain which was fought over and possessed through the sacrifice of American lives. Perhaps soldiers left the pages of Meet the Marianas with feelings of patriotism and victory about a place as seemingly American as the coast of Florida.
While Meet the Marianas was a booklet made to assist military troops in adjusting their lives to the peoples and environment of the Marianas, other booklets were made to help federal and US military agencies adjust their policies toward the peoples and environment of the Marianas. The Department of Interior, for example, produced annual reports on the geography, history, government, people, economy, and education of Guam. After ruling the island like a ship for almost fifty years, the Naval government was replaced in 1950 by the Department of Interior when Guam received an Organic Act which granted Chamorros’ limited US citizenship. Following the replacement of the Navy, the Department of Interior, wrote Robert Rogers, was “charged with representing and protecting Guam’s interests” in Washington (237). However, the Interior’s role in
Guam was to safeguard federal concerns pertaining to the island’s economy and locally run government (Rogers 226). This ambiguous and unstable political relationship between the Department of Interior and the government of Guam was more of a political front than an actual relationship between a colonizing country (US) and a colonized one (Guam). It was a front because the US could revoke, at any time, any law or policy made by the Chamorro people and government. The Interior’s annual reports were thus important materials which reminded the federal government, as well as American business corporations, of the economic and military strategic importance of Guam. The 1951 United States Department of the Interior report entitled General Information: Guam, for example, highlighted the island’s landscape in paradisiacal ways and, as a result, implied that tourism was the economy of the island’s post-war future. Compiled by an unknown author who equated Guam to a “kidney bean,” the report indicated that Guam was the “most populous of the Marianas” (General Information 2). None of Guam’s estimated population of 58,000 was present, however, in the eyes of the writer who viewed the island’s landscape:

Lush tropical flora cover the island on its lower levels. Tall, graceful coconut palms, broad-leafed banana trees, breadfruit trees, ipil [sic] (ironwood) trees and rubber trees grow in dense thickets along the white sand of the shore. At the higher elevations, these gradually blend into flowering bushes, tangantangan, small pines and sword grass. The upper elevations of the island bring to mind the varicolored hills of America’s Southwest. An area of intense greens, splashed with the brilliant red and magenta of bougainvillia [sic] and hibiscus bushes in the settled areas, Guam is set in a multicolored sea, which varies from the jade within the protective reef which surrounds the island, through the turquoise of the middle depths, into the dramatic blues and purples of the deep ocean. At sunset, the island and its surrounding waters are a symphony of fiery reds, soft yellows, lavenders and greys. (General Information 2)
This passage was more than an author’s casual glance over and around certain areas of Guam’s lands and seas. It was a patiently carved romanticization of the island’s plant life and ocean colors. Numerous adjectives feminized the island from its “brilliant red” bougainvillea to its “dramatic blues and purples” of the ocean’s surface. Guam’s “upper elevations” were familiarized as “the varicolored hills of America’s Southwest.” And though the passage was only a paragraph in length, the author appeared to condense the whole landscape and seascape of Guam as if atop some high point in the island. Scholars such as Mary Louise Pratt have critiqued this genre of landscape description writing which preserved mastery over the land in view.

In this context, when the author of the above Department of Interior report enframed Guam’s landscape as familiar and feminine in ways similar to that of a naturalist’s description of plant life, s/he produces what Pratt calls “‘empty’ landscapes, meaningful only in terms of a capitalist future and of their potential for producing a marketable surplus” (61). The quoted paragraph evokes three stylistic patterns of the “monarch of all I survey” scene as discussed by Pratt. They are the writer’s estheticization of the landscape, the writer’s search for a density of meaning, and the writer’s mastery of the landscape. Notice how, in the Department of Interior report on Guam, that ordering takes place in the passage with movement from the “lush tropical flora” of valleys to the “graceful coconut palms” of beaches to the “flowering bushes” of hills to the “multicolored sea.” “America’s Southwest” and “a symphony” are two examples in the Interior’s 1951 report which illustrate the author’s process of familiarization, or search for
density of meaning. Further, the author’s attention to detail in the landscape signifies his or her mastery of the island’s physical environment. According to this author’s feminized description of Guam, the island represents itself as inviting and alluring for both economic and military exploitation. The discourse of militourism works in such ways, often evoking tourist images in military publications.

On the Mainland

What I have not yet discussed is the mid-twentieth century mainland military production of travel literature about Guam. The information in these military publications paralleled those of the Department of Interior’s reports. Military journals particulary focused on Guam during and after World War Two because of the island’s strategic role in the Pacific Theater. After Guam was invaded by the US military, the Navy publication, All Hands, noted that by the end of 1945 the island had become a major stopover for up to 300,000 Marine soldiers en route to nearby “Jap-held” territories such as Iwo Jima and Okinawa (“Harbor” 41). Tinian, one of the Mariana Islands north of Guam, later attracted international attention as the infamous takeoff site of the Enola Gay, the Air Force B-29 bomber which dropped the atomic bomb over Hiroshima and was responsible for the deaths of more than 78,000 Japanese residents (Rogers 203). But as tragic experiences of World War Two became memories of pain, nostalgia, or patriotism (depending on one’s position in the war), military publications refashioned the memories of those who were designated to be transferred to one of Guam’s Navy or Air Force installations.

Americans in the US mainland were told of the intense militarization efforts occurring during Guam’s immediate post-war era, such as the construction of air fields,
harbors, and military housing. Magazines like *All Hands*, described as “one of the best journals published by the armed forces” by military scholar Michael E. Unsworth, reminded military personnel and their dependents that Guam’s lands were no longer torn up battlefields (243). Rather, the island was once again shaped into a paradise by these mainland-based journals. For example, J. B. Smith of the US Navy wrote an article, “Strategic Guam,” published by *All Hands* in 1951, which, aside from discussing the military transformation of the island in 1951, encouraged military dependents during their spare time to swim or fish in one of Guam’s beaches which “they say, are the equal of Hawai’i’s Waikiki” (19). And if those activities were inconvenient or expensive, Smith suggested to “drive or bus . . . around the island for a look at Guam’s tropical splendor and picture-postcard views” (19).

Another “picture-postcard” recreational characterization of the island came from Major Frances H. Griswold who in a 1947 publication entitled *Guam: Key to the Pacific* asserted that “[a] tour of duty in the Marianas is quite different from those of rugged days during the war. Certainly the recreational advantages are better. Ball diamonds, tennis, badminton, horseshoe, and volleyball courts, bowling alleys, and skeet ranges . . . may be found on almost every Twentieth Air Force Installation” (1). Yet Griswold disagreed with Smith’s comparison between the beaches of Hawai’i and Guam as being “equally beautiful.” To Griswold, Guam’s beaches were evaluated as “surpassing Waikiki” (1). Yet another author disagreed with both Smith and Griswold. In Paul Carano’s article, “‘What’s it Like in Guam?’: Island Newcomers Can Ask,” published by the 19th Bombardment Wing at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, he compared the island’s beaches
to those of others across the world from America to France to Hawai'i. On this broader range of familiarizing Guam’s beaches for incoming American military personnel, he remarked that the island’s beaches “offer all the famed attractions of Miami, the Riviera, Waikiki—balmy weather, crystal-clear water, powdery white sand, scenic beauty, charming girls—and yet entail none of those famed resorts’ expenses” (“What’s it Like” 15). These hyperbolic assertions—not in the act of comparing beaches, but of romanticizing them—elided the reality of America’s predominantly military mission in Guam. They informed American audiences abroad that life on Guam was supposedly peaceful and serene, again dismissing the harsh realities of militourism on the island, such as post-war land pillaging for recreational facilities. However, some writings by military personnel stationed in Guam ruptured the discourse of militourism, illustrating variation in the projects of familiarization and feminization.

Rupturing Militourism

There were Americans who would have indirectly or directly contested the literatures of Beane, Wheeler, and Channell—all travelers who briefly visited Guam—during the early twentieth century. American travelers, especially those who were stationed as Marines or Navy sailors in Guam for periods of time of up to as long as two years and who had never experienced overseas duty in their lives, overall existence on Guam was sometimes not such a paradisiacal experience. These men and women had to cope with the realities of living on foreign land far from their homes. The unfamiliarity of the Chamorro people, the island’s humid climate, the typhoons which came and went, and the earthquakes which frequently occurred shaped stories of American soldiers longing for
home. These narratives ruptured the dominant American representation of the Chamorro people as hospitable and the island’s landscape as paradisiacal. One piece of writing delivered complexity to the travel and tourist genre of Guam as it challenged and uprooted the norms of the Pacific American frontier.

The autobiography of John H. Clifford entitled *History of the Pioneer Marine Battalion at GUAM, L. I., 1899 and the Campaign in Samar, P. I., 1901* recorded soldier memories of struggle and strife in islands such as “faraway” Guam (8). Accompanying Captain Richard Leary’s military expedition to Guam in 1899, Clifford, an enlisted Marine with the rank of private, was part of the battalion composed of one hundred and fifty enlisted marines and sailors, including six officers (2). Clifford based this book on a five year diary which transcribed events in Guam and the island of Samar, Philippines. In the case of Guam, his autobiography devoted most of its attention to the daily lives of enlisted Marines. This Yankee soldier quickly discovered that Guam, or “the island of misery” as he called it, was not the so-called island paradise as described by previous and later American travel writings (8). As the military expedition began to settle, the tasks of cleaning and repairing former Spanish facilities, such as a barracks “which looked like an old barn” and the governors’ palace, took their toll on these men who were not accustomed to Guam’s hot weather (J. H. Clifford 9). These Marines worked outside daily. They were cutting trees in preparation for a marching field and laying foundations for a sewer canal and a distilling plant, among other assignments which reshaped the island’s landscape for military needs and wants. But it was Guam’s landscape--its earthquakes, its weather, its removed distance from America--that reshaped some of these
soldiers’ views of Pacific Islands in general. They may have brought “order” to Guam’s lands, but they soon found out that their military institutions and technologies could not control nor accurately predict the island’s weather.

The Marines from America’s east coast knew of snow and rain, but not of tropical heat and humidity. Clifford was concerned for the health of his fellow soldiers who had to endure “[t]he hot tropical sun and working hard with poor food” (10). These stressful working conditions led to sickness among the men. Clifford remarked that “[n]ot a day passed but that two or three men went to the hospital with fever. Finally the number was reduced to sixty-five on the sick list. Twelve of our comrades and an officer died with the fever” (10). Clifford concluded that “[c]limatic fever was the cause” (10). Working in Guam’s weather conditions, he continued, drove “[n]early every man . . . on the verge of insanity” (10). He likened Guam’s climate to that of a “battlefield,” “for there was great danger of being sunstruck, for the sun was terribly hot, fever raging, and also danger of being killed by storms and earthquakes, Guam being noted for them” (10).

The island was never a “tranquil paradise” indeed. Various authors such as Clifford recorded traveling typhoons, including periodic earthquakes, which affected the lives of those in Guam. Recollecting the troubled life of Clifford’s battalion stationed on Guam, travel writer I. G. Edmonds, of Micronesia: America’s Outpost in the Pacific, wrote that “[t]he Americans soon learned—as the islanders had always known—that life on these paradise islands of the Pacific was not so delightful as travelers had led the folk back home to believe” (65). Many Americans still believed, however, that “paradise” existed in the Pacific since romanticized and exoticized travel literature were the authoritative
sources on information about places far from the metropoles of America. Information on Guam’s hot weather, typhoons, earthquakes and other things which disturbed American visitors played marginal roles in the documentation of the island’s overall environment. There were some who attempted to resolve what may have been, at first, a contradicting issue between popular images of a Pacific paradise and unpopular images of isolation and inconvenience, both of which were generated by various forms of Euro-American writing ranging from Rousseau to John Clifford.

**Known Only to Me and to the Taotaomo’na: Notions of Chamorro Ancestry, Spirituality, and Land**

Can you see what I see? Much of what I have been talking about in this chapter relates to what American travelers “saw” during their brief explorations, visits, or tour of duties to Guam. After all, cultures from the West, asserts Anthony King, built their systems of epistemology on “[t]he notion that vision is the most comprehensive, the most reliable of our senses” which “has been an article of faith since the beginning of our own philosophical tradition” (172). Vision is a powerful sense, indeed, and the visual is privileged over other senses. Yet it is also important to consider that which is “invisible” to the eyes of American travelers. As Americans could rarely see (or did not want to see or understand) the spiritual connections between Chamorros of today and our ancestors of the past rendered in stories of the taotaomo’na, Guam’s landscape became just another piece of land emptied of its spirituality and, as Vicente Diaz suggests, its “Chamorro cultural history” (“Pious Sites” 91). American travelers’ eyes were equipped to “see” certain things.
Because their vision was limited to that which could be seen, American travelers to Guam came to understand the Chamorro people in circumscribed ways. On the surface, for instance, travelers often documented that the Chamorro people are a “religious” community steeped in the faith of Catholicism. For example, observing what was perhaps a procession for a village saint, Eliza Williams, visiting Guam in 1860 with her whaler husband, writes that “[T]hey [the Chamorros] were following an image, set up in a frame carried by 4 Men, that they called Jesus Christ. It was large as a Man, with long flowing hair, a crown of thorns on the head, a cross on the shoulders, bright red garments” (qtd. in Lowe 269). Surely, these writers like Williams see our novenas, our churches, our religious fiestas, and our weekly Sunday devotion to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph. Yet a majority of these travelers fail to see beyond or outside of their Eurocentric lenses. The Chamorro people cannot be simply essentialized as “Catholic” as much as our lands cannot be simply seen as scientific specimens lodged in the geological terminology of “layered soils,” “limestone formations,” or “pillow basalt.” In other words, Chamorro spiritualism predates and has superceded the imposition of Catholic theology. But the early American writers rarely went beyond the superficial meanings of the Chamorro people and land onto which they had formed attachments and familiarizations.

Scholar Vicente Diaz’s analysis that “[C]hamorro cultural history is etched in the topography and architecture of the land” approximates what I seek to articulate here in regards to a Chamorro spiritual connectedness to the land (“Pious Sites” 91). There are specific places on Guam which evoke Chamorro cultural and ancestral spirituality. For example, the latte, stone structures once used to elevate Chamorro homes above the
ground, and which line Guam’s coastline and interior jungles, are an indication of the “visibility” and “invisibility” of Chamorro ancestry and spirituality for our lands. On the one hand, many travelers see the latte, a physical edifice, as a reminder of pre-contact Chamorro homes. The latte reminds the Chamorro people, on the other hand, of the taotaomo’na. The taotaomo’na are Chamorro spirits who live throughout Guam’s jungles, homes, beaches and pretty much anywhere in the island. Some villages in Guam, such as Pagat on the eastern coast of the island, are especially noted for the presence of taotaomo’na as told in numerous stories which refer to that village’s special spirituality. The taotaomo’na are spirits that are sometimes seen or heard or felt or touched. These spirits can help or harm someone, depending on the situation. One who makes too much noise or does not ask permission before urinating or defecating in the jungle can get sick. The taotaomo’na inflicts skin rashes and bruises, among other kinds of pain, upon those who show signs of disrespect. A suruhanu or suruhan, a Chamorro herbal healer, can often remedy these pains or sicknesses attributed to the taotaomo’na. Thus, to enter a jungle to cut wood, urinate, or just pass through one asks for permission as a sign of respect to the taotaomo’na, co-Chamorro “owners” of the Mariana Islands, if you will.

There are positive stories of the taotaomo’na as well. There are, for example, Chamorro farmers and fishermen and women who seek the guidance of the taotaomo’na as they prepare for a better crop or catch. However pleasing or displeasing an encounter with the taotaomo’na may be, the stories of Chamorro encounters with ancestral spirits vary and no two stories are exactly alike. In Hattori’s poem, “jungle trails,” she acknowledges the presence of the taotaomo’na in the jungle near her house. She writes,
Throughout my life, I've walked along these forested trails, sometimes forging new tracks known only to me and to the taotaomo'na. Hattori, a Catholic, believes in the taotaomo'na's presence around her and her home. This syncretic version of the Chamorro-Catholic faith which believes in many spirits runs against the grain of the fundamental Christian principle of monotheism. As the authors of a recently-published history of Guam note of the Chamorro spiritual relationship with the taotaomo'na, "even the most devout native Catholic will not fail to propitiate the powerful taotaomona when the occasion arises" (Nelson and Nelson 44). This Chamorro syncretic version of the Catholic faith is largely absent in nineteenth century American writings about Guam. It is obvious that American travelers rarely "saw" the taotaomo'na, and, if they did, they labeled this Chamorro spiritual belief of our ancestors as "superstitious." American travelers to Guam could not or did not "see" the spiritual connections between the taotaomo'na and living Chamorros.

I've Lived My Whole Life Near the Jungle: From Beautiful Landscapes to Hospitable Chamorros

Like Anne Hattori, I, too, live "near the jungle." My family's house in Liguan Terrace, Dededo is built in one. During the 1960s when Guam was experiencing a rise in immigration to the island, Liguan Terrace was one of the large housing subdivisions built by private corporations to shelter those migrant families. But I do not consider Liguan Terrace my familial land, although that is the place where I spent most of my young life. When Chamorros ask where I am from, I say, "Dededo," but I then tell them about my familial clans and where they reside in Guam. So although the village of Dededo is the
place where I grew up, the village of Barrigada is where my mom’s clan, Capili, comes from. My dad’s familial clan, Potu, comes from Chalan Piao on Saipan. As much as I know where my mother and father’s familial lands are, so, too, do I know of other lands owned by Chamorro clans. As I drive around the island to get food or to visit friends, I know of certain areas in Guam which belong to specific Chamorro clans. For instance, some villages have numerous families with surnames like “Naputi,” “Afaisan,” or “Cruz,” but it is the name of their clans, and not their familial surnames, that distinguish one from another. I do not know all of the lands and clans on the island, and I never grew up with images of land as paradisiacal. Rather, in my understanding, land is primarily a marker of clan affiliation and family history. These are the images of the island’s landscape I grew up with. These are the familial images of the island I have been raised with.

This chapter has demonstrated that American military writers were not so concerned with documenting Chamorro cultural beliefs and practices. Their collective representation of the island’s environment as paradise has been widely disseminated through exploratory narratives, newspaper articles, history books, and military publications, to name a few. The authors of nineteenth century American narratives who describe the landscape of Guam rarely state an intention to familiarize the reader with the island’s climate and geography. Those paradisiacally charged writings had other political intentions at that time. Whether they were about charting sea routes or chasing sperm whales, these explicit intentions were printed and published in the preface and introductions of these books. But I am more interested in the subtle intentions which can be read between the lines of these travel accounts. These numerous writings form a
genealogy, I argue, of Guam’s tourist industry, dating as far back as the early nineteenth
century. This discursive genealogy gradually builds and strengthens as American military
authors explore the island and circulate knowledge about sites for economic and military
expansion, often through the tropes of travel and tourist literature. Challenges to the
discourse of militourism are marginal thusfar, and if they occur, they are nearly silenced by
seemingly more credible works, as well as from the generally-held belief that tourism will
bring economic prosperity to the peoples of Guam.

By the turn of the twentieth century, military authors such as General Joseph
Wheeler started familiarizing Pacific peoples and Islands for military audiences. This
literature lays a foundation of knowledge which supports American economic interests in
the region while essentializing indigenous lands as “virgin.” The island of Guam is further
forced into this touristic construction of knowledge. Knowledge gained about “beautiful”
beaches, “fertile” valleys, and “abundant” vegetation encourages and promotes future
settlement of islands in the Pacific and elsewhere. This possibility becomes a promising
fact as travel becomes increasingly feasible, welcomed, and marketed as a form of
recreation. While the Second World War between the colonial nations temporarily
lessened the traffic of touristic ideological formations of Guam’s landscape, these returned
later in the post-war period with the help of mainland and Guam-based military
publications (see fig. 9).

When the tourism industry officially began in 1963, the large scale marketing of
Guam’s environmental beauty was remarkably, and I would argue, not coincidentally
similar to the tropes of paradisiacal writings which members of the military had been
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producing for over a century. Military writings, as this chapter has demonstrated, consistently feminized Guam’s landscape as “lush,” “fertile,” and “virgin.” These descriptions popularized by the military became fundamental characteristics of an island fit for tourist consumption. Furthermore, the familiarization of Guam served to characterize
the island as a comfortable place not so dissimilar from American homelands, which had
the effect of lessening the extreme foreignness of the island’s environment. In the
examples which I have shown, military writings enframed Guam’s landscape in touristic
ways. Indeed, the very language used by the military to assure its dependents that their
stay on Guam could be one filled with adventure and relaxation was replicated to
commodify the island as a tourist destination. This chapter has examined militourism as it
pertained to Guam’s landscape, and as we will see in chapter four, the acts of
familiarization and feminization also worked to produce representations of “hospitable”
Chamorros--images which seemingly invited military dependents and tourists alike to this
so-called island paradise.
Chapter 4
Establishing the Norm of Hospitality

Prelude to Hospitality: Recalling the Americanized Landscape of Guam

In the previous chapter, I examined the ways in which US military writers employed paradisiacal tropes as they attempted to understand Guam’s landscape. American non-military travelers to Guam also played an important role in representing the island as a feminized and familiar landscape. Some of these American travelers visited the island as whalers, traders, or missionaries. Their writings were usually aimed at mainstream audiences in America, informing them of the whereabouts and physical characteristics of Guam. Yet the military literature of the twentieth century particularly spoke to American audiences about the island. Military documents demonstrated the island’s strategic relevance in the context of America’s westward expansion into the Pacific. Writings of this nature provided American policy makers with the information necessary to make decisions concerning Guam’s geostrategic significance, as well as its economic potential and the social livelihood of its people.

This information varied in form and content—ranging from military journals to military orders to personal biographies. As the military mapped Guam for information about such topics as natural resources, the outcome of such findings led to precise mathematical and scientific descriptions of the island’s harbors, valleys, and overall physical contours. Another outcome of these writings was the expansion of a not-so-mathematical discourse about Guam. Military authors used adjectives and metaphors like “fertile” and “virgin” in order to convey the attractiveness and desirability of the island.
These descriptive devices portrayed the island's landscape as if it were an inviting woman, accessible and vulnerable to the "penetration" of masculine military and economic forms of exploitation. The language of military documents often described Guam's landscape in feminine terms which suggested accommodation and availability. The gendered connotations associated with such rhetoric were touristic in the sense that they allured and enticed readers to a supposedly exotic, feminine place. Even mathematical and scientific writings participated in the discourse of feminization and familiarization, by mapping out the island as a safe and knowable place, capable of being evaluated under universal scientific categories of classification. Furthermore, this particular kind of militourism legitimized the need for American males to conquer and tame a "feminine" Guam. In a 1994 article entitled "Rethinking the Military in Hawai'i," scholars Kathy Ferguson, Phyllis Turnbull, and Mehmed Ali, analyze US military discourses in Hawai'i. In this critique, they "call attention to the military's presence in language, institutions and everyday life, and encourage people to raise questions about it" (183). The authors consider some problems with the ways in which military discourses are gendered, hierarchic, and economically exploitative. Their findings offer insight to this paper as the authors draw striking parallels between the military's contemporary feminization of Hawai'i and Guam. Expanding on the masculinized structure of the military, they argue that although the most visible articulations of Hawai'i as a soft, welcoming, feminine place appear now in the strategic economies of tourism, the manly military continues to confirm itself and its eligibilities on a gendered horizon through such practices as determining the island's needs in terms of their own operational requirements, re-naming islands and landmarks, and
servicemembers' assumptions that when they come in a to [sic] a new place, they 'kind of adopt it.' Even when the military contains a certain number of women, it is still very masculine in its language, its hierarchies, and its standard operating procedures. (Ferguson, Turnbull, and Ali 183)

One way in which Americans (and not only military service personnel) "adopted" a new place was by familiarizing themselves with the landscapes and peoples which surrounded them. As Anthony Pagden has theorized, the principle of attachment is precisely this process of making familiar the unfamiliar.

The process of familiarization, as Pagden sees it, entailed the domestication of strange and different landscapes into ones which were familiar and comfortable. American authors on Guam accomplished this by enframing the physical makeup of the island within the descriptive parameters of their own vocabularies and knowledges. This process included mapping and re-naming Guam's landscape from its coasts to its interior. Caves, beaches, waterfalls and other landmarks in Guam already known and named by the indigenous Chamorro people were newly "discovered," explored, and written about by Americans in often touristic ways. Military publications in Guam and in the US mainland promoted such exploratory activities under the rubric of "recreation" in ways similar to the tourist industry. Throughout the twentieth century, the US military in Guam justified their confiscation of beach front properties, such as those along Sumay, Piti, Tumon Bay, Finegayan, Malesso, and Yigo, on the basis of maintaining morale and cohesion among their personnel and dependents. And along with the numerous "military" beaches on Guam, other places on the island were designated as sites for recreational facilities, such as swimming pools and gymnasiums, all for the exclusive use of military personnel.
Indeed, the proliferation of recreational facilities on Guam was part of a larger pattern evidenced around the world. Writing for Soldiers: The Official U.S. Army Magazine, Sgt. Jim Boersema notes that “[i]t’s true. The Army, and other military services, sponsor perhaps the largest network of recreational areas and facilities in the world. In almost every state, and in some foreign countries, there are travel camps, beaches and hiking areas owned and operated by the military” (26). Boersema observes that the US military sponsors the “largest network of recreational areas” in the world, with the troubling implication being that the military promotes touristic activities indiscriminately. As evidenced on Guam, as early as the founding of the Elks club in 1914, the suggestions and definitions of “recreation” entailed acts of familiarization. For example, recreational activities sponsored by the military on Guam, which include snorkeling along reefs, hiking in jungles, and “touring” the island, reflect notions of recreation that are customary to military personnel, yet were unfamiliar to Chamorros in the early twentieth century.

Kustumbren Chamorro: More than just Hospitality

Military writers not only familiarized themselves with Guam’s lands and seas, but also described the Chamorro people in terms which made them appear to be familiar to American audiences. In the case of Guam, the trope of hospitality has gone unchallenged as the single typification of the Chamorro people. Numerous writers have replicated the discourse expressed by Naval governor Benjamin V. McCandlish, who in 1937 essentialized the indigenous people with his analysis that “generosity to those in distress is a dominant trait in the character of the Chamorro race” (4). Indeed, the familiarization of
the Chamorro people occurred through the trope of hospitality which complemented, maintained, and supported the paradisiacal images of Guam’s landscape. For instance, in a letter addressed to his family in 1940, Charles Mckew Parr describes a utopian Guam where Chamorros are hospitable and jungles are fertile. On the issues of agriculture and Chamorro work ethics, Parr declares that “[i]n the country one can build a house out of bamboo and palm at no cost and without working can live on fish, papayas, mangoes, bananas, coconuts and other fruits” (121). There are some Chamorros who do work in the city as “servants” for the wives of Naval officers, Parr goes on to comment (124). Of these particular Chamorro workers, Parr describes a few of them as “cheerful, neat and obedient but very indolent and forgetful” (124). In Parr’s representation, the land provides generous amounts of food, while the people also can be relied upon for their servitude and obedience. The images of a giving land and a giving people suggest that processes of familiarization and feminization are at work in creating the trope of Chamorro hospitality.

The theme of hospitality assures travelers of a non-hostile landscape whose people allegedly open their homes and hearts to strangers. But, as this chapter will demonstrate, this is a false generalization. Whether the tropes have to do with infantilization or savagery, hospitality becomes the most employed adjective by twentieth-century American travelers in their description of Chamorro work ethics and behavior. Hospitality ultimately depicts the Chamorro people as hosts and hostesses to outsiders of all races, classes, and gender.
The referencing of the Chamorro people as kind and loving toward Americans, furthermore, perhaps also relates to the absence of written accounts of resistance in the history of American occupation on Guam. The few documented instances of Chamorros contesting naval forms of discipline which did exist were marginal in comparison to the popular discourse which held that Chamorros were hospitable. Had there been collective responses to military occupation other than those of hopes for economic and political opportunities, American narratives would have then portrayed the Chamorro people in other ways—ways which might have challenged and subverted the norm of hospitality. Of course, there were a variety of individual responses that never generated a collective reaction to American colonialism, especially in June of 1898. This marked the month when Secretary of the Navy, John D. Long, ordered Naval Captain Henry Glass to capture Guam from the Spanish empire.

During the transfer of Guam’s colonial property rights from Spain to the United States via the Treaty of Paris, several Chamorros were confused, exhilarated, and scared not knowing what the Americans in naval uniforms wanted. Chamorro educator Tony Palomo recalled that initial interactions between Spaniards, Americans, and Chamorros led to this temporary and contradictory air of relief and tension felt among them. The Spaniards, taken aback since they did not know that their country was at war with the US, were unhappy because they were seized as prisoners of war placed on board the USS Charleston and shipped to the Philippines. Americans, on the other hand, were pleased with their newly claimed possession. Some Chamorros, such as those assigned to a company of Spanish soldiers, were excited with the arrival of the Americans and the
departure of the Spaniards. The violent manner in which these Chamorros dismantled their Spanish uniforms in the presence of their former and future rulers evidenced their sense of relief from what must have been heavy and constraining clothing. In the words of Palomo, among these Chamorro soldiers "[t]here was a great outcry and much embracing. The Chamorros could hardly repress their satisfaction--as soon as they were sure were [sic] to be free, they began ripping the Spanish buttons and insignias off their uniforms. Buttons and collar marks were discarded by the handfuls; the Charleston marines and sailors gathered them for souvenirs" (9). But for other Chamorros the American presence was not one of celebration, but one of apprehension.

News of the Americans arrival in Apra Harbor may have traveled quickly to places throughout the island as there were Chamorros with "quick feet" who rushed to convey this information. When the USS Charleston fired shots at a rundown Fort Santiago located in the harbor, believing it was a Spanish defense post, the piercing noise produced by its cannons jolted not only the Spaniards, but also Chamorros nearby. For instance, an unidentified Chamorro fisher was attending to his traps when the unloading of the ship's ammunition frightened him. The man, wrote Palomo, "fled for his life" (6). Perhaps this Chamorro fisher was one of those messengers who distributed the news that the Americans were on island. A short while later, others, too, were fleeing for their lives. According to the testimony of Father Ildefonso Cabanillas, a priest from the Agaña parish, Chamorros in this village, upon learning of the Americans approach, headed for their ranches located at other areas of the island. Palomo, summarizing Father Cabanillas' account, wrote that "[m]any [Chamorros] in Agana became so frightened that entire
families left their homes and fled to the jungle” (9). These Chamorro responses indicated ambivalent attitudes toward Americans. The Chamorro soldiers were excited because they no longer had to take orders from their Spanish counterparts. And the notion that some “9,000” Chamorros feared Americans suggests a subversion of the trope of hospitality (T. Palomo 9). That is, the panic which Palomo describes upon the arrival of the Americans on Guam suggests that perhaps concerns other than those of hospitality were on the minds of Chamorro people. That military writers focused their accounts on Chamorro hospitality perhaps reflects their desire to be perceived as wanted guests, rather than invading colonizers. Further, perhaps acts of Chamorro hospitality might have been motivated by factors other than the indigenous people’s so-called essential generous nature.

Despite the spread of naval discourses of Chamorro hospitality, perhaps other explanations for Chamorro reactions toward Americans can be discerned. In an early encounter, the second Naval governor of Guam, Seaton Schroeder, wrote, “‘It is amazing that so great friendliness for the Americans exists so soon’” (qtd. in F. Nelson 12). During his reign as governor from 1900 to 1903, Schroeder observed a Chamorro population who, in his estimation, viewed the American military presence on Guam not simply as a change in colonizers, but as a move toward economic prosperity and political sovereignty. Similarly, Leonard M. Cox, a naval civil engineer stationed on Guam in 1904, believed that the Chamorro people “desired a civil government under a civilian governor and that they sought American citizenship as well as improvements in the island’s infrastructure” (Rogers 126). The ideals of Schroeder and Cox both reflect something of the
expectations of the Chamorro people. In this sense, perhaps it is possible to imagine that acts of Chamorro hospitality were backed by various political and economic interests. It needs to be understood, therefore, that while hospitality looms large in the written representations of the Chamorro people, there are numerous ways in which acts of hospitality might be understood. In many cases, what Naval officials interpreted as the essence of Chamorro culture was more likely a practical measure based upon various personal and familial motives.

American writers' representations of Chamorros in terms of hospitality also reflect the larger goals of American territorial expansion and nation building in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. American authors immersed in nation building narratives such as ones of the frontier hero and Manifest Destiny eagerly recorded instances and events which demonstrated what they believed to be Chamorro patriotism and obedience to American forms of order. Moreover, because the Chamorro people did not exhibit the stereotypical cultural artifacts, dances, or events often associated with the regions of Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia, hospitality became the available, as well as favored, trope of representation. In the case of Guam, American writers referred to hospitality as the dominant trope because the Chamorro people did not ultimately figure into what Nicholas Thomas phrased as "the superficial level of the type--the cannibal or dusky maiden" (17).

In a booklet entitled Tourism Services Manpower Development Study of the American Pacific Islands prepared by the School of Travel Industry Management at the University of Hawai`i at Mānoa in 1983, the authors examine methods to promote
Guam’s tourism through the marketing of the Chamorro culture. They do so in ways which are seemingly culturally complex and sensitive, but are really culturally superficial and degrading. The authors’ section on Guam borders on replicating the rhetoric of Chamorro cultural genocide I talked about in chapter two. Although they argue that “there are distinct Chamorro cultural values which prevail in everyday life,” such as “reciprocity within the extended family,” they are troubled to find that the Chamorro culture does not evidence stereotypical Pacific images which they could commodify and market (Tourism Services 19). For them the Chamorro culture—one which displays centuries of linguistic, religious, and political influence by Spain, Japan, and the U.S.—did not easily fit into their conceptions of stereotypical Pacific cultures. They assert that “[p]erhaps Guam’s weakest link in providing viable tourist attractions is the lack of a distinctive Chamorro cultural image to convey to the visitor who seeks an educational experience” (Tourism Services 30). This supposed lack of a “distinctive Chamorro cultural image” results in the privileging of hospitality as the dominant stereotype of Chamorro cultural representation. That is, perhaps the trope of hospitality fills a gap for tourist marketing agents and military writers like, a gap which has been created by the absence of unique cultural markers.

Americans who came to Guam lacked an understanding that all cultures held layered, multiple, and, at times, contradictory views of gender, identity, and religion. When the Chamorro people did not exhibit “authentic” Pacific motifs and practices, these American writers implied that we were bastardized and “inauthentic” Pacific Islanders. Nicholas Thomas warned that such extensive and casual use of tropes in identifying and
understanding a people failed to reveal “the more complex level of the narratives and classifications in which these types figure” (17). Consistent oversimplifications of the Chamorro people in terms of hospitality, in other words, fail to address the complexity of Chamorro culture, and, in fact, serve to fill the “cultural void” created by our inability to fit the dominant Pacific stereotypes.

Not only did the use of hospitality engender the Chamorro culture as feminine, it also asserted hospitality as the normative behavior. American travelers generally described the Chamorros as a gentle, loving people whose generosity and friendliness were the so-called essential traits of our culture. These authors pronounced that it was “normal” for Chamorros to be hospitable toward others. Michel Foucault cautioned his readers about the homogenizing effect of normalization, or the process in which ideas and institutional practices shaped “bodies” and through which power was attained or distributed. As David Couzens Hoy notes, “Foucault is concerned to chart what he calls the process of ‘normalization’-- the increasing rationalization, organization, and homogenization of society in modern times” (131). In the context of American descriptions of the Chamorro people, these writers inscribed the trope of hospitality onto Chamorro bodies, thus producing a norm that appropriately suited the needs and interests of the US military in their mission to Americanize our people. A supposedly hospitable population allowed the military to shape, mold, and change the Chamorro people according to what they deemed were “proper” ways of living.

Many of these writers, however, failed to understand that hospitality was not simply about giving or sharing free food or free labor. Hospitality in this touristic sense
was a foreign construction which only superficially explained or pointed to one aspect of an intricate network of reciprocation immersed in Chamorro “family and kinship ties” (Souder, Daughters 59). These networks of reciprocity obligated Chamorro families, not only individuals, to help each other in times of family crisis or celebration. At times, networks of reciprocation between Chamorro families extended as far back as two or even three generations, demonstrating a clan’s commitment and respect to help others who have helped them before. This complex cultural system was what Chamorro scholar, Robert Underwood, called kustumbren Chamoru, or Chamorro customs. Underwood asserted that

In ‘kustumbren Chamoru,’ we give, we receive, we help and we get helped. This underlying reciprocity is the crux of the whole system of ‘kustumbren Chamoru.’ Everything is done to build and sustain relationships. Every event, from the ostentatious ‘bautismo,’ the birthday party for the oblivious one-year-old, to the seemingly endless rounds of ‘lisayu,’ helps ensure the continuation of these relationships. When we step outside of them, we find ourselves lost. When we step into them, we find ourselves in others.

‘Estague’ kustumbren Chamoru; manhita kosaki sina manhita ta’lo.’ (‘This is the Chamoru custom; we are together so that we can continue to be together.’). (qtd. in Crisostomo 15)

American travel writers failed to appreciate the Chamorro cultural context in which acts of so-called hospitality occurred.

---

1 Bautismo translates in English to baptism. Matal literally means dead, but is used to signify someone’s funeral. Lisayu literally means necklace. Yet it is also used to signify the nine-day public rosary for the deceased, as well as the following nine-day private rosary held for the immediate family.
Nowadays tourists who travel to foreign countries do not search for gold, silver, or material wealth as Columbus did in the fifteenth century. Rather, these strangers-turned-tourists pursue an illusion that promises them transport to a utopian world. This is the world of beautiful landscapes and happy people, the perfect combination for a relaxing atmosphere away from one’s point of origin. Tourism is, if you will, one of Foucault’s normalizing technologies through which Chamorros are known and controlled. That is, the body of knowledge produced in militouristic discourses establishes hospitality and generosity as the normative behavior for Chamorros. Such behaviors unsurprisingly perpetuate colonial forms of control, including those associated with the tourism industry. Those who violate normative behaviors, such as Chamorro activists protesting at Guam’s Won Pat International Airport in full view of arriving tourists, are demonized for displaying “inappropriate” forms of cultural behavior.

Establishing the Norm of Hospitality

Before Guam was possessed by the American government in 1898, American travelers at that time described the Chamorro people in passing and without much ethnographic analysis. Of those comments about Chamorros, some were critical of the Spanish colonial government. For example, some satirical descriptions of the Chamorro people instead reflected the tensions of colonizing nations fighting for global dominance. Robert Kerr, an American who participated in a 1814 sea exploration of the Pacific upon the John Clipperton, noted that the Chamorro people “are strong, active, vigorous, and war-like, but are represented as cruel, vindictive, and treacherous, though perhaps the Spaniards have exaggerated their bad qualities, to extenuate their own tyranny and
oppression” (Kerr, F.R.S., and Edin 420). Another American seafarer by the name of Thomas W. Smith faulted Spain in 1844 for the ineffectiveness of its civilizing mission in the Marianas. The Spanish colonial government, Smith argued, “has not made much progress among the [Chamorros]” (202). Remarks like these served the purpose of challenging and subverting the achievements of an Old World superpower, Spain, in favor of a rising superpower, the United States. American authors at the advent of the twentieth century were acutely aware of their country’s growing military prowess, particularly in regards to the Navy.

American military accounts not surprisingly portrayed positive images of their budding Pacific colonies. For example, General Joseph Wheeler’s record upon inspecting the Naval government in Guam in February 1900 depicted a peaceful, law abiding Chamorro population. Escorted by Lieutenant William Safford and Father Jose Palomo, Wheeler performed his military inspection of Guam’s naval administration, commenting here and there on Chamorro hospitality. Very soon after the American takeover of Guam, the trope begins emerging. Upon visiting some of the southern villages of Guam, such as Agat and Sumay, Wheeler surmised that the Chamorro people “are very cordial and friendly. At every town we entered we were met by the leading men of the place, at two places with the United States flying” (16). The display of US flags signified to Navy officials their success in assimilating the Chamorro people into the American culture. Wheeler also noted that “bells were rung, and other efforts were made by the [Chamorros] to manifest regard for the Americans” (16). His testimony of a hospitable and patriotic Chamorro population was read as evidence of the success of the naval government. This
was good news for an expanding US empire, seemingly validating their achievement as benevolent colonizers. These observations also demonstrated the Chamorro people’s so-called acceptance of the paternal naval government on Guam. Further, the standard of living in the island supposedly improved for the better, Wheeler argued, when compared to the “lazy and dirty” conditions of the Chamorros under the Spanish occupation (26).

General Wheeler’s narrative continually referred to the Chamorro people as hospitable and patriotic. In Merizo, for example, Wheeler was delighted to find Chamorro residents greeting him and other military officials as they entered the village. Wheeler must have been a happy American because, he asserted, “[t]he [Chamorros] came out to meet us before we reached the place. They had a large United States flag, fired guns and rang bells of welcome, and displayed white flags upon all their houses. They were very courteous, and entertained our party” (26). Although I am not sure what “white flags,” “bells,” and “guns” signified, Wheeler’s documentation of village greetings from the Chamorro people evidenced what he interpreted as signs of patriotic Chamorros eager to be of service to the US military. The theme of Chamorro hospitality continued uninterrupted throughout Wheeler’s text, as accounts of greetings from village to village closely resembled each other.

As Wheeler approached the village of Umatac, for instance, he noted that Chamorros “fired guns, rang bells, and made all possible display of welcome and good feeling toward our Government. They insisted upon our partaking of an entertainment which they had prepared, and in many ways exhibited a desire to receive us with cordiality” (27). Agat, another southern village, provided a similar atmosphere for
Wheeler, who upon entering the village, stated that “every possible expression of welcome to Americans was manifested. [The Chamorros’] one little canon saluted, small arms were fired, and the bells were rung” (28). And in Inarajan, a village also situated in the south of Guam, Wheeler claimed that “[g]uns were fired, bells rung, and the little son of the town governor walked by my side playing the accordion. We were taken to the best house in the place, where we were entertained by the people. We were given an excellent supper and were furnished comfortable beds with very clean, nice, snow-white sheets and pillowcases” (34). Perhaps the unnamed Chamorro boy playing music and walking by Wheeler’s side can be read as representing America’s future relationship with Guam, as seen through the eyes of military officials then and now. The Chamorro people were and still are understood by the American government as “hospitable children.” Upon reading these passages I wondered what were the unsaid events and/or edited actions which surrounded such so-called hospitable village receptions. Did these unidentified Chamorro families know of the importance of General Wheeler, a military official sent to Guam and the Philippines to inspect military personnel stationed in those places? Could these receptions have been staged or promoted by the US Navy? Why did Wheeler make no mention of Chamorros in villages located in northern Guam? Could the various hospitable receptions be better understood in terms of village rivalries? Or in terms of expectations of reciprocity from a “benevolent” US government?

Whatever the case, military documents like those of Wheeler served the purpose of enframing the Chamorro people as docile and obedient servants of the US government (see fig. 10). William E. Safford, a former lieutenant Naval governor turned botanist,
The caption reads, “Many of the Navy personnel enjoyed learning about Guamanian culture during their tour on Guam” (Farrell 84).

course, with such statements. Chamorro scholar, Anne Perez Hattori, for example, examined naval discourses in Guam from the period 1898 to 1941. Hattori asserts that military writings like those of General Joseph Wheeler and Naval governors in general portrayed “Chamorros who were described as proud to be American, friendly to American colonialism, and ultimately, satisfied with the autocratic rule over the island imposed by the Navy” (18). Even non-military publications added to the representation of a Chamorro people happy under US rule. Wheeler’s account may not have come across in the 1900s as a tourist guide offering a packaged stay of three days and two nights in Guam. However, the tropes it evoked were a fundamental part of a tourist ideology which, when combined with the rhetoric of patriotism, resulted in a discourse of militourism. Indeed, military documentation, perhaps the most influential and threatening
of discourses in international political arenas, provided what was perceived as the
objective truth of Chamorro hospitality.

The trope of hospitality, furthermore, had the power to transform the experiences
of reluctant travelers from fearful adventures to comfortable visits. Frederick Chamberlin,
for example, first described his visit to Guam in 1906 as an “adventure” (113).
Chamberlin was part of a crew of travelers who stopped over in Guam to deliver mail to
Navy personnel stationed there. As Chamberlin toured the island he thought of negative
stereotypes associated with far away places. Chamberlin was, at first, an afraid and
insecure “guest.” Of his trip from Apra harbor to Agaña, he wrote, “[W]here in the world
we were going not one of us knew, and all sorts of visions of treachery, ambuscades and
slaughter flashed through my mind” (100). Further, there was nothing feminine or
beautiful in Chamberlin’s portrayal of Chamorro women. He remarked that “[t]he
women, who were evidently the hard working members of the family, were inclined to be
scrawny, flat-breasted, possessing, with their flat heads and low retreating foreheads about
as unattractive bodies, limbs, heads, and faces, as could be devised” (100). But these
images changed as Chamberlin encountered what he thought was Chamorro hospitality.

In an unidentified Chamorro household, Lieutenant Fulton, a soldier with the
Philippine Scouts who accompanied Chamberlin, warned him that “according to the laws
of hospitality we would probably be asked to drink and drink we must, or offend the host”
(107). And drink they did until Chamberlin had to return to the port. On his way back to
Apra harbor, Chamberlin grew more confident of his surroundings. As a curious
Chamberlin entered the jungle searching for a coconut tree spotted from a trail, he
"wondered about snakes, jaguars and all sorts of things. Such grass as we found could easily have concealed a whole menagerie" (110). But Chamberlin was a brave American tourist and, therefore, he "took the risk" (110). In his short stay in Guam, Chamberlin concluded with what appeared to be a positive gesture in comparison to his earlier negative comments. The Chamorro people, he wrote, "respond to kindness and true consideration as unerringly as does a baby" (111). Indeed, Chamberlin "tamed" the jungle, as well as "calmed" the natives to the point where we were transformed in his imagination from "hideous beings" to "manageable children."

Yet there was nothing really positive about this infantilization of the Chamorro people as it implied the need for supervision by a patriarchal US government. Such infantilizing remarks, commonly articulated in naval documents, further implied that Chamorros were not capable of self-government, and thus were not dissatisfied with the dictator-like governing methods of the US Navy in the early twentieth century. The rhetoric of infantilization was one link to the feminization of the Chamorro people. In conjunction with illustrations, such as those found in the Guam Recorder and elsewhere, the infantilization of the Chamorro people provided a picture of child-like Chamorros under the parental guidance of the US government (see fig. 11, 12, and 13). Hospitality and the infantilization of the Chamorro people, in this sense, disguised the realities of social problems and conflict between American military personnel and Chamorros in Guam. For example, despite earnest and persistent attempts by Chamorro leaders from 1901 on to address their abject political status before the US Congress, Navy officials used the discourse of hospitality and infantilization as a way of undermining the political
Fig. 11. Early nineteenth century American illustration of the Mariana Islands. The Spanish text reads, "TODO EL MUNDO VER ESTRELLAS AMERICAN," which translates into English as “everybody sees American stars" (Haswell 192). Notice the tools of Euro-American navigation, such as the compass, on the bottom right hand corner. The child-like Chamorro who is naked appears to be reaching out for the partially clad American father figure. This sketch reproduces Michelangelo’s creation scene in which “man” reached out his hands for “God.” Illustration from William Haswell, “Remarks on a Voyage in 1801 to the Island of Guam,” *Historical Collections of the Essex Institute* (Salem, 1917) 192.

development of the Chamorro people (Hattori, “Righting Civil Wrongs,” 58). The US military in the early 1900s considered problems such as ethnic tension and political unrest to be of only marginal significance. Perhaps the only instances in which the US Navy accorded a degree of respect to peoples of color were when those particular populations obeyed US laws and military interventions without question. The Chamorro people in
Guam were considered to fit that role according to the expertise of certain military officials because of their hospitality.

If works by Wheeler rationalized American colonial interests by portraying Chamorros as happy in their colonized status, so, too, did other works promote American colonizing interests. By the 1930s, Americans abroad were already obsessed with
conquering continents, islands, and the waters in between them, and American educators promoted this superior race complex through their classroom emphasis on travel and geography. Take for instance Jay Earle Thomson’s 1931 *Our Pacific Possessions* which promised to “[take] both the teacher and pupil on interesting journeys through Alaska, Hawaii [sic], Samoa, Philippines, and Guam. These adventures, authentic and fascinating, include a social, civic, industrial, and historical view, vital in studying geography” (v). The important aspect to studying geography, argued Thomson, was what he called the
"journey method" (v). The journey method described traveling to a place and writing
about their people and resources. According to Thomson, many American "boys" wanted
to travel to foreign places on trails laid down by earlier generations of pioneers. He
asserted that Americans aspired to travel and familiarize themselves with foreign peoples
and countries. Thomson wrote that

\textit{every child is imbued with a desire to travel abroad} and see the world for
himself. He is keenly interested to know what foreign lands have to offer
as contrasted with his own environment. Probably no substitute for travel
will ever be found to satisfy the child's \textit{innate} desire to see distant
countries, but books of travel give the child a comprehensive idea of the
countries and peoples, and \textit{inspire him to become more familiar} with the
physical, social, and industrial conditions. (emphasis added, v)

For American students in the US mainland, Guam became familiarized by Thomson who
observed, upon disembarking in Apra Harbor, that there were "American flags flying from
every mast" (244). The island was also described in feminine terms, with the Chamorro
people portrayed as "courteous and hospitable and eager to render service" (251). Guam
was also a safe place for American tourists to visit, Thomson reminded his readers,
because there "Uncle Sam will protect us" (244). This protective aspect of American
colonialism was a theme developed by other travel writers, especially in the context of
world war.

Take for instance Willard Price's article, "Hidden Key to the Pacific," published by
National Geographic Magazine in 1942. Although Price focused on the Japanese
occupation of Micronesia, he discussed his encounters with Chamorros on Saipan. While
on Saipan, an initially disappointed Price found that there were "no hotels, no inns, no
provisions for tourists" which resulted in him "[living] with the natives," among whom
"some were savage, naked head-hunters" (746-7). Yet the image of savagery, as well as the feminine connotations associated with it, such as inferiority, dissipated somewhat as the Chamorro widow, Concepcion Reyes, welcomed Price into her house. Price noted that Reyes’ house “was always overflowing with relatives, friends, and perfect strangers, for if you hear the sound of music in a Chamorro house, you just walk in” (770). In the Reyes home, the discourse transforms from that of the savage household to the hospitable venue. Price did not explain the sudden change in his perception of the Chamorro people from hostile to peaceful natives. Price then compared the so-called welcoming Chamorro home to that of “the exclusiveness of the Japanese home,” a statement perhaps reflective of the tense relations between Americans and Japanese during World War Two (770).

But travelogues were not only about suspense or hospitality. Larger themes were certainly at work in Price’s narrative. Perhaps one of those themes was that of American superiority in the Pacific region, specifically in Micronesia. Perhaps we can surmise that Price’s actual visit preceded the outbreak of war, and that the publication of his article evidences the editorializing intentions of National Geographic Magazine and their support of the US and Allied cause.

The excitement, curiosity, and political implications of Price’s article should come as no surprise as the National Geographic Magazine was one of the prime movers of a tourist literature primarily targeted at white middle class Americans. Catherine A. Lutz and Jane L. Collins, in their study, Reading National Geographic, argued that “[t]he Geographic likely helped direct tourists to the Pacific, and has also served as an acculturating background to the many ads that use Pacific motifs to sell a product as
sensual, often as feminine” (152). Stephen Greenblatt, in his review of Lutz and Collin’s book, concurred with the authors that “[t]he friendliness of the exotic other has long been one of the staples of the *National Geographic*’s vision of the world” (112). Greenblatt continued to say that the *National Geographic Magazine* “has been promoting tourism for decades” (114). Price’s article and his “selling” of Chamorro hospitality is indicative of this larger and long-standing *National Geographic Magazine* project. Although Price’s article was not a sensual advertisement for American readers in the 1940s, he, nevertheless, feminized the Chamorro people by transforming so-called savagery into hospitality. Like many travel writers in the Pacific, Price domesticated the Chamorro people at his own will. His eventual use of the trope of hospitality later justified American military intervention in the Marianas in World War Two. Price’s article implied that American invasion into the Marianas was justified, and that the Chamorros preferred an American colony over a Japanese one. He exploited Chamorro hospitality because, like numerous authors before and after him, he was not involved actively in Chamorro networks of reciprocation. For the Chamorro people, hospitality is not a one shot deal to be forgotten. Networks of reciprocation bound families together through countless years of support and survival. Where, may I ask, were these cultural narratives in the literature which discussed Chamorro hospitality?

At least one woman addressed complex cultural issues of reciprocity in a time of otherwise superficial descriptions of culture. Anthropologist Laura Thompson was one of the few Americans who discussed the Chamorro culture in ways sensitive to our understandings when compared to her fellow counterparts. In one of Thompson’s works,
The Native Culture of the Mariana Islands, she examined various aspects of the Chamorro culture which included our beliefs in the taotaomo’na and the medicinal practices of Chamorro herbal healers, such as the suruhanas. Although Thompson’s book had its own problems in perceiving the Chamorro culture as racially impure and mixed, her anthropological fieldwork done in the late 1930s evidenced a more scholarly analysis of Chamorro culture and history. She was even critical of the US Navy’s treatment of the Chamorro people in 1947, calling the Naval government a “rapidly rotating personal dictatorship” (“Laura Thompson” 6A). But despite Thompson’s overall support of Chamorros, she, too, was a participant in promoting Guam as a tourist venue, coming to Guam with expectations of resort hotels, white sand beaches, and picture-perfect sunsets.

When Thompson arrived in Guam in October 1938, she stayed temporarily in the village of Agaña until she was transferred by the Navy to the more rural village of Merizo. Thompson’s recently published autobiography, Beyond the Dream: A Search for Meaning, expressed her touristic anxieties and expectations during her study in Guam. While residing temporarily in the Naval Hospital located in Agaña, she remarked that “[t]here were no hotels or tourist accommodations available” (Beyond 81). One could almost sense the relief Thompson felt when she was transferred to Merizo where she “[moved] into a large beachfront on the western edge of the village” with a “sweeping marine view” of Cocos, a small island south of Guam (Beyond 81). Originally a site for Naval officers seeking rest and recreation, Thompson described her house as “comfortable,” furnished with all the modern necessities, such as “a living room, dining room, kitchen, two bedrooms, a bath, and a lanai facing the sea” (Beyond 81). She arrived with touristic
anxieties about the quality of available lodgings and the like, and happily enjoyed her relocation to an ideal, stereotypical Pacific village.

Some forty nine years later, in 1987, Thompson revisited an island whose architecture and landscape had changed drastically since her last visit. Now there were cement houses, asphalt roads, shopping malls, and, yes, hotels. On island for an academic conference, Thompson resided in the Hilton Hotel, one of Tumon Bay’s resorts, which, she wrote, was “more luxurious this time when compared to my first stay on Guam” (Beyond 86). By the late 1930s American travelers like Thompson held expectations that Guam had hotels, as well as hospitality and a paradisiacal landscape. The genre of travel writing in Guam produced myths of rest and relaxation in a place far from home, as well as truths of foreign economic and military exploitations. In some ways, Thompson accepted Guam’s so-called invitation, partially because it was an island already marked by the myths of American travel writing. Perhaps it was the US Navy, and not the Chamorro people, that needed to be studied as its discourses about Guam have proven to be problematic in so many ways. The Guam Recorder, a Naval publication, was one of those problems.

Femininity and Fiestas: The Saga of Hospitality in Military Discourse

As I have discussed in chapter three, The Guam Recorder was a journal notorious for promoting touristic literature about Guam’s landscape. In the words of Mrs. O. Quande, a military dependent stationed in Guam in the late 1930s, The Guam Recorder was also popular for portraying the Chamorros as “very friendly” (301). The four years spent on Guam by Quande led her to believe in the “true meaning of hospitality” (301). She wrote that “[f]or many years I have been following my husband from duty to duty.
We have been in many places but it took this trip to Guam to show me the true meaning of hospitality. My many friends all over the Island have proven to me that: hospitality knows no bounds" (301). It appeared that hospitality held “no bounds” among the imaginations of American writers as example after example can be found elsewhere (see fig. 14).

Another writer by the name of Clarke Irvine published an article in *The Guam Recorder* which conveyed not only the so-called hospitality of the Chamorro people, but also the “utopian paradise” associated with the environment of Guam. In 1927, Irvine noted that “a lot of happy, simple souls are today living in peace and plenty and quiet out on the ‘top of the world,’ the highest sea peak, the beautiful island of Guam: a Utopian paradise long since lost to human memory and record” (308). These authors’ expressions of Chamorro hospitality may have indeed held no boundaries and limitations. The femininzation of the Chamorro people in this manner continued into the mid-twentieth century and *The Guam Recorder* played an important role in the continuity of that discourse.

Let me share with you sections of a poem published in 1941 by this military journal. The title is “The Smiles of Guam.” The unknown author went by the pseudonym of “Army,” an appropriate name for an author whose poem evokes several of the themes from which American writers shaped Chamorro hospitality. The second stanza, filled with allusions to American patriotism and military order, reads:

> The children marching off to school  
> Or going home again  
> Obey this happy smiling rule--  
> Excepting now and then  
> A little boy will stand erect  
> In dignified salute  
> Until you’re past, or almost past,
And then he'll simply hoot!
I love these comic little boys--
Their sisters’ smiling balm:
*Of all the smiles, of all the isles,*
*I choose the smiles of Guam!* (205)

But children are not the only ones supposedly smiling. The author of this poem ensures
his or her audience that no matter how hesitant, even Chamorro elders eventually give in
to the author’s imposing presence. In the fourth stanza, Army suggests images of
Chamorro elders submitting to authority:

The elders, with their shirts outside--
Or in *mestizas* brown,
May hesitate, but soon decide
It would be wrong to frown.
And so they give you smile for smile;
Their wrinkled faces shine
With friendliness that would beguile
Far colder hearts than mine.
    Their teeth are stained with betelnut,
But in this land of palm
*Of all the smiles, of all the isles,*
*I choose the smiles of Guam!* (205)

Notice how Army attempts to pacify Chamorro elders into obedient and friendly peoples
with the phrase, “It would be wrong to frown” (205). The remainder of the poem
repeatedly enforces this conformity to norms of hospitality. The metaphor of the
“smiling” Chamorros serves once again to convey a content and cheerful population under
US colonialism. One does not have to second guess that “smiling” natives are one of the
instruments in marketing tourism. Here we have the military partaking in that industry of
feminization. There are other events as well in which military personnel participate in.
Some of those events are Guam’s fiestas which celebrate each village’s patron saint. Fiestas are marked by a Church mass, procession, and the sharing of food and music. These celebrations partially signify the thankfulness and appreciation for family
members and food we have around us, and they are also events in which Chamorro families reciprocally exchange food, labor, or material wealth. Many military personnel describe fiestas as Chamorro hospitality at its best. Many have been known to arrive when it is time to eat, but are nowhere to be found when it comes to praying, preparing food dishes, and, finally, cleaning up. Most military personnel come freely to village fiestas, assuming that these are "public" gatherings where they may go uninvited from party to party without even knowing the host families. It does not help when Guam's media promotes this "friendly fiesta" image.

In the "Islander" section of the Pacific Daily News, the unknown author of "Fiesta: Everyone's Welcome to Line Up..." writes, "How do you introduce a Guam fiesta? You don't. You just walk in to be instantly overwhelmed by mountains of multicolored food piled high on a table big enough to play ping pong on" (36A). Just north of the Pacific Daily News building in Agaña stands a building which formerly housed a newspaper establishment no longer in production and circulation. Formerly known as the Guam Tribune with its offices located in Tamuning, this newspaper once delivered issues to residents throughout Guam. Writing for the Guam Tribune in 1983, Amparo "Nita" Canzon, asserts, in referring to a photograph of two unidentified Chamorro men barbecuing, that "[m]ost anyday [sic] of the week someone in Guam is barbequing something like these men with two pigs in merizo [sic]. It was for a birthday for one of them. Tourists are welcome to most places where these parties are at. Especially Chamorro homes" (16A). Military personnel seem to agree with these so-called invitations. Donald Herring of USS Proteus states that the Chamorro people are ""really
good”” because “‘every weekend there’s a fiesta in one of the villages, and when they have a fiesta, everybody’s invited. You don’t need a personal invite -- just show up’” (qtd. in Dorey 30). Further, military service members--families or single--are rarely seen in large numbers attending funerals, baptisms, and other Chamorro gatherings as they would in fiestas. Chamorro families do indeed invite unexpected military personnel into their homes out of courtesy. However, coming to a familial gathering without permission is still considered rude and disrespectful behavior.

Few military personnel repay the generosities of their Chamorro fiesta hosts, thus ignoring the reciprocal obligations which go along with participation in such events. They attend fiestas as if the food were free. For example, SMSgt. Doug Gillert of the military publication, Airman, declares that some Air Force active duty members like Mike and Paula Heath “look for the free and the cheap” in Guam (14). On the weekends, Gillert continues, the Heaths “go in search of village fiestas” where there is bound to be “free” food (14). Describing the so-called nonchalant atmosphere of fiestas, Paula Heath states that “[y]ou can be driving along and see a fiesta going on and just pull over, and the [Chamorro] villagers will invite you to have a drink and eat with them”’ (qtd. in Gillert 14). These sorts of examples occur precisely because stories of Chamorro hospitality dominate military discourses. Military personnel are led to believe that they can invade the most personal place of a Chamorro family, the home, and feel welcomed. As SMSgt. Doug Gillert puts it, the Chamorro people’s “food and friendliness are so alluring, many service members volunteer for repeat assignments” (12).
Some Remarks: The Militourism of Landscape Description and Hospitality

This chapter has shown how American military and non-military writers have essentialized the Chamorro people as hospitable for reasons of American control and subjugation. Authors who employed hospitality as a theme in their literature contributed to the discourse of militourism. Familiarization was not such a strong factor in the makings of this particular kind of hospitality ideology. However, numerous writers consistently feminized the Chamorro people as “childlike” and “generous.” The results were often dangerous in the sense that they implied the demise of the Chamorro culture based on the absence of complex practices from which to support more critically sensitive understandings of our people. The trope of hospitality did not emerge into the positive characteristic with which it was usually associated.

In the past century, as this chapter has illustrated, the “positive” stereotype of Chamorro hospitality has been established as a norm in American travel literature about Guam. Rotuman scholar Vilsoni Hereniko, elaborating on the culturally derogatory effects of normalizing Pacific identities, argues that “[n]egative or positive stereotypes reduce islanders to two-dimensional figures, not fully human, resulting in the erosion of the self-esteem and dignity of the colonised” (413). Disturbed with the ethnocentrism attached to such Pacific stereotypes as that of the cannibal, for example, Hereniko argues further that “[Pacific Islanders] must then contend with identities that are not of their own making but nonetheless become regarded over time as their distinctive characteristic, that which makes them different from others. A stereotypical identity, once stuck, is almost impossible to shake off completely” (413).
Should the trope of hospitality “stick” onto the Chamorros for years to come, our people will continue to be “typed” as obedient, generous, and loving. These representations assure audiences abroad, large and small, that we are essentially non-threatening and subservient to outside forces. Combine hospitality with images of a feminine and familiar landscape and one has the two central themes of militourism in Guam; two central themes, let us remember, in which the US military has played a significant role in forming, documenting, and enacting. Joe Murphy, editor emeritus for the Pacific Daily News, unwittingly exposes the discourse of militourism on Guam in a recent column entitled “I’m still optimistic about tourism on Guam.” Here Murphy combines the island’s “natural” beauty with Chamorro hospitality, as well as with other things commonly used to market the island for tourists. In an enthusiastic tone, he writes that “[G]uam has a lot going for it, including location, which means inexpensive tickets here, good hotels, blue skies, warm clear water, good beaches and a generally friendly population” (39).

Published in the “Opinion” column interestingly positioned just above the “Voice of the People” section of the Pacific Daily News, Murphy’s piece is one of the few “local” voices spoken in a newspaper owned by the Gannett corporation and dedicated to covering global and national issues. Evelyn Craft, a writer for Glimpses of Guam in the 1970s, summarized the intentions of Murphy’s editorials, arguing that Murphy’s writings “stress the economic opportunities on Guam and the need for tourism as a second economy. He sees Guam as a Bermuda-type vacation spot for the Japanese and anticipates North-South flights using more airlines. He applauds the many new hotels now
under construction but adds there is still a need for more recreation for the military” (30-31).

Insignificant as it may seem, Murphy’s article, including others written by different contributors, is read widely by audiences in Guam and elsewhere, and it is one of the few sources of information about public issues pertaining to the Mariana Islands and the regions and peoples which surround them. Thus, publicity and public accessibility are important aspects for the dissemination of discourses, especially with regard to militourism on Guam. As Walter Benjamin wrote in the 1930s, various forms of art are now reproduced and distributed in massive quantities due to modernity’s technological inventions, such as the camera. Similarly, musical lyrics, poetry, artwork, essays, and other cultural representations today proliferate, thanks to printing presses and other technologies such as those found in the Pacific Daily News building. Talking about the generative capability of film, Benjamin remarks that “the reflected image has become separable, transportable. And where is it transported? Before the public” (231). Militourism has indeed gone public in contemporary Guam, as Joe Murphy’s column demonstrates.

The next and final chapter of this thesis will discuss how militourism is “separated,” “transported,” and, ultimately, negotiated by Chamorros and non-Chamorros alike. Chapter five will examine the “second invasion” of the Japanese; we will see possible alternatives to tourism or ways with working with tourism; and, lastly, we will learn to listen to and understand the colonizing and decolonizing voices of those challenged by militourism’s mechanisms of control.
Chapter 5
Toward a Conclusion

This thesis has attempted to demonstrate the discursive formation of militourism in Guam through the processes of familiarization and feminization. Both the acts of familiarization and feminization sought to transform, reshape, and ultimately possess the Chamorro peoples and the island’s landscape. The process of familiarization entailed the making of the strange and different into the familiar and comfortable. In their various writings, Americans employed familiar English words and phrases to describe what was not part of their systems of knowledge. This led to their mapping and re-naming of some of the island’s beaches, harbors, roads, valleys, and so forth, re-mapping and re-namings which can be read as attempts to know, to understand, and to possess. On the other hand, the workings of feminization portrayed the Chamorro peoples and the landscape in feminine language—metaphors, adjectives, and phrases. The notion that someone or something was feminine raised implications of submission, inferiority, obedience, and a host of other demeaning descriptions. These two discursive processes, as evidenced in the works of American writers in Guam, intersect to enframe the Chamorro people as essentially hospitable and the island’s landscape as paradisiacal.

Throughout my survey of twentieth-century American literature of the Chamorro people in Guam, I have also shown that the discourse of militourism produced a body of knowledge that concomitantly justified US colonialism while promoting tourism. I have demonstrated that the discourse of militourism was in the process of formation even prior to the American establishment of a colony in Guam in 1898. Following the settlement of
American military personnel in 1898, however, the discourse flourished and dominated the fields of militarist, scientific, travel, academic, and tourist writings. In some ways, the discourse of militourism generated an orientalist representation of the Chamorro people and our landscape. These militouristic writings about Chamorro culture were not always only imaginative discourses. Indeed, what made militourism a concrete form of orientalism is that it was not limited to the discursive realm of representation. Military officials actively used beach lands for recreational purposes before and after World War Two and, thus, enforced concrete colonial policies which favored a future tourist economy. Not only did the military want to know more about the Chamorro people in order to control us, they also unwittingly laid the foundations for tourism, an economy that would exploit Chamorro cultural practices, beliefs, and lands.

This chapter intends to discuss the ways in which militourism affects the social, economic, and political spheres of Chamorro culture. I want to conclude this thesis with an examination of popular conceptions of contemporary tourism and how these views contradict or complement one another. For instance, Paul Carano, an esteemed historian and professor at the University of Guam, published “Guam Scenic Route” in 1979. Carano described the histories and locations of several of the island’s beaches, parks, and monuments, as well as other tourist sites. He expressed a concern for more tour guides like his to be written and passed out to visitors. “For many years,” wrote Carano, “and especially since the large-scale influx of tourists into Guam, there has been an urgent and continually growing need for a book presenting, in a concise and factual manner, information about the island’s numerous historic, scenic, and recreational sites” (ii).
Carano desired that tourist guides be written with historical accuracy and with recreational appeal. The views he expressed evidenced the pervasiveness of tourist discourses even at the level of academic inquiry. Carano’s comments added to the century long development of tourist discourses by American travel writers and military personnel who came to Guam for a variety of different reasons.

This chapter thus intends to demonstrate that tourist discourses are no longer exclusively the workings of American military personnel, but are now further complicated by both Chamorro and non-Chamorro participants and protestors of tourism. This chapter will also discuss the ways in which Japanese visitors have contributed to the formation of Guam’s tourist industry, especially within the context of World War Two’s military legacies. I then offer some concluding thoughts on militourism in an attempt to raise questions about its multiple meanings as we enter the twenty-first century.

Confronting Tumon Bay

Do not let the subtitle frighten you. Tumon Bay is actually one of my favorite areas in Guam for holding gatherings of friends and family. For me, the Tumon Bay area conjures up fond memories of Sunday beach barbecues, hotel weddings, weekend brunches, Friday night parties, and afternoon football pick-up games. But after researching the genealogies of American military tourist discourses in Guam, I am now troubled by the ways in which tourism has increasingly become a part of our lives without much thought given to its long-term problems and effects. For example, the numerous hotels which line the Bay are important venues not only for tourists on their vacations, but also for Chamorros celebrating weddings, graduations, and other familial events. How
does one then go about critiquing the tourist industry when its facilities are used and enjoyed by one’s own people? Ypao Beach, for example, Guam’s largest and most widely utilized public park, lies at the southern end of the Bay and attracts cultural festivals, government-sponsored parties, and the annual “liberation” carnival.

Aside from Ypao beach as a place of significance to the Chamorro people, Tumon Bay is also the site of important Catholic Church lands. Located near the northern tip of Tumon Bay, for example, is the Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores Memorial. The site is dedicated to Sanvitores, the Jesuit priest who founded the Spanish colonial settlement in the Marianas, and who died at the hands of Chief Mata’pang and Hirao in 1672. Former Archbishop of the Marianas Archdiocese, Felixberto C. Flores, who passed away in 1987, spent several years trying to prove to Catholic ecclesiastical authorities that Sanvitores died as a martyr and, thus, deserved sainthood. Scholar Vicente Diaz writes that Archbishop Flores’ struggles, among others, led to the Vatican’s beatification of “the now ‘Blessed’ Diego” in 1985 (Repositioning iv). Can Sanvitores’ ongoing bid for canonization serve as a podium for addressing tourist issues which specifically affect Catholic communities in Guam? For example, is the “eight to five” work ethic of business and government jobs, many of which cater to tourism both directly and indirectly, threatening the social fabric of Chamorro Catholic families? Driving along Sanvitores’ new four-lane road, one can hardly even see the Sanvitores memorial anymore as it is situated between the Guam Reef hotel and other tall buildings. To drivers along Tumon’s hotel row, the memorial is almost completely concealed from the road, camouflaged by high-rise hotels and other ongoing construction projects in the area. Perhaps the
invisibility of the Sanvitores memorial demonstrates metaphorically some of the ways in which tourist-sponsored activities eclipse and erase Chamorro histories and events from Tumon Bay.

Becoming increasingly invisible also are the mañahak, or juvenile rabbit fish so popular among Chamorros for consumption. These small fish frequent the Bay every year, but are now in danger of disappearing from these waters. The large numbers of jet skiers, snorkelers, kayakers, and beachcombers who swim, float, or bathe in the Bay create noises which frighten the fish from their natural habitat. Talayeros, or Chamorro net fishers, are forced to compete with these beachgoers for the limited resources of the Bay. It indeed appears that as a result of Guam’s tourist industry, one’s sustenance is secondary in importance to another’s recreation. On the topic of fishing, Chamorro scholar Laura Souder writes that

before World War II, fishing was an integral part of Chamorro life. During the seasonal fish runs, whole neighborhoods would work together in communal net-fishing expeditions to catch maniahac, tiao, or other small fish. My mother recalls that the beach front from Hagatna, the main town, all the way to Tohnum, now an enclave for tourists, would be lined with groups of people. Some would be laying or pulling in the nets laden with small fish. The women would often remain on the shore, preparing titiyas and atuli, to be eaten with the freshly salted fish after the catch was divided up and distributed to everyone. Children would be playing in the sand quietly, knowing they would get scolded for making noise and scaring the fish away. (Souder, “Kantan Chamorrita” 189)

Respect for Chamorro fishers and for the Bay itself is diminishing quickly. Before Tumon became a venue for tourist development in 1962, the Bay was well known, as Souder points out, for Chamorro fishing activities. Now the fishing parties appear only occasionally along the Bay’s shores. And, already overcrowded as it is with peoples and
hotels, developers still continue to construct new buildings and other projects in Tumon at a rapid pace.

In the summer of 1997, the popular international restaurant chain, Planet Hollywood, held a grand opening in Tumon. Guam’s media provided live coverage of visiting film celebrities. The event was so important for the tourist industry that the Guam Police Department even closed off a section of the Sanvitores road adjacent to the Planet Hollywood complex. The blockade cut off traffic in order to accommodate the “red carpet” arrival of the Hollywood movie stars. And a few months later, Hard Rock Cafe Guam, opened its doors. Besides the opening of franchise clubs and restaurants, the Westin Resort Guam also joined Tumon’s “hotel row.” All of these grand opening events generated a considerable degree of publicity. For example, the May 25, 1997 Sunday issue of Pacific Daily News had an insert entitled “Planet Hollywood Lands on Guam.” The supplement’s contents included color pictures, welcoming remarks by prominent island business leaders, biographies of celebrities, menus, and a host of other goodies for Hollywood enthusiasts. The issue also advertised what merchandise Planet Hollywood would offer to its Guam customers. Little public criticism was aired about the construction of this new club. Nor was much attention paid to its impact on the surrounding environment.

Large scale developments have been, unsurprisingly, damaging to the ecosystem of Tumon. For example, Tumon Bay’s waters are polluted. The conditions of the water vary from week to week and the degree of pollution depends in part on the amount of sewage which enters and exits Tumon’s shallow waters. The chemically-treated waste, a
large portion of which comes from Tumon’s toilet bowls, is deposited in the nearby Agaña Bay and then flows back to one of its origins, Tumon. The sand beneath the ocean literally stinks as a result of the high bacteria content present in the waters. But sand is not the only source of foul smells in Tumon. During Guam’s rainy season from July to November, certain areas in Tumon typically become flooded. Rainwater has a hard time seeping through Tumon’s soils, especially with the increasing miles of inabsorbent concrete on the roads, sidewalks, and driveways. The floods have also been attributed to the village’s poor drainage system which overflows with both sewage and rainwater.

Fishers are not the only Chamorros who suffer from the gradual environmental destruction of Tumon’s marine life.

Chamorritas, or Chamorro singers of Kantan Chamorrita, are also rarely seen or heard on the shores of Tumon now. The various melodies of Tumon’s beach-side clubs now overpower the songs of the Chamorrita. Laura Souder defines the Kantan Chamorrita as a “four-line poetic verse sung to the tune of a single melody, with slight regional variations. Typically, the second and fourth lines rhyme. The verses are made up spontaneously, as they are sung, and may express a wide range of emotions and experiences” (“Kantan Chamorrita,” 189). Sometimes Chamorritas sang in Tumon and, when they did, they sang after a day’s routine of fishing. Souder remarks that “[f]or miles up and down a shoreline, the calls and responses of the lead singers would be heard. . . . Rhyming phrases would be thrown back and forth, sometimes for hours, with different people joining in and calling out challenges or responding to the rhyming of others” (“Kantan Chamorrita” 189). Although I am not well-versed in the Kantan Chamorrita, I
do believe Souder’s claim that “[i]t brings people together, encourages cooperation, allows for friendly competition, and forms the basis for spontaneous and humorous interaction,” illustrating a different way of life from that of tourism (Souder, “Kantan Chamorrita” 190). When such “vital social function[s]” like the Kantan Chamorrita are threatened it is important to understand what factors led to its decrease in use and value (Souder, “Kantan Chamorrita” 190).

Surely the imposition of the English language in Guam’s schools during the 1960s has played a role in the rare use of the Kantan Chamorrita among young generations of Chamorros. Yet one cannot dismiss the fact that Tumon Bay’s tourist industry privileges and sells “culture” in the interests of monetary gain. As such, traditional forms of cultural practice which seemingly lack in profitability—such as fishing and Kantan Chamorrita singing—are not prioritized by some of those supposedly interested in protecting the Chamorro culture. Some Chamorro leaders in Guam promote cultural activities for the purpose of selling Guam to tourists. This perspective resonates in the comments of Clifford Guzman, advisor to Guam’s current governor, Carl Gutierrez. In an interview with Barbara Gayle, Guzman discusses ways to promote Guam as a tourist venue. Guzman’s interests, writes Gayle, draw upon “cultural attractions to distinguish Guam from other tropical destinations” (23). Although Guzman does not specify which “cultural attractions” he intends on marketing, he later asserts that “‘we need to stimulate the resurgence of Chamorro culture among our own people so that we can share it with our visitors’” (qtd. in Gayle 23).
At least in the case of Guzman, fishing and the Kantan Chamorrita are not marketing strategies for contemporary tourist developers in Guam. I am, like the Talayero and the Chamorrita, caught between the traditions of the past and the traditions of the present. Whether or not fishing or singing persists, the point is that I, as well as other post-war Chamorros, have to find a balance between living our language and culture and working for monetary gain. Both cultural and material values can help one’s culture survive when balanced carefully. Yet materialistic and individualistic value systems can destroy a culture in today’s modernized world, especially when these needs assume priority over cultural beliefs and practices. Chailang T. Palacios, a Chamorro activist and public health educator, argues that the newly introduced tourist industry in Saipan was never planned carefully and, consequently, led to problems of materialism and greed among some Chamorros. As Palacios states, “Our people have become materialistic and have put their trust in money” (28). Critical of Japanese tourist investment in Saipan and its influences on Chamorro families, she remarks that

Japan lost the war, but won the Pacific with their big bucks! Our island people are like a giant who slept for a hundred years and has just awaken [sic] to the new world without any preparation for what to expect. The land transactions, between the locals, simple and poor people becoming rich overnight whose only concern was to make big money and who forgot the impact of their families and the confusion this causes. As the [sic] we were not prepared for this, many have turned to poker, frequent visits to all the bars, and have gotten involved with bar women. Married women rebelled against their husbands and they too engaged in the same activities as their husbands. (28)

Palacios' analysis of tourism relates to the experiences of Chamorro families in Guam as much as in Saipan. Take for instance Lola Quan-Bautista’s story about the selling of land
in Tumon. Bautista, one of my Chamorro friends also studying at the University of Hawai‘i, said that her family, the Unpingco clan, faced exorbitant land taxes made even more costly because their land is situated near the center of Tumon, close to the Sanvitores Church. As a result of these high taxes, Quan-Bautista’s family had no choice but to sell their land. She told me that “[her] mother, Josephine, sold her father’s land in Tumon to a Japanese corporation simply because she couldn’t afford to pay the property tax” (Quan-Bautista, L. Personal interview. 12 May 1997). Now a mother herself, Lola Quan-Bautista is even more bothered by the disruption which has been made in the inherited passing of land to her daughter, Jesi. The stories of Chailang T. Palacios and Lola Quan-Bautista are not the only stories of familial struggle and land dispossession. Although some Chamorro families have become wealthy because of tourism, as Palacios notes, I would argue that many others grapple on a day-to-day basis with the problems of cultural alienation, environmental degradation, and land ownership disputes.

Uncontrolled tourist development (and I have yet to read a critical example of “controlled” tourism) has been shown to threaten a people’s way of living to the point of cultural genocide. As Hawaiian political activist and scholar, Haunani-Kay Trask warns, “Pacific Islanders can learn from Hawai‘i” (64). Here she refers to the ways in which Hawai‘i’s tourism industry has profoundly impacted upon the lives of Hawaiians and other peoples residing in Hawai‘i. Trask is not talking about economic gains per se. Rather, she intends to educate neighboring countries and peoples in the Pacific on the long-term problems of tourism, arguing that
the overpowering impact of tourism on island cultures is best studied in Hawai‘i, where the multi-billion dollar industry has resulted in grotesque commercialization of Hawaiian culture, creation of a racially-stratified, poorly paid servant class of industry workers, transformation of whole sections of the major islands into high-rise cities, contamination and depletion of water sources, intense crowding with densities in the worst areas beyond that of Hong Kong, increases in crimes against property and violent crime against tourists, and increasing dependency on multinational investments, particularly from Japan. (64-5)

One does not need to “visit” Hawai‘i and contribute to the ongoing difficulties there in order to understand the problems associated with tourist industries. Nor does one have to come to Guam to see the disadvantages of tourism. The island draws similar problems with Hawai‘i. There is, for instance, low water pressure in some villages which surround Tumon Bay. Despite the opening of a police post in Tumon, crimes such as “purse snatching” are all too commonly committed in the streets by peoples who steal for reasons unknown. The nearby villages of Tamuning and Dededo are already overcrowded. Foreign and locally run contractors are now presently building vertically due to Guam’s limited availability of land and increase in immigrant arrivals to the island. Haunani-Kay Trask’s battle to educate peoples about the everyday cultural and social problems associated with tourism in the Pacific seem unresolvable when voices, young and old, attempt to argue otherwise.

Tammy Teodosio, writing in 1997 for Hospitality Guahan, a quarterly magazine published by the Guam Hotel and Restaurant Association, notes that “[t]ourism is the life blood of Guam’s economy” (“Protecting Guam’s Future” 26). In another article, Teodosio says that “[i]t’s easy to see how tourism benefits Guam. The proof is in the $300 million in revenues the visitor industry contributes to the government annually”
Vison 2001’’ 33). Hospitality Guahan focuses on restaurants, shopping, interviews with tourist personnel, and other issues pertaining to Guam’s tourist industry. Wilma Sisior, a Palauan employed at Hotel Nikko, chose this title for the leisure journal because, she asserts, “‘we’re in the hospitality business . . . and I chose ‘Guahan’ to give it Chamoru authenticity’” (7). Sisior adds that “everyone should read [Hospitality Guahan]’’ (7).

Unsurprisingly, the trope of hospitality now has a magazine named after it. The discourse of Chamorro hospitality has become indeed pervasive to a point in which almost anyone can render it (ab)useful. However, Hospitality Guahan is actually a latecomer in publicizing the trope of hospitable Chamorros. The trope has been institutionalized by various local schools and education programs.

The Guam Community College (GCC), established in 1977, has been holding tourism classes for the past few years. A few of the courses offered at the GCC Hospitality Institute are Hospitality Japanese I and II, Hospitality Korean I, Landscape Gardener I, and Professional Security Training. These courses prepare students for the tasks and responsibilities of gardeners, security guards, desk clerks, and a variety of other low-paying jobs. The students are trained in the tradition of “customer service.” In other words, the students, not to belittle their personal skills and knowledge, are taught to be obedient, clean, and friendly to tourists. I visited these classrooms in May 1996 when I was looking for a summer job. Some of them do not look like your “typical” college classroom with chairs and desks lined up in front of a blackboard. One could easily mistake these class rooms for hotel bars or dining ballrooms since several of them replicate generic hotel settings. At the time of my visit, there were no students in the rooms. All I
recall are dark empty rooms with rays of light filtering through their windows. These rooms are not the only ones which cater to tourism education. The University of Guam now offers a bachelor of arts degree in International Tourism, as well as a minor in Visitor Industry Management. One can now receive a college degree from learning how to “serve” tourists.

Although the tourist industry is run largely by foreign business persons, there are a few Chamorros who have achieved success as a result of their education and hard work. Frank Borja, for example, is the “first Chamorro hotel general manager” of the Reef hotel (T. Teodosio, “Local Roots” 22). In an article entitled “Local Roots Grow Visitor Industry,” Tammy Teodosio interviews Borja regarding his views on tourist education. According to Teodosio, Borja believes that “in order to stimulate young people into looking at tourism-related careers, the island needs to educate them early about the opportunities available” (T. Teodosio, “Local Roots” 22). Based on his twenty-three year rise from a desk clerk to a hotel manager, Borja is confident of and convinced by the career possibilities of tourism (T. Teodosio, “Local Roots” 22). Borja’s conviction leads him to suggest that island educators “have to start in the elementary schools - talking about tourism and hospitality so that by the time they get to high school they are exposed to these career opportunities” (qtd. in T. Teodosio, “Local Roots” 22). From the above statement Borja appears to accept the trope of hospitality as an integral part of tourism. In fact, tourism and hospitality are both intertwined and inseparable for Borja. He remarks, “I always say, there’s no end in the hospitality industry” (qtd. in T. Teodosio, “Local Roots” 22). Stories like Frank Borja’s inform audiences that tourism is the
employment opportunity of the twentieth century. This is especially the case for Guam’s youth where educational campaigns are targeting children in schools for future economic exploitation. Borja’s call has been answered.

The Guam Visitor Industry Education Council, a non-government tourist promotion, founded the Welcome All Visitors Enthusiastically (WAVE) program in 1995. The WAVE program encourages youth to participate in tourist-related discussions and activities (“W.A.V.E.” 8). There are WAVE clubs in several of Guam’s public schools. The schools that participate in the WAVE program are Harmon Loop Elementary School, Dededo Middle School, George Washington High School, John F. Kennedy High School, Simon Sanchez High School, and, the newly built Southern High School. Harmon Loop Elementary School is the only institution which caters to youth from kindergarten to fifth grade. The remaining schools in the WAVE program constitute more than half of Guam’s public high school population. It is obvious that the WAVE floods in places of ambitious young men and women who will soon be searching for jobs. Schools are not the only sites of WAVE activity. For the past three years, the Hafa Adai theaters, such as Cinema and Hafa Adai I, have preceded their showing of film previews with a thirty second WAVE advertisement which shows people smiling and waving excitedly to visitors. The commercial is as troubling as the school program itself because both fail to address the various problems of tourist development and tourist ideologies.

The numerous cultural, social, and environmental problems of tourism continue to be largely ignored. It appears that only the so-called positive characteristics of tourism are discussed in public spaces. Youth are a part of this project to belittle the problems
associated with tourism. An indication of the ways in which students identify with Guam’s tourist industry can be garnered from a 1997 Pacific Daily News publication. The “Advertising Supplement” contains several excerpts from prize-winning essays written on the topic of “The Importance of Tourism to Me.” Michael Dene Aguon, a 6th grader from Untalan Middle School, writes that “[t]ourism is important to me because as you can see, it makes our island leaders pay attention to the conditions of the roads, power, water, telephone, health, education and public safety” (3). What Aguon’s comments do not suggest are the ways in which Guam’s infrastructural problems are, in fact, largely caused by tourism overdevelopment. Besides bringing in large numbers of visitors to Guam (over a million per year), the tourism industry has also necessitated an increase in immigration in order to meet unfulfilled labor needs. These population pressures have taken their toll on the island’s infrastructure. Another student, Jamie-Lynn Manzano, a 6th grader from Santa Barbara School, expresses concern with the paradisiacal image of Guam. She remarks that “[w]e want tourists to enjoy their stay here and tell others to visit likewise. . .To make this possible, we must respect and treat the tourists hospitably and to keep our island beautiful” (3). Paul Caampued, a 7th grader from Santa Barbara School, agrees with Manzano’s views. Writes Caampued, “What tourists like is the smile they get when they come to the stores or when they see the people” (7). The discourses of hospitality and paradise have ostensibly colonized the minds of these students. They are taught at an early age that tourism is supposedly the economy of the future. More importantly, through the awarding of prizes, these students are led to believe that tourism is an industry without critical problems.
The values and attitudes produced by essay contests and the WAVE campaign work to condition children's views favorably toward tourism. Other students similarly demonstrate this pro-tourism condition. Kennon E. Wolff, for example, is a resident from Guam who attends the University of Pennsylvania. While a student there, Wolff had the opportunity to share with his fellow classmates some of his experiences and knowledge of Guam. His conversations centered on the touristic disposition of the Chamorro people and Wolff referred to himself as a "'tourist promoter' whenever [he] describe[d] the island" (22). Speaking like a tourist guide, Wolff remarked to his peers that "you can have all the luxuries available in the states but you have the added advantage of a beautiful tropical island with great beaches, warm weather, delicious food, very hospitable people, and prime location for travel" (22). Once again, Wolff, like numerous others, demonstrates the normalization of the hospitality trope and the feminization of Guam's landscape.

The general lack of criticism in touristic discourses evidences the public acceptance on Guam of their superficial meanings and implications. Words like beautiful and hospitable attract visitors to an imagined safe haven, while their consumer spending, in turn, generates monies for Guam's economy. Material wealth thus comes to signify tourism and the capitalistic use of tourist discourses in gift shops, advertisements, and hotel sponsored activities becomes the means through which this wealth is achieved. The embedded meanings and implications of these tourist discourses, such as inferiority and obedience, have been examined in this thesis in chapters three and four. I want to argue here that the images of paradise and hospitality have produced a contemporary
understanding of the Chamorro culture disseminated now among the peoples of Guam which dictates that the essence of Chamorro culture is hospitality. American military writers are no longer the sole, or even the primary, authors of this discourse. In a letter addressed to the Pacific Daily News, Dr. Peter H.T. Liu, president of the United Chinese Association of Guam, refers to Chamorro hospitality as "Guam's reputation" (25). Further, Guam's landscape is perceived to be beautiful and any instance which speaks otherwise, such as a public waste disposal site or a deteriorating home, is looked upon as a threat to the island's tourism industry. My point is that touristic rhetoric produces norms which prescribe how to act, how to behave, and how to look in the presence of visitors. The tourist industry indeed shapes a new sense of order among the peoples of Guam.

The order to which I am referring relates to the ways in which the tourist industry sets a standard of living in the island. For tourist developers like Bob L. Coe, chairman of the Government of Guam Tourism Task Force, Tumon Bay is the model of an orderly modern village. Remarks Coe, "'Tumon Bay today . . . is a much cleaner, more orderly place than it was previously'" (qtd. in Gayle 22). The paved and lighted sidewalks, the beautifully manicured hotel landscapes, the many shops and restaurants, and, most of all, the impeccable customer service of hotel employees are among the standards of cleanliness, beauty, and hospitality set by Tumon's tourist industry which other villages in Guam should supposedly follow. Audiences in the Philippines would concur with Coe's assertion that Tumon in particular and Guam in general are orderly places for living. In a 1997 interview with Pacific Daily News journalist Lloyd Jojola, Emilio Y. Uy, a prominent businessperson and president of the Filipino Community of Guam, asserts that visitors
from the Philippines (like himself) are impressed with the availability of tourist facilities on Guam, such as hotels and water-parks (3). He argues that, based on his assessment of visitor impressions of Guam, there is an order which can be found here and not there in the Philippines. Uy says that "'[t]here's a peace and order they [visitors from the Philippines] cannot get in the Philippines. They can bring their kids and relax without having to worry'" (qtd. in Jojola 3). Without giving specific examples of the visitor "impressions," and without elaborating on his description of the Philippines as a "disorderly" place, Uy refers to the supposedly safe and peaceful atmosphere of Guam's villages and communities.

Second Invasions: Militourisms of World War Two

While some argue that the contemporary landscape and overall atmosphere of Guam presents a peaceful place in which to live and visit, two Japanese invasions disturb these notions of touristic calm and order. One invasion happened during World War Two, whereas the other ensued following John F. Kennedy's removal of the Naval Security Clearance Act in 1962 which allowed migration into and out of Guam. The first Japanese invasion was a military campaign accompanied by an act of war. Lieutenant Colonel Tsukamoto of the Japanese Imperial Army led the first wave of Japanese troops which landed in American-occupied Guam on Monday, December 8, 1941 (Rogers 165). Tsukamoto's battalion took to the shores of Tumon Bay (see fig. 15). Joe Murphy, editor for the Pacific Daily News, described the encroaching Japanese soldiers as "tourists" who "carried guns instead of cameras, didn't pay rent for rooms and they stayed on Guam for the better part of three years" ("The Return of the Japanese" 85). Although there were
other invasion sites, such as one at Talofofo Bay, Tumon was significant because of its
miltouristic value. Harry Gailey, a military historian, discussed several possible US
military invasion sites in the “liberation” campaign of Guam. In Gailey’s description of
Tumon Bay, one gets a sense of the possible Japanese perceptions of Tumon as a landing
area for war and, some twenty years later, as a recreational area for tourism. Gailey writes
that “[t]he best place for a landing on Guam was Tumon Bay north of Agana. The reef
was not too wide at that point and could be crossed by all landing vehicles without too much difficulty. The fine sand beach at Tumon Bay was a broad arc approximately two miles long” (67). Perhaps it is no coincidence that Tumon Bay first served Japanese military needs as an invasion site and, later, as a recreation locale for tourists.

In their military capacity, the Japanese occupiers of Guam constructed airports, harbors, and other infrastructure for militaristic purposes in Guam. The Won Pat International Airport, named after one of Guam’s congressional representatives and the entry and exit point for daily flights from Japan, Hawai‘i, and neighboring islands in Micronesia, was originally an airstrip for the Japanese in World War Two. Rogers notes that the Japanese military constructed the groundwork for this airport in Tiyan with “the forced labor of Chamorros, Okinawans, and Koreans” (195). Not long after the reoccupation campaign of American troops in July 21, 1944, the US military, specifically the Navy, took over the airfield and the entire village of Tiyan for the purposes of creating the Naval Air Station. The US military built airfields and bases at such a rapid pace that by early 1945 there were, remarked Pedro Sanchez, “five large air bases and eight air strips . . . in operation” (252).

Another project undertaken by the US military was the construction of Marine Drive, a highway which connects Apra Harbor in the center of Guam to Andersen Air Force Base in the north. The road was named after the US Marines who “liberated” Guam from the Japanese and who engineered its construction for essentially militaristic purposes. The road’s primary intent was to transfer bombs, gasoline, and other military machinery and technology from ships in Apra Harbor to military bases around the island in
the event of war. The Cold War was then developing between the US and the former USSR, with Japan-as-enemy fading into the background. The military in Guam took every precaution to prepare themselves for nuclear holocaust as evidenced in the construction of public and military nuclear fallout shelters. Aside from serving the needs of the military, Marine Drive was a convenient addition to the island’s tourist industry which shortly emerged twenty years later after its completion. The road provided the means through which tour buses and taxi cabs could transport tourists from Won Pat International Airport to resorts in Tumon. The building of airports, cement roads, and the introduction of modern forms of travel as a result of war, argue Lamont Lindstrom and Geoffrey M. White, established “a legacy of airfields, roads, and jet-plane technology that constitutes the infrastructure of regional tourism” (27). In the histories of Guam, the Won Pat International Airport and Marine Drive serve as past reminders of war, as well as contemporary symbols of tourism. They are examples of militourism’s infrastructure which literally paved the way for the second invasion of the Japanese in the 1960s.

“Second Invasion,” in fact, is the title of a poem written by Mary C. Ferris. Part of a collection of poems about Chamorro history and her personal life experiences called Beyond the Dateline, Ferris’ poem about a second Japanese invasion says much about their present “takeover” of Tumon Bay. In full quotation, the poem reads:

Just a little bit of Nippon
Fell from out the sky one day.
It landed near the ocean
In a spot called Tumon Bay.

If you chance to go there
To enjoy the evening breeze,
The number of Japanese tourists who annually flock to Guam number in the thousands. It does not take a poem, however, to convey the large amount of Japanese tourist arrivals on island. The statistics themselves are astounding. According to Robert Rogers, “over 585,000 visitors, predominantly Japanese tourists, came to the island” in 1988 (277). By 1995, visitor arrivals to Guam reached 1.69 million (R. Teodosio 39). Currently, the Government of Guam is teaming up with private tour companies in an attempt to attract at least two million visitors to Guam by 2001 (T. Teodosio, “Vision 2001” 33). In a more global context, Japanese literary critic, Masao Miyoshi, argues that “one tenth of the whole population” of Japan travels abroad as tourists every year (75). As long as there are thriving tourist industries dependent on Japanese visitors to Guam and elsewhere, there will also be the accompanying problems of overpopulation, pollution, and cultural prostitution, rupturing the so-called orderly image of paradise. For some Japanese, Guam is not simply a paradise.

Newlywed couples and small families make up most of Guam’s current Japanese tourists. An older generation of Japanese visitors previously visited the island, but not for reasons of relaxation and recreation. This older generation of Japanese came to Guam seeking spiritual closure for their deceased family members, many of whom were soldiers stationed throughout the Marianas during World War Two. Japanese war veterans and their family members have come as tourists to the Mariana Islands to gather the remains of their relatives and friends, as well as to hold religious ceremonies in remembrance of their
lives and contributions. Miyoshi argues that many Japanese painfully recall the war, elaborating that “[t]he Japanese may not be eager to express their regret over their past conduct abroad, but they do remember the damages done to themselves. Nor can they forget how the processes of militarization irresistibly dragged them into a total war. Those days still haunt many Japanese as a nightmare” (68-69).

In an article on World War Two and tourism in Melanesia, Charles De Burlo notes that war veterans generally “return to . . . places they last saw as members of a special kind of ‘tour’ group (the military), during a time of fighting, fear, and destruction. These are ‘memory tours’ of unique times and places, not just a departure from the workaday world for leisure and recreation” (314). De Burlo adds that those “[v]eterans who return to Pacific Islands battlegrounds are making both group and personal pilgrimages. Not only do they leave mundane existences at home for a valued journey that takes them into ‘a non-ordinary sphere of existence,’ they return to a time and place (in mind and fact) that was in their earlier life quite extraordinary” (314). Japanese war veterans indeed have visited Guam on spiritual pilgrimages and for nostalgic reasons.

While American war veterans believed they were “liberating” the Chamorro people from Japanese rule, Japanese war veterans appeared to be concerned about themselves and their pasts, often demonstrating little respect for the Chamorro people who suffered under their oppression. I am not implying that there is a better or lesser form of colonial rule, as colonialism comes in many forms with various means and motives. Nor am I saying that Americans are any less guilty of using Guam as a site on which their nostalgia for war experiences might be played out. The point I am making is that when Japanese war
veterans came to Guam to perform their spiritual rituals, they did so without acknowledging the sacredness of Chamorro remains.

This is especially the case in Guam’s tourist industry which continues to welcome Japanese to the island as if the multiple tragedies and hardships of World War Two never occurred. Chamorro activist and former senator Hope Cristobal raises this issue of Japanese imperial nostalgia in a book of oral narratives by indigenous Pacific Islanders entitled Daughters of the Pacific. Quoting Cristobal, Zohl dé Ishtar, writes that:

When the tourist industry opened up, a lot of Japanese started coming up here. One of the first things they did was to organize Japanese tour groups and comb through the jungles and collect all the bones of the Japanese people, Japanese soldiers. They looked in all the caves, we have many man-made caves the Japanese had used for refuge during the war. The tour groups collect the bones and have worship service and cremate them. They have a lot of respect for the Japanese bones but they don’t care about Chamorro bones. They’re doing a lot of building in Tumon Bay. The area was actually a flourishing Chamorro community long before contact with the Europeans and there are a lot of burial sites and a lot of artefacts [sic] all over the place. Almost everywhere you dig you find bones. Chamorro bones. These are our ancestors. (75)

Cristobal’s passage echoes Renato Rosaldo’s notion of imperialist nostalgia as “the curious phenomena of people’s longing for what they themselves have destroyed” (Rosaldo, 87). Japanese veterans returning to Guam lament the often violent deaths of their friends and family during World War Two. Yet they appear to be oblivious to the injustices imposed on the Chamorro people, such as the public executions of Chamorros and the deprivation of food and other resources. Cristobal criticizes this kind of Japanese imperialist nostalgia with her references to “many man-made caves the Japanese had used for refuge during the war.” Such caves sheltered Japanese soldiers, artillery, and food from the American aerial bombardment of Guam. Further, Cristobal expresses her
concern over the apparent Japanese lack of “care about Chamorro bones.” Her frustration aims not only at the disrespect shown by Japanese tour groups, but also at the tourist industry itself which provides contemporary shelter, accommodations, and food for these Japanese tourists.

American war veterans tell a different story. These veterans do not exhibit as much public spiritual connectedness with their dead, as in the case with Japanese war veterans. Their return visits to the island generally favor memorializing acts of patriotism and loyalty to the US. As Francis Hezel suggests, “For the American public . . . the scenes of battle in Micronesia--were becoming sacred monuments sanctified by the blood of the US fighting men who had died there” (Strangers 254). Perhaps Hezel’s assertion about American battles as “becoming sacred monuments” is representative of some of the reasons why American war veterans return to Guam, an island with its own World War Two battle sites. In their study of tourism and war, Diller and Scofidio refer to battlefields as “markers” in which tourists and soldiers identify and locate themselves as visitors, strategists, or both (48). They argue that

[the battlefield, an otherwise undifferentiated terrain, becomes an ideologically encoded landscape through the commemorative function of the ‘marker.’ As a marker inscribes war onto material soil, it becomes the sight. Without the marker, a battlefield might be indistinguishable from a golf course or a beach. Guided by a system of markers and maps, the tourist/strategist reenacts the battle by tracing the tragic space of conflict by foot or by car. (48)

In Guam, the “markers” are World War Two tanks, guns, airfields, sunken planes, and invasion sites, as well as Spanish forts and architecture. But for the most part, American and Japanese war veterans are attracted to their war battlefields, as Diller and Scofidio
note, in order to “reenact the battle.” Some publications, in fact, promote this type of militourism, evoking a nostalgia for acting out the past and memorializing the present.

Andrew H. Malcolm’s article, “A New Invasion of the Island of Guam By Tourists,” reads like a tour guide specifically catered to war buffs. A correspondent for The New York Times in 1977, Malcolm first informs the reader that Guam is a paradisiacal island. The jungles, writes Malcolm, are “virtually unexplored” and “[t]he hillsides are rolling and almost shockingly green, and the weather is monotonously magnificent” (1). After feminizing the landscape, Malcolm proceeds to familiarize readers with directions on the whereabouts of war battlefields, stating, for instance, that one should “[t]ake the west coast road south past the invasion beaches of Asan. There in the shadow of the cliffs where Japanese gunners poured down murderous fire, visitors can also see battered metal barracks” (16). Malcolm reenacts World War Two in Guam with drama and imagination, writing that “[f]rom a hill overlooking the Naval Air Station one can see the cracking cement of Orote Point, an abandoned Japanese Zero field where Comdr. Asaichi Tamai led 3,100 screaming soldiers in a suicidal charge against advancing American marines on July 26, 1944” (16). These dramatized battles are especially the kind of storylines favored by military readerships.

An article published in Air Force Times in 1986 and written by Keith Alexander Evans escorts the reader to several war markers of Guam in ways similar to those employed by Malcolm. Evans remarks that “[a]nyone with an interest in World War II will want to stop by the new War in the Pacific Park in nearby Asan, where an unimposing building along the beachfront houses a fascinating museum. Aply placed, for Asan was
the site of an American invasion in 1944, the museum houses many artifacts from the war” (40). Evan’s description of the War in the Pacific National Historical Park museum alludes to the touristic with the mention of “beachfront houses.” Indeed, perhaps without markers, such as prominently displayed road signs and writeups in numerous travel guide books, one could easily speculate that many drivers could pass by Asan without looking twice (see fig. 16). To many Chamorros Asan is more significant as a place for jogging, fishing, walking, and barbecuing.

The frequent referencing of war sites in travel guides, in fact, privileges which areas of the island are supposedly important historical landmarks and venues for tourist picture taking. For example, Robert Rogers wrote that Japanese war relics in Tumon were sites of interest for Japanese tourists walking along the Bay’s shores. Remarked Rogers, “Japanese fortifications of thick cement were left in place and remain today along Guam’s beaches as subjects for endless photographs by Japanese tourists” (198). Bev and Dave Lotz, two Americans who continue to map Guam’s trails, beaches, and rivers for touristic and capitalistic purposes, describe Japanese fortifications in Tumon in greater detail. With the dramatization of war, they state:

At the Hilton Beach pass by the sunning tourists on the elevated beach. Toward the west end note the partially buried Japanese fortification along the limestone cliff face. . . . Below the wing of the Hilton Hotel and hidden in an alcove of the cliff is a second Japanese fortification in the cliff face. A look at the fortification reveals that the feature is hidden from view and yet has a clear field of fire across Tumon Bay. (10-11)

Just as much as battlefields and remnants of war attract veterans, the advertised idea that there are more war relics to be found and explored in Guam’s jungles lures war enthusiasts
and adventurers as well. Writing for R & R Pacific, a private publication that “is not just a magazine for the military; it is also a magazine about Guam’s military,” editor Stephen V. Nygard demonstrates that World War Two has left a yearning for the unknown and the unexplored among military personnel of today (McCarthy 1). Depicting a scenario of exploration into Guam’s jungles and seas, Nygard writes that “[r]usting tanks slumber in our jungles, warships sleep in our seas, some of them side by side, and digging machines unearth ancient ordinance. A trip though [sic] the boondocks is a brush with the past. You never know what’s playing hoary hide-and-seek” (1).
After reviewing the literature on the militourism of war sites, I have to agree with Dave Lotz’s assertion that “war remains will keep war buffs, historians, residents, and tourists busy visiting for countless days” (6). The Japanese and American war sites and relics will continue to be remembered and memorialized by future generations of tourists as long as there are “markers” which distinguish them. The discursive act of identifying particular locations as being of historic significance lures would-be-tourists to these sites: the militouristic gaze would cease to have such powerful effects without the instructions and directions provided by military and tourist publications. Tourists are being told what to look at, where to find it, and how to look at it--indeed, the act of gazing and the ways in which the gaze both familiarizes and feminizes is actively created through militouristic discourses. Perhaps I can go so far as to say that as long as Chamorros celebrate “liberation” day and as long as there is a tourist industry, militourism will remain with us, i taotaota’no.

Leaving Asan

Summer 1997. The sun’s rays touch my left forearm as it hangs outside my truck window. I am driving my father’s Toyota 4x4 pickup. Every now and then I pull my forearm away from the window. I cannot bear the heat for too long. A strong breeze suddenly calms the nerves in my arm. I feel better. I feel better knowing that it has not rained today. Dragging. I can hear the truck’s rubber tires dragging along Marine Drive. Is it me or the tires? Dragging.

Along with me in the truck are my brothers, Jacob and Chris. Our destination is the War in the Pacific National Historical Park in Asan. Chris does not seem to be pleased
about being with his brothers. He appears to be thinking about something other than rockets. "Rockets!" Jacob yells excitedly. Yeah, we are almost there. "Relax," I tell him.

As we approach the Park, I slow the vehicle down from a restless forty-five miles per hour to an easy fifteen. I signal right. We turn right. Off onto the curb. And park. Jacob runs out onto the large grassy field. Chris lags behind with the rocket materials and instructions for assembly. We take out our coolers of drinks and snacks. Jacob is still running. Chris is still thinking. Bored, I bet. "Hand me the instructions," I tell him. "Huh," he replies. "Lachadek, hurry up," I say. He hands me the crumpled instructions.

As I read the papers, Chris slowly reaches for the pack of chewing tobacco in his pocket. He does not have to hide his habit. We all know. It’s not good for him. As he chews, slurps, and sucks on his tobacco, I try desperately to recall my basic mathematical skills.

12.5 centimeters? 4 double-A batteries. Scissors. "Hey! Are ... you ... guys almost ... finished?" Jacob asks trying to catch his breath. Like clockwork, Chris and I quickly stare at Jacob. "What?" he asks. "Never mind," we both reply.

Two hours. That’s how long it took us to put together one rocket. I stand up and for the first time notice how large Asan Park is. I think to myself, this place has got be to at least two miles in length. Chris begins to set up the rocket. He seems happy now. I guess it’s because he will launch the rocket after Jacob gives it a try. In bold black ink, we write on the rocket “asta agupa” (until tomorrow), “chadek” (fast), and “CNMI or bust.” I then follow my brothers to the middle of the field. While they set up the rocket launch pad, I face the beach and notice that waves thrash vigorously onto the reef. The currents are strong today, indeed. I glance over my shoulder and notice that there is a lot of
tangantangan in the nearby jungles. Encircling the Park are coconut trees neatly aligned, one after another. The lawn is manicured and one can still notice the brown grass left over from last week’s cutting. Yet I do not see any coconuts on the ground. Does the military throw those away, too? “Excuse me, what’s that?” a young girl asks. “Oh, it is our rocket.” “Can I watch?” she asks. “Sure, why not,” I reply. Slowly, more kids approach us in silent anticipation of the launching of our rocket.

“Are you ready!” Jacob yells, mimicking a sports announcer. Yeah, yeah. Let’s give it a try. The kids busily munch on their barbecued food as Chris and Jacob set the rocket to go off. We all sit in a semi-circle. Waiting. Counting. Hoping the rocket will fly. Three . . . two . . . one, liftoff! Chris and Jacob scream excitedly. Swooooomosh. Whoa. “There it is!” one of the boys yells. Poof! The parachute opened! “Alright, man!” Jacob shouts as he gives me and Chris a high five. Heck, everyone gives each other high fives. After several successful rocket launches, the kids begin to disperse. And so do we. We then leave Asan Park tired, but filled with memories of a fun day. Fun. Yeah, that’s the word.
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