(RE)SEARCHING IDENTITY: BEING CHAMORRO IN AN AMERICAN COLONY

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

AUGUST 2012

By

Mary Therese F. Cruz

Dissertation Committee:

Neal Milner, Chairperson
Michael Shapiro
Noenoe Silva
David Hanlon
Julie Kaomea

DEDICATION

To my parents, Samuel and Dorothy Cruz.

They have been a source of strength in my life.

They taught me the value of education, the possibility of dreams, and the power of love.

I have been blessed, and for this I dedicate this dream to them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing is a personal search that requires the commitment of not only the writer but a community. Together we embarked on this search that led us through the memories of a place I call home. The search is complete, *for now*, and the community deserves endless thank yous.

My first thank you belongs to my professor and advisor, Neal Milner, who patiently guided me on my search. Your support allowed me to keep searching. I would also like to thank my committee, Michael Shapiro, Noenoe Silva, David Hanlon, and Julie Kaomea. Your work, your teaching, and your support inspired me to embark on this search.

This search would not have been possible without the wisdom of those who possess a far greater understanding of what it means to be Chamoru. I would like to thank those whose memories were part of my search. My gratitude goes to my grandparents, Maria & Joaquin Flores and Enrique, Felicidad and Tomasa Cruz who helped to shape my memories of Guam. To those who must remain nameless because of the constraints of research, thank you for sharing your stories with me. I am honored that you have allowed me to share them with everyone.   And to the generation of World War II survivors, thank you for sharing your memories with us. Your memories have helped pave the future of our home.

I am grateful to the many colleagues that have supported my work. Dr. Richard Matheny, thank you for being a star professor and mentor. You gave me the opportunity to share my passion with Guam's future teachers, doctors, lawyers, entrepreneurs, and leaders. Dr. Michael Stoil, thank you for your insights and interest in this project. You

fueling my desire to always strive harder and do better. Our sisterhood transcends our distance. To my Mesngon family, words cannot express the thanks and love I have for all of you. Family is where the soul truly thrives. To my Duenas, Cruz, Limtiaco, Alig, Calvo and Flores families, thank you for helping to form the roots that have helped me to grow. To my love, Joseph Mesngon, thank you for being my best friend. The passion and confidence you have in me give me a reason to keep on this search. Thank you for sharing this roller coaster ride with me. To my best gift, Josiah, I dreamed this dream for you. I have been blessed to be so loved. Thank you all!

ABSTRACT

Identity has emerged at the core of many political and social debates among indigenous communities. Identity is socially constructed, carried in language, expressed in mundane routine, liable to revision and routinely contested. The way in which we understand different groups within our political interactions is changing, resulting in a change in the way these groups understand and define themselves within their communities and to others. Therefore, it is important that we reexamine the notion of identity in light of this constantly changing nature of political studies.

In 1944, American military forces landed on Guam to (re)capture the island after it was invaded by the Japanese. The American military, then, secured control of the island and began rehabilitation efforts that eventually led to the construction of large military bases that would facilitate the continued occupation of Guam by Americans. Since WWII, Chamorus have confronted the many drastic political, social, and cultural changes that came with this period of Americanization, modernization, and globalization. Chamorus were forced to contend with the melding of two cultures in the midst of a drastically changing world; and Chamoru identity, inevitably, became implicated in these changes brought on by American colonialism.

This project examines the emergence of Chamoru identity on Guam as Chamorus continued to negotiate their place within the context of American rule. This project further (re)searches Chamoru identity as it has been re-imagined since the "liberation" of the island through the use of historical texts, social and cultural symbols of identity, and Chamoru narratives. It critically examines the extent to which Guam's American colonizer helped shape Chamoru identity as well as the role that Chamorus played in the

negotiation of their identities. While identity tends to be analyzed in terms of

psychological and social motives, this project instead looks at the historical and political

impetus through which identity becomes re-imagined. This suggests that, in the

negotiation between power and agency, a Chamorro identity was formed and then

internalized, maintained, and deployed in the colonial context by both the American

colonizer and the colonized Chamoru to facilitate the continued domination of the island

and its people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Colonization not only changed the face of Guam, it also changed the face of her

people. At different times in Guam's history, particular events redefined identity for

Chamorus. Just as the arrival of Spanish missionaries and the later death of Father Diego

de San Vitores made Chamorus Catholic, the "liberation" of Guam at the end of WWII

made Chamorus American patriots. The fear and uncertainty felt by Chamorus during

the war turned to gratefulness and loyalty on "Liberation Day," and it is this instance that

changed the nature of identity for Chamorus. Chamorus were proud Americans during

this time of turmoil, and it is this same identity that continues to manifest itself through

many Chamorus today. American patriotism has become an established part of the

Chamoru conscience that it is often difficult to imagine a place for Chamorus outside of

American culture and identity. History, education, law, and culture on Guam have all

been shaped by the need (and desire) to perpetuate Chamorus as loyal Americans and in

turn helped shape an identity of a people as colonial subjects.

Identity is a complex idea. It comes in many forms and is formed in many ways.

Identity, whether it is individual or collective, is the means by which we define ourselves

and the expression of that self to others. We display an outward image of who we are

that is a product of the internal perception that we have created for ourselves. This

identity is defined through individual perceptions of the self and is in turn collectively

(re)presented by the discourse that helped to create that identity. In the case of Guam, the

collective identity of Chamorus is the articulation of an event or a particular

circumstance. As Chamoru identity was (re)created in the aftermath of WWII, it was

framed, both individually and collectively, within the context of American colonization.

Through Guam's more recent past, however, tensions have arisen between a cultural identity and a legal identity. On the one hand, Chamorus struggle with what it means to be Chamoru; and on the other, Chamorus must contend with being Chamoru (or Chamorro) in an American colony. And it is in this context that we begin this narrative of identity and colonization.

The Emergence of an Identity

Identity emerges through our lived experience and is marked by the memories we have of these encounters. Identity is then constituted through and reaffirmed by our associations with one another in both horizontal and vertical relationships. The interaction of individuals in these relationships then creates the structure of the community for which a collective identity can be formed. Identity, thus, becomes the way Chamorus have gained a sense of being in order to move within the social structure and participate as members of their community on Guam so that the community might progress (or not).

Identity is a vague concept, and identity continues to be an ambiguous idea because it does not only lie in a people but rests in a public often political and social conception of the self in relation to the other and it encompasses aspects of a past event or interaction or experience and is constructed through the interactions, relationships, communications, roles, and groups that develop out of this instance. For as long as the people of Guam have encountered difference, Chamorus have only been partly the authors of who they have become. A large part of Chamoru identity has been in response to outside factors. Chamoru identity, as with all identities, is often something that is taken for granted until there is an external impetus that forces people to think about it.

And in the case of Guam, this began with the initial movement of peoples throughout the north Pacific, continued with the landing of Spanish explorers and missionaries, was fashioned as a war prize for the United States and later by the Japanese occupation, but the turning point for a "Chamorro" identity within an American colony was the "liberation" of the island from the Japanese during WWII. [1]

Chamorus, in the face of difference and as a response to American forces during and immediately after WWII, have become increasingly aware of that which makes them distinct from their colonizer. Americans have undoubtedly played a key role in this process of identity formation. American colonialism has made Chamorus' conscious of difference and then reaffirmed that difference not only to dominate but to also create a sense of identity that will ensure successful and continued rule. As members of a community, Chamorus have become forced to think about notions of identity in response

---

[1] Many spelling variations exist in the accounts written by European explorers when referring to the people of Guam. Some of them include Tsamoru, Chamorru, and Chamoru; however, the use of "orro" in Chamorro has become the traditional and more widely used spelling of the word. In 1993, the Chamorro Language Commission held a series of public hearings to change Chamorro names to better reflect orthographic standards of the language. The Commission decided to maintain the commonly used spelling of proper names to avoid confusion, but decided to change the official spelling of "Chamorro" to "Chamoru." This decision was met with some opposition mostly on the grounds of practicality, but there was some discussion about maintaining what was already established as an identity for the people. This struggle over the spelling of the word turned into one filled with political controversy. Proponents of the change were associated with advocating for the political development of the indigenous people; whereas, opponents of the change were seen as supporting the status quo. In the end, the Guam Legislature chose to keep the traditional spelling of the term. Although one's preference for spelling is a matter of personal choice, it is often considered an indicator of his/her political philosophy. For purposes of this project, I have chosen to use the spelling of "Chamoru" to refer to the indigenous people of Guam and their culture and identity (as may have been the implied feeling behind the change) while the spelling of "Chamorro" will be used to refer to what I am attempting to argue is an alternate form of identity that has been constructed through as well as in response to American colonization. For a more detailed discussion of the debate over spelling see Gina E. Taitano's *Chamorro vs. Chamoru* (2009).

to American colonialism. Literature on identity has provided a wealth of information on the nature of identity, the traditional conceptions of identity, the social, cultural, and psychological factors of identity, and the political motivations for identity. There, however, remains a gap in our understanding of identity formation. That gap lies in the external impetus behind the emergence of an identity. Ultimately, identity emerges as a response to the encounter with the other and becomes a means for survival and a form of resistance to the invasion. But what happens when outside forces find interest in the process of identity formation? Defining identity for Chamorus, then, becomes not only crucial but also inescapable as determined in part by the will of American colonialism to further its interest.

In this project, I examine the degree to which American colonization has played a role in the (re)imagination of Chamoru identity in the years after World War II. I argue that the narratives of Chamorus and Chamoru history are the key to understanding the power of colonization in the formation or (re)formation of identities. Similar to an argument made by Vicente M. Diaz in his book *Repositioning the Missionary*, I believe that it was the fear experienced and created during and after WWII that solidified America's hold of the island. Diaz notes, "The 'Americanization' of the Chamorros (and the quest for US citizenship) received a big boost from the Japanese. The Japanese invasion, and especially Chamorro memories of the brutal occupation, accomplished in less than three years what US Naval officials could not do in almost fifty…they fused the Chamorros to their colonial overseer, with religious zeal and cultural prescriptions of gratitude and loyalty" (2010, p. 13). The (re)imagination of both Chamoru and Chamorro identity after the war is embedded in the memories of what was experienced during the

war and the memories that continue to be created about the war among Chamorus. It is in

this feeling of fear and display of patriotism (or loyalty, as Diaz refers to it) that I believe

the American colonial project found its success and continues to hold claim to the

political development of the people. It is in the (re)imagination of identity that Chamorus

are able to reconcile colonization and history. Whether it is an accident of history or an

intention of colonization, the narrative of fear that is told and (re)told on the island of

Guam tells a story of who the people of Guam are. And embedded in this retelling is the

event of World War II and identity for Chamorus.

This project is a critique of both memory and history to provide an understanding

of identity as it formed out of a specific event tied to colonialism and the process by

which this identity has been used as a tool to maintain power. I juxtapose the narratives

of WWII survivors and stories that have emerged from WWII experiences. A critical

analysis of the literature about the American colonization of Guam; the political, social,

and cultural changes that have contributed to the shaping of identity as they occurred in

the context of American colonialism on Guam from 1945 to the present; and further

perspectives on political identity and Chamorro identity shed light on the negotiations

that took place between Chamorus and their American counterparts during this time and

the identity that emerged out of this encounter.

Colonization has stirred mixed feelings among Guam's indigenous people—

Chamorus. Chamorus have been the most visible group on the island, and they are the

focus of this project. Chamorus comprise much of the island's elite, the island's

prominent figures, as well as the island's working class and families. They have been

politically, socially, culturally, and economically the island's people. As a result of

colonization, Chamorus have seen a degradation of their island and culture. Chamoru stories are essential for understanding the changing nature of culture. Progress has brought many opportunities for the people of Guam by means of employment, wealth, competition, and economic desirability but has not come without a substantial cost to the island, the people, the resources, and the culture. The goal of this project is to listen to the Chamoru voices speak of the ongoing struggle to understand identity. Chamorus, particularly the survivors of WWII, possess the memories of a time of drastic change. They are the foundation of the island and its culture, and they are the foundation of this project. The WWII survivors in this project comprise a group of Chamoru men and women who were born on Guam during the first American administration of the island and lived on Guam during the war and the years of rebuilding after. They were chosen as the focus of this project because they were witness to a time of drastic change in the form of development and modernization. At the time of the interviews, they ranged in ages from 68 to 87. They are former educators, government workers, elected leaders, business owners, military servicemen, nurses, and homemakers. And it is the stories they've shared with me about WWII, the reoccupation of Guam by military forces, rebuilding homes, attending school, travelling abroad, working, raising families, returning home, and experience change that have provided a starting point for which other narratives of this time are analyzed in this project to provide insight into the many struggles that Chamorus on Guam have endured for many years and the struggles that they face within the political and social communities.

It is in retelling the memories of Chamoru survivors and WWII narratives here that we see how the encounter with difference has brought about an inevitable process of

change among Chamorus. "The ways in which individuals and groups understand themselves is taken to be a matter of reading changing circumstances in the light of available ideas and present urgent problems" (Preston, 1997, p 150). Identity is defined, maintained, and deployed by means of negotiating between the complexities of the newly encountered and existing traditional notions of identity. The emergence of identity, therefore, has to be explored with regards to the complex view of history, difference, and change. "It is impossible to understand the history of the powerless without understanding the history of the powerful" (Marx, 1995, p. 162). At the same time, it is crucial to know the histories of both to understand the way in which both Chamoru and Chamorro identity emerged in the context of the American colonial encounter. Identity is complex, but more importantly, it exists as a result of our memories of a specific moment in our history. It is this lived experience that creates a consciousness of self in light of drastic change. "The self is incredibly rich, anchored in time by its disposition both to recall its past and to plan its future" (Fitzgerald, 1993, p 34). At different times in the colonial history of Guam, Chamorus chose to identify with different parts of their past in order to reconcile the external impetus. Identity, then, became the means in which Chamorus related to the colonial power, institutions, and people while attempting to preserve their histories and cultures. The question that arises, however, is what forces are involved in a community's negotiation with its colonizer for identity.

While much has been written on the colonization, and more specifically, the American colonization, of Guam as well as on the many social, cultural, political, economic, and religious issues facing contemporary Chamorros, there is no significant body of literature that specifically addresses the emergence of Chamorro identity nor

attempts to directly link the issue of colonization to that of identity formation.[2]

Approaches to the study of identity do not look at identity as being dependent on or a

construct of time. Instead, the issue of identity tends only to be alluded to or mentioned

in passing as a byproduct of other circumstances such as religious encounters, political

movements, historical and cultural exchanges, and social relations.[3] By looking at

Guam's history, it becomes obvious how great an impact colonization, especially

American colonization, has had on the island's political, social, and economic community

and more importantly the Chamorro people.[4]

Guam's American colonial history has, undoubtedly, provided a context in which

a Chamorro identity formed and continues to be reaffirmed. For this reason, this project

broadens our understanding of Chamoru identity in an effort to examine the role that the

colonial encounter has played in the formation of identity. In the context of American

colonization on Guam, it is important, therefore, to understand the significance of WWII

in the emergence of a Chamorro identity; and by adding identity (re)search to the

growing body of literature on colonization that is more critical than accepting of Guam's

---

[2] An exception to this statement would be research by Michael Peter Perez who, in his dissertation *The Dialectic of indigenous Identity in the Wake of Colonialism: The Case of Chamorros of Guam* (1997), attempted to reconcile his personal identity by arguing that Chamorro identity is not extinct but is part of a struggling "minority consciousness." Perez uses a multi-method approach to the study of identity in order to show how a Chamorro identity crisis fits into the larger scheme of social science, namely social psychological, research.

[3] For further discussion of these issues see works *Reposition the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholocisim, and Indigeneity in Guam* (2010) by Vicente Diaz, *Chamorro Self-Determination* (1987) edited by Laura Souder-Jaffery and Robert Underwood, *Colonial Dis-Ease: U.S. Naval Health Policies and the Chamorro of Guam* (1999) by Anne Hattori, *Economics and Fertility: Changing Family Structure among Chamorros on the Island of Guam* (2001) by Ann Pobutsky, and *Excursions into Inauthenticity: The Chamorros of Guam*(1987) by Robert Underwood, respectively.

[4] For detailed histories of Guam see works by Robert Rogers (1995) and Pedro Sanchez (1987).

colonial history, this project will contribute to the reshaping of the history of colonization

by critically examining the event, the experience, and the negotiation involved in identity

formation.

In addition, it is equally important to note the significant amount of research on

identity, in general, and the gap that exists within this body of literature. Although

identity has been well researched within the fields of psychology, sociology, history, and

politics, the main focus of these works have been to discuss the conditions through which

identity emerges, leaving to question the impetus through which identity can be re-

imagined, namely colonization.[5] Clearly defining an identity, however, is problematic;

---

[5] See works *Introduction* by Joan Stambaugh in M. Heidegger's *Identity and Difference* (1969), *Citizenship, Identity, and Social History* (1995) by Charles Tilly, and *Metaphors of Identity: A Culture-Communication Dialogue* (1993) by Thomas Fitzgerald for a discussion on the nature of identity; *The Quest for Identity: From Minority Groups to Gerneration Xers* (2002) by Donald Taylor, *Citizenship, Identity, and Social History* (1995) by Charles Tilly, *Metaphors of Identity: A Culture-Communication Dialogue* (1993) by Thomas Fitzgerald, *Ethos and Identity: Three Studies in Ethnicity* (1978) by A.L. Epstein, *Political/Cultural Identity: Citizens and Nations in a Global Era* (1997) by P.W. Preston, *Identity and Social Movements* (1995) by Anthony Marx, *Mobility and Identity in the Island Pacific* (1985) by David Lowenthal, and *Introduction* (1985) Murray Chapman in *Mobility and Identity in the Island Pacific* (1985) edited by Murray Chapman for a discussion on the conditions by which both individual and collective identities are understood; *Political/Cultural Identity: Citizens and Nations in a Global Era* (1997) by P.W. Preston, *Identity and Social Movements* (1995) by Anthony Marx, and *Colonizing Hawaiʻi: The Cultural Power of Law* (2000) by Sally Engle Merry for a discussion on the emergence of a political identity; *Identity and Social Movements* (1995) by Anthony Marx for a discussion on the mobilization of identity; and *Introduction* (2000) by Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton and Will Sanders in *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (2000) edited by D. Ivison, P. Patton and W. Sanders, *Introduction* (2004) by Toon van Meijl in *Shifting Images of Identity in the Pacific* (2004) edited by T.V Meij and J. Miedema, *Strange Multiplicity* (1995) by James Tully, *Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Idigenous Manifesto* (1999) Taiaiake Alfred, *Introduction* (1990) by Jocelyn Linneken and Lin Poyer in *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific* (1990) edited by J. Linnekin and L. Poyer, *Decolonizing Pacific Studies* (2003) by Konai Helu Thaman, *Our Sea of Islands* (1994) by Epeli Hauʹofa, *Introduction* (1985) Murray Chapman in *Mobility and Identity in the Island Pacific* (1985) edited by Murray Chapman for a discussion on indigenous identity and Pacific identities.

and the forces through which these identities emerge remain unclear. This project will, thus, attempt to close this gap in our understanding of identity formation and provide for a discussion of the role that colonization plays in the emergence of a particular sense of identity.

As groups attempt to understand identity within a colonial context, they become increasingly linked to their colonizing political institutions. Identity thus becomes increasingly political. And it is this move that makes this project significant because it provides us with a look at the nature of identity and the forces at play in the (re)imagination of identity. Chamorro identity is now as increasingly political as it is embedded within American institutions. And because identity formation is often discussed using western concepts and in the terms of the dominant power, groups who desire rights and improved statuses tend to get caught up in a web of unrelenting discourses with no way out.

And finally, this identity (re)search is not only significant for a general level of understanding; it reaches a strong personal level as well. Identity (re)search has been somewhat discomforting for me but has also helped to defamiliarize many of the long-standing assumptions I had about colonization as I hope it will do for many others. It seems that many Chamorus, including myself, continue to battle with the disconnect between, on the one hand, an identity that has been cherished through generations, is inherent in the Chamoru culture, and is in many ways a result of a nostalgia for a part of the past that has been lost and, on the other hand, an identity that is a result of hundreds of years of colonization and, in the last century, a result of the struggle to be American or not. Because Chamoru identity is a product of historical events and the experiences and

memories we have about these events, this project adds another dimension to the

literature on Guam by exploring identity through a complex view of the past enhanced by

a collection of personal narratives about change. This project gives a voice to the

valuable stories of Chamorus about their struggles, resistance, and negotiations with

colonization, particularly in the American context. A look at Chamoru identity in this

light uncovers the power dynamics that produced the colonial history that shaped

identities. It shows Chamoru identity as it emerged in response to WWII and articulate

the ways in which Chamorus have used this identity to move within the community in

order to negotiate a shift in place and power. This project fills a gap in our knowledge of

Chamorro history, American colonization, and identity politics by critically examining

issues of power and the politics of identity.

The Politics of Identity

The most violent of encounters has, undoubtedly, been colonization. Ironically,

the notion of identity did not exist prior to the colonial encounter while the encounter is

also what drastically changed, and from some perspectives destroyed, traditional views of

identity. Colonization not only devastated lands it also overpowered cultures and

identities. As a result of the colonial encounter, subjugated people were faced with the

challenge of coming to terms with two incompatible identities—one rooted in tradition

and the other a product of a historical event.

> The power differential between the competing collective identities is what makes
> the reconciling of collective identities so problematic. When one cultural group
> has complete power over another, the task of integrating the powerful collective
> identity with the much less powerful heritage collective identity is
> overwhelming…After all, the less powerful group does not voluntarily choose to
> place itself in a bicultural context: it's imposed on them…Groups that are

overpowered by another cultural group do not choose to incorporate the new powerful collective identity. (Taylor, 2002, p. 71)

Colonization is a threat to the traditional cultures and notions of identity of subjugated peoples. The reality of displaced subordinate cultures combined with the conflict of the collective identity of the colonial power is the compelling force for the (re)imagining of identities.

> The crisis in identity is one of both conflict and confusion arising from competing cultures that are devoid of fundamental values. Aboriginal people do not merely face the pushes and pulls of their heritage culture, on the one hand, and mainstream culture, on the other. Rather, they confront a heritage culture that is itself a confusing array of values and practices as a consequence of internal colonialism…Colonized people, then, have their identity conflicts compounded by the fact that the two competing cultural identities are themselves poorly defined templates…At best, [they] must rely on reconstructions of past idealized descriptions of traditional values and ways of life. This is precisely why Aboriginal people in the process of redefining their heritage culture hearken back to precolonial times for a romanticized image of collective identity. (p. 81)

Therefore, it becomes almost impossible for subjugated people to clearly define their collective identity. At the same time, the colonizer is able to play upon the inconceivable nature of a collectivity by creating an alternate sense of identity that reaffirms his power. As groups attempt to make sense of the disconnect between these competing collectivities, they are forced to continually construct and reconstruct their identities. Culture and history of the Chamoru people have, then, been the means through which Chamoru identity is constructed through the need for distinction, resistance, and survival all shaped within the colonial encounter forcing Chamorus to continually negotiate within the system established by their colonizer.

Identity that is based on self-perception, on the other hand, is a result of experiences and memories. In this sense, identity can be understood as a collection of stories that individuals tell about themselves in order to situate ourselves in the sphere in

which we inhabit (Preston, 1997). But what happens when identity formation becomes part of the process of domination?

Our knowledge of identity, thus, has shifted from a traditional notion of being toward a more complex understanding of identity constructed of a moment in history. Identity is no longer seen as naturally occurring in a person's essence. Instead, Chamoru identity can now be understood through the memories and experiences of WWII among Chamorus reified by their American colonizer. "Identity is always expressed in opposition to something or someone else and consequently is as much a product of social and economic context as of the perceptions of others" (Chapman, 1985, p. 4). It is the product of a memory of fear and gratefulness that through a process embedded in colonization is learned, reinforced, and relearned through time. Charles Tilly (1995) suggests that the traditional understanding of social relations is now being discussed in terms of a relational, cultural, historical, and contingent conception of identity.

> The emerging view is *relational* in the sense that it locates identities in connections among individuals and groups rather than in the minds of particular persons or of whole populations…The emerging view is…*cultural* in insisting that social identities rest on shared understandings and their representations. It is *historical* in calling attention to the path-dependent accretion of memories, understandings and means of action within particular identities. The emerging view, finally, is *contingent* in that it regards each assertion of identity as a strategic interaction liable to failure or misfiring rather than as a straightforward expression of an actor's attributes. (p. 5)

As members of the Chamoru community, then how does Chamoru identity get reimagined, by what means does it change and at what costs? Chamorus inhabit a world of lived experiences, and Chamoru identity is implicated within the framework of thoughts and actions. It does not reside in any given texts or symbols. It is, instead, carried through language and embedded in social interactions. Identity has been the

means by which Chamorus have located themselves in society and can be defined by history and carried through our ideas and interactions that are linked to everyday life. People "inhabit a particular place, which is the sphere of routine activity and interaction and is richly suffused with meanings, which in turn is the base for a dispersed series of networks of exchanges with others centered on particular interests, all of which are brought together in the sphere of continually reworked memory" (Preston, 1997, p. 44). Identity is a means for anchoring people in their perceived reality; thus, any perceived understanding and expression of identity can be contested and often is. Involved in the contested nature of identity is the "conflict between the powerful and their subordinates, a battle for possession and control" of capacity and history (Preston, 1997, p. 65). Because identity is the way in which Chamorus perceive and make sense of reality, identity is often challenged by Chamorus within the community and among those across different groups or power structures.

Identity is often (re)imagined when a community is faced with new circumstances that they are forced to contend with, such as the colonial encounter. "We do not change our identity like a suit of clothes, but in different social situations different aspects of self come to the fore and other aspects move into the background" (Preston, 1997, p. 44). As the sense of reality shifts for the Chamoru people, identity is (re)imagined through new patterns and understandings of life. Chamorus have created their identity "by reshaping and piecing together chunks of existing social structure rather than inventing whole new forms" (Tilly, 1995, p. 9). Chamorrow identity was, then, a response to the drastic change that came during and immediately after WWII.

Traditional conceptions of identity see it as "the narratives whereby we constitute discrete events as belonging to a particular self" (Preston, 1997, p.169). Thus, identity becomes "the way in which we more or less self-consciously locate ourselves in our social world" (Preston, 1997, p. 168). As the Chamoru community becomes increasingly linked to their political institutions, however, identity also becomes increasingly political. And it is in this move that I am interested. American forces have not been innocent in their role in the formation of a Chamorro identity. This Chamorro identity is now as increasingly political as it is embedded within American institutions.

This political identity, then, is the means by which the Chamoru community identifies as an ordered body of people. It is constructed based on the relationship of Chamorus and the community to the world around them. The political aspect of Chamoru identity includes "accidents of biography" and a history that involves unseen circumstances and incidents of either accepted or unsolicited power structures. Political identity sees a shift from a private notion of identity to a public understanding, a shift from private knowledge to public ideologies, and a shift from private hierarchies and communities to autonomous relationships within the political institution (Preston, 1997). This shift also implies a move from a complex understanding of identity intended to empower a people to one that is more simplified and can be defined within the political arena transferring power to the institution (Preston, 1995). As the world changes, our knowledge and perception of our place in the world changes, and our political identity becomes reconstructed based on this new understanding in light of the memory of the past. Political identity, thus, makes our knowledge, experiences, and memories public and seemingly more legitimate in the realm of the political, the national, and the global.

The reality, however, is that, often, political identity rejects any other construct of identity such as cultural and social as irrelevant or insignificant and places primary importance on the identity that is constructed by and within the political institution, in this case the American institution. Political notions of identity are often expressed through values based on history, race, language, religion, ethnicity, and culture. Identity that is contingent upon these ideas has to be constantly asserted to solidify the community and defended against claims by other groups resulting in the unstable nature of identity. Ironically, identity is also thought of as a means for solidifying and stabilizing a community.

The construction of some kind of identity is a fundamental aspect of the power of the state (Merry, 2000). What is important about identity constructed within the state, however, is the way in which it becomes shaped and authorized. New notions of self are created within state discourses through defining and labeling, but what is the context in which identity is articulated? Chamorro identity in its political sense has been shaped by the power dynamics out of the discourse of WWII memory within the community on Guam. Those in power, generally, define ideas of identity using the political institutions and the terms of the state. Chamorus then assume this identity as a means for legitimacy within the community and in the national and global arena. Identity is spread by the powerful and self-consciously deployed by those with whom the psychological understandings of the subordinate have been internalized. And because identity formation is often discussed using western concepts and in the terms of the dominant power, the Chamoru people who have long desired rights and improved statuses tend to get caught up in a web of unrelenting discourses with no way out.

History as a Narrative of Memory

The study of history and memory has found significance in the memories of events that are told through our stories as sources for the (re)creation of history. This suggests the need to (re)evaluate the relationship between the past as it happened and the discourse of history that has given meaning to what we remember about the past. History is not a mere reflection of the past. It is rather the embedded discourse of colonization present in history that has created meaning in the events of our past. As Paul Veyne argues, history "remains fundamentally an account, and what is called explanation is nothing but the way in which the account is arranged in a comprehensible plot" (1984, p. 87). The meaning created in history about the events in our past is an obstacle to the true knowledge of the event.[6] If history, as Hayden White suggests, is a fiction-making process, then the "truths" that are found in colonial histories are mere representations not of the past but of the desires of the colonial project (2010). The memories contained within these histories have, thus, been implicated by the "truth-making process" that is crucial to the colonial discourse. This "truth" in turn has shaped the existing collective representation of the past. This doesn't discount the importance of history. It merely opens up a space for the critique of not only history but identity formation as well and a means for the (re)presentation of the past.

Memory and sites of memory are crucial to understanding the relationship between the events of the past and the desire for power. Pierre Nora, in his work "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," argues that sites of memory are manifestations of what is not only remembered but also forgotten (Nora, 1989, Spring).

---

[6] Roger Chartier references "L'art du recit historique" by Francois Hartog in his critique of the challenges facing History.

It is in these sites of memory—prevalent in the many WWII memorials, artifacts, and celebrations on Guam—that memory is turned into history. What we know about WWII and the identity that has been (re)imagined out of WWII memory is a product of the (re)presentation of that memory. Henri Bergson, in his book *Matter and Memory*, contends that our "pure memory" or the survival of our personal memories is spontaneously deployed (1929). It is at the point that our memories are deployed that they are used to (re)create history. They are, as Walter Benjamin points out, the medium for our past experiences (1999). Our present realities are a reflection of the stage on which these past experiences have been both remembered and forgotten and then used to articulate a particular sentiment about the events as they "happened." "It is no surprise that histories of World War II rarely mention the roles of Pacific Islanders, presuming that they do not fit nicely into the schemes of colonial history and historiography" (Camacho, 2011, p. 7). As Camacho notes, the stories, songs, and memories of the people provide a valuable source for linking history to identity. Although both are contested sites, Camacho argues that both memory and history are entangled" by the need to use power to shape the discourse of the past. It is in remembering particular moments of the past that the past is "constructed, represented, and interpreted" in history (Camacho, 2011, p.10). And it is in the construction, representation and interpretation a particular past that identity is (re)imagined through the lens of history and articulated through the colonial project.

The Imagined Community and the Imagined Subject?

Long before and continuing after WWII, Guam was a desired military location because of its strategic position in the Pacific. The United States' desire to acquire and maintain hold of the island resulted in the creation of a community that is undoubtedly implicated in this colonial context; and the relationship between the United States and Guam has produced great changes for both the island and its people. Communities are continually (re)constructed through changes that occur in space and over time; and Guam is no exception. This is why communities, especially indigenous communities, often become imagined in the context of colonization; and as colonization takes root in a place, the gap between the real community and the (re)constructed community decreases. This results in a sense of uncertainty between reality and what we perceive as real. Communities are imagined through our perceptions of reality and our inventions of models of the real; and they become defined by the means through which they have been imagined (Anderson, 1991). In the American colonial context on Guam, the Chamorro community that has been constructed out of the context of WWII memory has become the perceived reality of the community; and since the Chamorro community has been constructed in the American colonial context, it tends to be defined through it as well.

In creating the community, colonization has also created the imagined subject; and each has aided in the maintenance of the other. The American colonization of Guam in its desire to gain power over the land and its people created a Chamorro community which in turn created a Chamorro in order to perpetuate the colonial community that continues to sustain the colonial subject. As Edward Said (1978) argues was the case in India, Europe created the idea of the Orient to defend the presence of Western ideas that

aimed at "dealing with" the Orient. This meant "making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism [was] a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (p. 3). In much the same way, American colonizers used the discourse of fear and gratefulness on Guam to create a Chamorro community to justify the need for American rule. This is apparent through the histories that have been written about the island, the strong military presence on the land, and the many laws and policies regarding such things as religion, economics, education, and health care that were established by the United States government and American military after WWII. Colonial forces aimed at conquering the land by destroying the "real" through the creation of an "imagined" community and an "imagined subject."

This Chamorro community, in turn, helped to cultivate a Chamorro that would become the desired American subject for the colonial community. The cultivation of this imagined subject became the "responsibility" of the colonizer. American colonial forces believed that they alone were responsible for the cultural, political, religious, and economic development of their colonies. Using power and force by means of colonization, the American military, then, reproduced itself in these distant lands and through subtler means, such as the (re)imagination of identity, reproduced itself in the minds of its subjects. As a result, the American colonial power has been able to define Chamorus using its terms, values and ideas thereby also creating the Chamorro subject. And at the same time, the colonial power was able to hold its subjects by remaining distant and detached from them (Said, 1978). The Chamorro subject was, thus, located within the colonial community bound by a political and social culture that was defined by

the powers of the American colonizer. Just as the imagined community becomes a reality

in the minds of a people, Chamorros imagined themselves within their given, yet

colonial, space by constructing an image of themselves that resembled their colonizer

more than their ancestor. Although, problematically, defined by the colonizer, they

perceived themselves to be no less real.

Inherent in the perpetuation of colonial rule, therefore, is the embodiment of the

"subject" by the people. It is at the point of assuming that sense of identity that

colonization is able to gain power over a people. And it is in the creation and constant

reinforcement of the idea of the "subject" by the colonizer, that the colonial community is

maintained once again sustaining the identity of the "subject." The question, then,

becomes to what extent does the colonizer's idea of the "subject" determine who the

subject becomes? And to what extent does the colonized assume an identity as the

"subject" and/or can he negotiate an alternate sense of identity for himself based on

another memory or a different experience?

Situating Identity (Re)Search on Guam

In 1944, American military forces landed on Guam in an effort to (re)capture the

island after it was invaded by the Japanese. The American military, then, secured control

of the island and began rehabilitation efforts that eventually led to the construction of

large military bases that would facilitate the continued occupation of Guam by

Americans. Since WWII, Chamorus have confronted the many drastic political, social,

and cultural changes that came with this period of Americanization, modernization, and

globalization. This period marks a time of new beginnings as well as a time of struggle

and crisis. Many Chamorus found themselves at a crossroad of sorts. Politically, they

were becoming self-sustaining and at the same time increasingly drawn into the American system. They were facing both rapid development and gradual break down in many social structures. And culturally, Chamorus were pushing for a renaissance while battling increased losses. Chamorus were forced to contend with the melding of two different cultures in the midst of a drastically changing world; and Chamoru identity, inevitably, became implicated in these changes brought on by American colonialism.

Chamoru identity has been used as a tool for American domination on Guam since the "liberation" of the island from Japanese forces during WWII. Guam's American colonizer has, undoubtedly, had a hand in shaping the present political, social, economic, and cultural conditions on the island, and identity has been used to help create a sense of self that has contributed to the success of its continued domination over the island and its people. This is not to discount the role that Chamorus have played in the (re)imagination of their identities, but it is important to note the extent to which this American colonizer has played a role in shaping a Chamorro identity. At the War's end, the American colonial power needed control of the colony on Guam. In the years following the war continuing to this present day, the colonizer's need for the colony resulted in the creation of not only a community but also a subject. Establishing an imagined community not only helped to create a setting for the success of American rule on Guam it also helped to create a Chamorro identity that ensured its hold over the island. This identity has been and continues to be defined, internalized, conveyed, maintained and deployed in a colonial context by both the American colonizer and the colonized Chamoru.

The island of Guam is one of the world's oldest colonies. For over four hundred years, Guam has been the possession of outside powers that valued the island mainly for its geographic location. As a result, Chamoru identity has been continually imagined, contested, and (re)imagined. Since the island's first colonial encounter, Chamorus were compelled to confront their prior understanding of their world, their community, and themselves. They were also forced to identify themselves in opposition to the new strangers as a form of resistance to the outside power. "The history of Guam says very little about how the Chamorro people thought and felt toward [as well negotiated their place within] the imposition of an alien religion and foreign political control. The 'silence' of the Chamorros on these issues leaves the impression that the Chamorros bowed to foreign domination quietly" (Gobien, 1993, p. 13). Of course, this was not the case, but without a better understanding of the emergence of both Chamoru and Chamorro identity in the American colonial context and the circumstances surrounding the construction and internalization of this identity, the image of the passive, complacent Chamoru will remain the "true" understanding of the history of the Chamoru people.

In 1898, after the defeat of the Spanish American War, Guam was ceded to the United States as a spoil of war. This would mark the first period in which the American military would decide the fate of Chamorus. The American administration viewed Guam as being "of great and recognized strategic value to the United States as a point to be occupied and held for Naval purposes alone. It has neither present nor prospective economic value, and should not, therefore, excite the interest of other than scientific and

military men."[7] As a result, the United States Congress instituted an administration under

the rule of the United States Navy to govern the island. Full protection of the island and

its people would be guaranteed, "as long as that protection was deserved by actual

submission to and compliance with the requirements of the Government of the United

States" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 85). The United States believed that it was their duty not only

to better the material condition of the island but also the physical and psychological well

being of its people. The Naval administration justified their existence by emphasizing the

necessity for the advancement of the people. They desired to "transform the Chamorro

populace into an 'American' society, a new people who would be productive, disciplined,

educated, and sanitary" (Hattori, 1995, p. 1). The first attempt to define identity during

this American administration was made by the people to distinguish the Chamorus on

Guam from the Chamorros in the Northern Marianas Islands, which was now a colony of

Germany. The impetus then was the division of the island chain and, thus, the people,

following the sell of the northern islands of the Marianas chain to Germany after the

Spanish American War. During this time, the term "Guamanian" was used in place of

the term "Chamorro" to refer to permanent residents of Guam regardless of race or

ethnicity, but has come to mean the Chamorros on Guam (Perez, 1997). Efforts made at

attaining United States citizenship by the Chamorro people, however, proved

unsuccessful.

   With the start of World War II, Guam was attacked by Japan. The United States

lost control of the island. The Japanese proclaimed that they had "rescued" the island

from the Western World in order to restore liberty and establish peace and a New World

---

[7] This quote by Governor Dyer in 1905 stated the sole purpose for military presence on
the island (Hattori, 1995, p. 14).

Order when in fact their ruthlessness was seen as destructive (Sanchez, 1987). During

this time, Chamorus responded to this uncertainty by identifying themselves with their

prior colonizers. When the American military finally landed on Guam to (re)capture the

island from the Japanese, many of Chamorus were grateful to the military for their

presence freeing them from the fear they had known in the years prior. The military took

control of the island once again in order to restore peace and convert the island into the

largest forward base of support necessary for America's attacks on Japan. As a result of

the suffering that had occurred during the time of the Japanese occupation, the Chamorro

people seemed more than willing to establish peaceful relations with the Americans. It is

this sense of fear and appreciation that noticeably becomes the key to the formation of a

Chamorro identity that continues to lend itself to American domination.

After conditions on Guam drastically improved, Chamorus became concerned

once again with island politics. Opposition to Guam's present situation by Chamoru

political activists was visible on the island. They began to concern themselves with

protecting the island's indigenous cultural background and at the same time sought

American citizenship and civil government. These activists believed that American

citizenship and self-government would provide them equality and a sense of security

under the protection of the United States government. After six years of negotiation,

Congress passed the Organic Act.[8] This was the first and last time the United States

made any effort to grant self-government to the people of Guam. Although the Organic

Act provided for citizenship, a local self-government, military presence, non-voting

---

[8] The Founders of the Organic Act of Guam passed in 1950 were members of the political community of Guam—Baltazar Bordallo, Francisco B. Leon Guerrero, Carlos P. Taitano, Governor Carlton Skinner, and Antonio B. Won Pat (Troutman, 2002).

delegate to the House of Representatives, and revenue through taxes, it falls short of being a self-governing constitution. The reality is that Chamorus now have United States citizenship but remain a people without a country and an identity that continues to remain rooted in the colonial encounter. "What does it mean when you tell a bird you will help it fly while cutting off its wings? It simply means the bird won't fly" (Souder, 1993, p. 119).

Since then, the island and its people have made several attempts at improving the relationship it has with the United States. In the 70s and 80s, the people held plebiscites in an effort to change the status of Guam's political association with the United States. And in 1984, Guam submitted a drafted Commonwealth Act that would allow the island to become a more self-governing entity with decreased military dependence and greater control over the island's economy and immigration issues while still maintaining citizenship and aid. The United States Congress, however, quickly rejected the Act because of these requests.

The idea of "indigenous rights" for Chamorus soon emerged after the Draft Commonwealth Act failed. The political status issue on the island rekindled a sense of Chamoru identity and gave indigenous rights a newfound purpose. Chamorus have developed an understanding of "their" rights and the rights of others within the community but all within the context of American colonialism. Nonetheless, they have used this idea of rights to create a sense of unity or disunity in the community. And in 1998, the leaders of Guam (comprised mainly of Chamorus) attempted to have a vote that would determine Guam's choice for a future political status. The island's Commission on Self-Determination established the need for a plebiscite to determine the Chamorro

people's preference on future political statuses. The island's leaders believed that the

Chamoru people needed to be given a vote on Guam's political status. As proposed, all

eligible Chamorus will register with the Chamorro Registry Advisory Board and then

vote in a Chamorro-only plebiscite to determine the future of the island.[9] As a result of

possible court actions and political games, this plebiscite has yet to take place, and the

status of Guam's political association with its American colonizer remains in limbo.

This look at a small piece of Guam's history is evidence of the great impact that

colonization, especially American colonization, has had on the island's political, social,

and economic community and more importantly the Chamoru people. Colonization has

greatly affected all aspects of the island community. "The everyday effects of

colonialism are so prevalent that we almost accept them as part of our lives. We have

become nearly numb to the turmoil in our community."[10] Guam's recent struggle for

self-determination has resulted in a legalized definition of what it means to be Chamorro

and is proof of the ongoing identity battle in the island community. Chamorro identity

has come to be defined in terms of American discourse but has arguably hindered the

way in which Chamorus perceive themselves within their community that perhaps was an

intended part of American rule. Guam's American colonial history has, undoubtedly,

---

[9] In 1996, the Guam Legislature created a legal definition of the term that is based on the Organic Act and will determine eligibility for the Chamorro Registry. The law states that Chamorro shall mean "all inhabitants of the island of Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date, who were Spanish subjects, who after that date continued to reside in Guam or other territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationalities" (Pub. L., 23-130). In 2000, a law was passed changing the Chamorro Registry to the Decolonization Registry while still making reference to definitions used in the Organic Act (Pub. L., 25-106). See Chapter 6 for further discussion.
[10] Ronald Rivera, the Vice Chairman of the Guam Decolonization Commission, quoted in *Guam appeals to U.N. on decolonization effort* (Loerzel, 2000).

provided a context in which a Chamorro identity has been shaped; and as a result of the

impact of this history of colonization, contemporary Chamorus are facing an identity

crisis similar to the comments articulated below:

> I was both a Chamorro and…American, I didn't identify fully with either nor could I reconcile the two…It had been easy to label myself a Chamorro, but until I had knowledge of that which is Chamorro, I could not identify with other Chamorros…As I came to understand my Chamorro self, I also came to understand that the United States has taken unfair advantage over a defenseless people and through gifts have caused them to be complacent, and through promises have deceived them into believing that they would control their own destiny and homeland. I have always respected and honored the legacy of both my parents, but when I found out that one was taking unfair advantage over the other…I feel that my Chamorro half is dying at the hands of its American counterpart, and I cannot remain still…I have come to love my island and that color which reflects my own. I have come to know my people and together we suffer the sadness of our past. And as I experience with them our present frustrations, I wonder if I have found my Chamorro identity only to lose it through American domination. (Howard, 1993, p. 155-161)

Chamoru identity, nonetheless, continues to be ambiguous. This is why it

becomes necessary to understand how the emergence of a Chamorro identity during the

American domination of the island after WWII was part of a grander plan for colonial

rule. Existing research about the colonization of Guam has argued that such things as

government, education, religion, and health policies were all tools in the colonial project,

and that through the internalization of these "gifts," the colonizers were able to guarantee

their power over Chamorus.[11] And so to that list, it is now possible to add identity. The

American rule of Guam from 1945 to the present was not innocent in the construction of

a Chamorro identity. "The psychological internalization of the [colonial] image of

Chamorros by Chamorros themselves" is the most damaging effect of colonization that

---

[11] For further discussion of these issues see references for works by Laura Souder-Jaffery and Robert Underwood (1987), Katherine Aguon (1993), Vicente Diaz (2000; 2002; 2010), and Anne Hattori (1999), respectively.

the Chamorro people have had to contend with especially in regard to their identity

(Aguon, 1993, P. 95). In this context of American colonization on Guam, it is possible to

see the forces at work in the emergence of a Chamorro identity and how identity has

since been used as a tool for achieving American domination over the Chamoru people of

Guam.

Identity has emerged at the core of many political and social debates among

different peoples such as women, minority races, gender groups, and indigenous

communities. Identity is socially constructed, carried in language, expressed in mundane

routine, liable to revision and routinely contested as we move through life. The ways in

which we understand different groups within the world of political interactions are

changing, resulting in a change in the ways these groups understand and define

themselves both within their communities and to others. Therefore, it is important that

we reexamine the notion of identity in light of this constantly changing nature of political

studies and in the context of the events that have come to define who we are.

Through the inherent (re)imagination of identity, Chamorus as well as their

community on Guam have come to understand those aspects of their being, their culture,

and their environment that makes them distinct. "In differentiating others, that is to say,

one is also defining oneself" (Esptein, 1978, p. 14). Chamorus, thus, associate within

their community as distinct from the other based on the fact that there is difference, and

the difference, in this case, is a historical connection to WWII. Identity as it has been

perceived by Chamorus and others is constructed within a social context as a reflection of

history and culture that becomes evident vis-a-vis other people (Webber, 2000; Barcham,

2000; Meijl, 2004). Theory on identity, however, has been constructed on the

assumption that indigenous people had a pre-existing sense of self. Edward Said (1978), however, has argued that the notion of the Other's self or the indigenous self was in many ways a construct of the dominant society. Identity for indigenous people did not exist prior to interaction with others and is not simply a perception by the dominant society. It is, instead, a complex construct based on the discourse of a history and memory of struggle. Chamoru identity is rooted in "self-knowledge—their way of looking at, and knowing, themselves" (Torres & Milun, 1995, p. 139). This self-knowledge, however, is only reified by the constant interaction a people have with their past often at the hands of those in power. Identification has multi-layered dimensions due to factors of colonization because colonization defined Chamorus as distinct and opposite from their colonizers in order to exclude them from aspects of politics, economics, and society. Ironically, they were defined against the dominant structure in order to create a community that would not only justify but also sustain that domination.

For hundreds of years, dominant societies have defined indigenous people as a justification for colonization, but in an effort to achieve respect and justice, indigenous people are now making efforts to define themselves, and Chamorus are no exception. Indigenous people often create political definitions of their identity in the context of their colonial histories in order to facilitate this goal of self-determination. This has resulted in the way in which Chamorus have gained a sense of their self in contrast to outsiders that came into their communities as a result of colonization. Chamoru identity, thus, tends to be articulated by the injustices of colonization and in reaction to the multiple dimensions of the self, the community and the world.

> Identity is no longer seen as exclusive, as individual, or rather: indivisible, but as multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic,

discourses, practices and positions…The construction of identity, or rather: identities, is a never-ending process, always incomplete, unfinished and open-ended…Since identities…are constantly in a process of change and transformation, they are also the subject of a radical historicization…The paradox in the construction of identities in the contemporary era, however, is the focus on continuity with a historical past, while identities are re-constituted in order to re-articulate the self to rapidly changing circumstances. History has in other words become a resource in the articulation of identification in the present and the future. (Meijl, 2004, pp. 3-4)

Societies, like individuals, interpret their place in the world in their own ways, and people use these understandings to construct their identities. People relate to their world through their identity. What becomes evident in the study of identity is the continual change in the personal, social, cultural, and political expression of identity. What is less obvious, however, is the actual role that colonization plays in the (re)construction or (re)imagination of these identities. Identity is marked by both change and permanence, and Chamorus have continually looked to their past to make sense of their shifting self-image in the present. Distinctions in identity are continuously "drawn between identity as self-perceived and as seen or imposed by others, between personal identity over the life cycle and group identity expressed from communal to national levels" (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 317). Chamorus, thus, use their "narratives to maintain a sense of personal and social continuity" (Fitgerald, 1993, p. 24). These narratives about the past are our identities and can be used to uncover some of the mysteries behind the changing nature of Chamoru identity. Chamoru identity is a result of over three thousand years of existence fused with over four hundred years of colonization. Chamoru history, Chamoru culture, and most importantly Chamoru memory can be seen as contested sites on which indigenous identity combined with exogenous identity are created, challenged,

and then recreated (Diaz, 2000). But, what has been left out of many histories of Guam is a critical look at the role of colonization and the colonizer.

Indigenous people have long been fragments within the dominant discourse of the colonizer and their history. A colonial history is one written with the narratives of the colonizer and the selected fragments of the colonized (Pandey, 2000). The displacement of colonial discourse—that is, "the distinction between the knower and the known"—into the perspective of the colonized is crucial in making what once was the object of history the subject of that history (Mignolo, 2000). This would be a narrative in which subordinate peoples are creators of their own destinies bringing to light the relationship between existing narratives and the power of the colonizer. This acceptance of a colonial past fused with power struggles and the recognition of subordinate perspectives may also shed light on the contested nature of being for many within the Chamoru community.

This narrative looks not at the history *of* the Chamoru people but rather at *Chamoru* history. A Chamoru history of colonization would be one of struggle, resistance, and negotiation with the forces of civilization, capitalism, individualism, and modernity, especially in the American context. And a look at Chamoru history would uncover the power dynamics that produced the colonial history that (re)created identity. This same dynamic made evident the domination of the subordinate by the powerful. This narrative would also show Chamoru identity as it emerged in response to the encounter and articulate the ways in which Chamorus have moved within the community in order to explore the "historical and cultural meandering of Chamorro identity" within the colonial context (Diaz, 2000, p. 149). Was identity used as a tool for American

domination on Guam? What role did Guam's American colonizer play in shaping

Chamorro identity? And, how did Chamorus negotiate their identities?

The second chapter of this project provides a narrative of WWII on Guam in an

effort to understand the war as the point in Guam's history that allowed for the continued

American domination of Guam. Chamorus were thrust into a war that became the

defining moment for the (re)creation of identity in the American context. American

colonial discourse is embedded in Guam's war history and has given veracity to the

narrative of "liberation" and rehabilitation of the "grateful" Chamoru.

Chapter three continues this narrative with a look at post-war politics. Soon after,

Chamorus revived their desires for American citizenship. With the passage of the 1950

Organic Act, Chamorus gained their place as American subjects in an American colony

where Chamorus could be politically identified as Chamorros.

The fourth chapter provides a narrative of education as a tool for colonization. A

Chamorro identity has been shaped by the discourse of pre-war Guam and post-war

Guam.   Chamoru past and Chamorro history comprise the supporting narrative to the

larger text of American colonization on Guam. Educating the Chamoru as subjects

depended on this narrative of the subject.

Chapter five uses this narrative of the subject to first define the Chamorro and

second to resist the external impetus of American colonization. Through this (re)creation

of identities, Chamorus have worked to redefine their Chamorro identity to make it

relevant for their present circumstances. Recognizing alternate perspectives of history

and alternate narratives of identity formation can help us to better understand the power

dynamic rooted in colonization and strengthen our ability to understand the impetus behind our contested identities.

The narrative will conclude with a look at the right of self-determination as a possibility for the future and a necessary end to Guam's colonial experience. Through the use of identity as a means for mobilization in 1950, Chamorus were able to secure American citizenship and limited self-government. The discussion of self-determination on Guam amidst the demographic changes seen in recent years is now centered on identity for the people of Guam. The final chapter discusses to what extent we can now look to identity as a means to deal with the new tides that Guam is facing, and whether or not there is an impetus for the perhaps (re)imagination of yet another identity out of a more recent memory.

CHAPTER 2. WORLD WAR II—THE TURNING POINT

History for the Chamoru people has in many ways resulted in a narrative of the past that is just as uncertain as one of the future. This chapter will begin by exploring the problematic nature of History before attempting to re-imagine a specific moment of Chamoru past so as to shed light on the how and why of contemporary Chamoru identity.

Looking at Yesterday to Make Sense of Today

Because history is, inherently, a western, colonial tool, it "cannot help but be implicated in colonization" (Alfred, 2001, p. 23). There often exists a sense that the past existed independently of our consciousness of it, and our understanding of the past is limitless. But Chamoru history, all history in fact, is a story that is particular to a certain time and place and can be an expression of something broader or more general that is happening outside of that space. And because history is symbolic of the past, it is a necessary tool for coming to terms with the present. It is often difficult to understand what happens in a particular history without an understanding of what is happening around the world. At the same time, it is important to keep a historical consciousness of that space and its cultural terms.

History is never just about reconstructing the past; instead, it is about creatively imagining and (re)presenting it. The making of Chamoru history should be about describing the past with the understanding that it will continue to be (re)imagined and (re)presented. The histories of Guam were often written within a context of the island's colonial past, and thus, could not give voice to that which it was not already predisposed to hear. As a result, Chamorus became fragments within the dominant discourse of their

colonizer and their *colonizer's* history. And it is in this context of colonization that we are continually presented with a history about Guam—a story assumingly about Chamorus that never really allows them a presence in the narrative.

History on Guam has become a tool of both power and struggle. This history as it is written in dominant texts is a history *of* a colonized people who have been almost entirely overshadowed by the seemingly more significant encounters of foreigners in a remote land. History on Guam has impacted the ways in which Chamorus engage in their community and the perceptions they have created about themselves and others. This becomes clear when we look at narratives about WWII and the way in which Chamorus have been (re)presented in this story of the past.[12] But perhaps it is more important to take notice of the extent to which these narratives (re)present Chamorus but only within the larger American colonial discourse. Wherein, WWII History on Guam is embedded with a narrative of American superiority and Chamoru gratefulness, and this lends itself to the identity that is to be created out of this discourse.

We must, then, begin to ask the questions: what is privileged in these histories and what is left out of history? Guam's history has been left in the shadows of this project. History presents the Chamoru people as if they exist but not quite. And until recently, their place in history has been somewhat unclear because the dominant history of Guam has been consumed by its colonial pasts. Chamorus are a people whose history has

---

[12] The lack of Chamoru presence in the narrative of WWII, as well as many other significant moments in Guam's past can be found in texts such as Charles *Guam: Past and Present* (Beardsley, 1964); *A Complete History of Guam* (Carano & Sanchez, 1964); *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam* (Rogers, 1995); and *Guahan Guam: The History of Our Island* (Sanchez, 1987) most of which are used to teach Guam's history in the public schools as well as the University on Guam and can arguably be a tool used to portray the island as a small part of the greater project of colonization.

become engulfed by dropping bombs and the smoke of a long colonial legacy. For

example,

> Prior to World War II, Guam, an American territory since 1898 was virtually unknown to most Americans—a mere coaling station almost lost in the vastness of the Pacific. However, with the dropping of Japanese bombs on December 7, 1941, and the United States' entry into the war, Guam was transformed from a relatively unknown island into occupied American soil to be reclaimed—whatever the cost—from the invader's hands…The entire island, although under civilian administration, is for practical purposes a fortress where now live seventy thousand Americans. (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, p. xiii)

> Thus, the outbreak of war in the Pacific was expected by everyone on Guam…the Chamorros and many Americans were confident that the United States would easily defeat the Japanese. This misplaced confidence was due to "childlike faith in the might and power of America." (Rogers, 1995, p. 162)

> War came finally upon the land and upon a peaceful and simple people who did not know what war was all about nor even had an indigenous word for it. For a people who were used to a quiet, simple and easy island life, the first days in occupied Guam were excruciatingly horrifying. (Sanchez, 1987, p. 184)

The history of Guam's more recent past also continues to be centered on its

relationship to United States and its colonial past.

> From the air, it lies on the rim of the western sea like a lump of jade rimmed in silver and blue…But Guam, from the air or a ship from the ocean sea, is a fantasy…For Guam is a huge construction camp, rowdy, crude and jerry-built. It is also a vast junk yard and a onetime battlefield where the scars of combat still offend the eye everywhere.[13]

> Social conditions on the island improved markedly during the first four years after liberation. This reflected a major credit upon the Naval Government which spared neither funds nor personnel available to it, in its efforts to improve the health, education and the general social conditions of the island and its people. (Sanchez, 1987, p. 282)

> Too small to become a U.S. state, too strategic to be permitted independence, Guam lives on in a kind of neocolonial limbo…Guam's case is notable not only because it concerns the fate of one of the world's last small colonies, but also because it significantly conditions the durability of the American presence

---

[13] This quote from an unnamed journalist (Rogers, 1995, p. 205).

throughout the strategically important western Pacific Ocean. (Rogers, 1988, pp. 1-2)

Marred by this legacy of colonization and obscure narratives, Guam's past remains in the shadow of the words and representations of historians and their histories.

Colonization, especially American colonization, has affected the way in which Chamorus take part in their communities, the levels to which they participate, and their relationship to the rest of the world. The island of Guam and its people have been hidden under the smoky covering of colonization for hundreds of years, and Guam's history is a testament to the embedded and contextualized nature of that history. All History, in fact, is a product of a particular time and space, and that embeddedness is also a product of its relationship to the present. In order to gain a better understanding of contemporary Chamoru identity as it emerged in the second American colonial encounter, it becomes necessary to (re)imagine a specific moment in the history of Guam that was in many ways a turning point for American colonization: World War II.

From One War to Another

[Let us take a quick look at the years preceding this turning point.] In the time of the Spanish-American War and the 43 years of Guam's past leading into World War II, the Chamoru people were victim to Cuban rebellions leading up to a short but unknown war between Spain and the United States, the eventual Spanish surrender and American military takeover, and the inevitable Americanization which ended abruptly with

destructive attacks at the onset of World War II.[14] All of which, Chamorus had almost no

involvement in and absolutely no control over, but were, as a result of each event,

dramatically impacted by. This seemingly insignificant role of Chamorus on the affairs

of the world speaks volumes about the role or lack thereof of a subjugated people in

histories of colonization.

> What the historian trades in, we are told, is facts. What s/he inherits and collects
> and explores are narratives. 'Facts' or, more broadly, 'evidence' comes to the
> historian in the form of narratives and narrative fragments: the narratives, one
> might say (with only a little exaggerations), of the ruling classes, and the
> 'fragments' of the subordinated…the narratives most commonly used by
> historians—belong overwhelmingly to the ruling classes, and owe their existence
> largely to a ruling class's need for security and control. Lost in the [narratives]
> are fragments (traces) of many lost (and usually unrecoverable) narratives.
> (Pandey, 2000, p. 282)

And it is with the "facts" and "evidence" of the ruling class, who in this instance takes on

the form of the American colonizer, that we are presented with a narrative about the

island's history.

The significance of these 43 years lies not in the fact that it was a time marked by

the struggle for power but in the very terms used in the history-making process that has

come to define this period. December 23, 1898 to December 8, 1941 has been referred to

as the time when "Guam Becomes an American Possession," marked by "The Americans

in Guam" or "The Anglo-Saxon Way," and most tellingly "The Americanization of

---

[14] For more on the history of Guam from 1898-1941, see *Guam: Past and Present*
(Beardsley, 1964); *A Complete History of Guam* (Carano & Sanchez, 1964); *Destiny's
Landfall: A History of Guam* (Rogers, 1995); and *Guahan Guam: The History of Our
Island* (Sanchez, 1987). For more specific histories of Guam during this time period, see
Colonial Dis-ease: U. S, Naval Health Policies and the Chamorro of Guam, *1898-1941*
(Hattori, 1999).

Guam."[15] Guam was under the administration of the United States Navy during these

four decades before Japan's attacks in World War II. What began as a philanthropic

project to rid the island of moral as well as physical leprosy ended in the creation of a

Pacific military outpost for the U.S. Navy. Initial reports to Washington regarding the

conditions on Guam, written by Lieutenant Vincendon L. Cottman in February 20, 1899

read:

> If the Government intends to make Guam a self-supporting island and a *creditable colony* it will be necessary to commence immediately and use *heroic* measures. The following are suggested as some of the necessary means to this end.
> 1. First of all send the Spanish priests to Spain or to one of the Spanish Islands and the native priest to one of the other islands, I believe he claims some of them. *These priests are the moral lepers of the place and are a great drawback and detriment* [emphasis added]; they have considerable political influence. As the people are all Roman Catholics send here four American priests, judiciously selected for their suitability. *Priests similar to the Catholic Chaplains in the Navy would be suitable* [emphasis added].
> 2. *Having gotten rid of the moral lepers send four government doctors whose first duty will be to examine all the natives in the island and corral all the lepers* [emphasis added] and send them out of the island, the leper settlement at Molokai [Hawaii] is suggested as rendezvous. There are about six lepers now in the island. Next let the doctors establish a hospital with sufficient surrounding ground for a ranch and collect all the syphilitics in the island and start a colony that will be self supporting, say at Merizo. If any of the cases can be cured by treatment let such be released from settlement when cured. Let the doctors look into the sanitary requirements. All the towns need sewers.
> 3. Establish a government pharmacy and have compulsory examination of all natives and for the present free treatment.
> 4. Send all the Filipino convicts back to Manila.
> 5. Compel all males above 18 to do a day's work six days in the week, *until they become accustomed to work* [emphasis added]; this will prevent their laying around the homes idle and drinking La Tuba. Make them build a good carriage road all around the island.

---

[15] Titles in quotations are Chapter headings for the 1898-1941 time period in Guam's past from the following history texts: *A Complete History of Guam* (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, pp. 169-221); *Guam: Past and Present* (Beardsley, 1964, pp. 191-206); *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam* (Rogers, 1995, pp. 108-126); and *Guahan Guam: The History of Our Island* (Sanchez, 1987, pp. pp. 81-93), respectively.

6. Establish Public Schools and compel all children to go to school and *teach them English* [emphasis added], having male teachers for the boys and women teachers for the girls.
7. Establish an Industrial School.
8. *Make American the business as well as the official language* [emphasis added].
9. Establish a government experimental agricultural station and stock farm in one, send out all kinds of vegetable seed, grain seed, fruit seed and grazing grass seed that is suitable for the tropics; have a fair amount to distribute free under supervision of the Agriculturist of the Experimental Station. Send out half a dozen good milk cows and a bull or two, Texas horses, ducks, partridges and quail, also agricultural implements and some axes and saws. (Sanchez, 1987, pp. 181-182)

It is clear from this report as well as latter mandates from Naval Governors that the intent of the United States was to establish a "creditable colony"—a colony of natives who were mentally and physically healthy, who possessed a good work and moral ethic, who were educated in American English, and who would then be capable of sustaining a military outpost on America's newest colony. "Guam had to be made healthy and bustling for troops and their dependents" (Beardsley, 1964, p. 199). Less clear was how these "heroic" recommendations would be a means for promoting a "self-supporting island" for the people of Guam. Neither was to be an easy task, however, because it seemed that Guam and her people were "plagued" with countless economic, social, physical and moral troubles; all of which required a "remedy" from whomever would later take on this arduous responsibility (Beardsley, 1963). Upon acquiring Guam in the Treaty of Peace, Richard P. Leary, a Captain in the United States Navy and newly appointed Governor of Guam issued a proclamation establishing the political authority of the United States over the inhabitants of Guam.[16] It is this proclamation to exert power for the "security of the

---

[16] Mandates and proclamations banning "intoxicating spirituous liquors," enforcing curfew laws and quarantines, mandating reading and writing of the English language, prohibiting gambling and public religious celebrations from Governor Richard P. Leary

persons and property of the Island" that enabled the United States to claim rights to land

and property paving the way for an eventual military buildup that to this date continues to

impact the Chamoru people. What began as a military outpost in the West Pacific has

now reached limitless bounds undoubtedly sustaining American dominance on Guam.[17]

But just as forceful as the metal fragments that were set in motion with every

gunshot and bomb dropped during WWII, the fragments or stories of the Chamoru

experience during this earlier Americanization period have pierced the larger narrative of

colonization and have been equally compelling. It is in these small pieces of the past that

have been broken apart from the larger whole of history that we are able to clear the

colonial smoke.[18] It is the stories that we are told at the feet of our *manamko* about

family and friends that give us a sense of Chamoru intuition.[19] It is also the stories of

Chamoru agency that are not prominent in a historian's accounts that can be used to shed

light on the Chamoru experience and their unseeming attempts at resistance. These are

the stories of Chamoru families that continued to walk around barefoot and hang their

laundry on nearby shrubbery even after "good hygienic" practices were mandated. They

managed to find shoes and tidy up their homes just as naval personnel were approaching.

These are the stories of Chamoru men that were hired by the Naval government at the

rate of twenty-four cents a day who in the end refused to do manual labor leaving the

---

were reflective of the recommendations made by Lieutenant Cottman (Sanchez, 1987, pp. 84-93).

[17] The strategic military importance of Guam continues to be the driving force for American colonial presence on the island especially in light of the proposed transfer by the United States Marine Corps of a low estimate of 8000 military personnel and their dependents from Okinawa, Japan to Guam that began late 2007.

[18] The Cambridge Dictionary (2010) defines the word fragment as "a small piece or a part, especially when broken from something whole."

[19] *Manamko* is the Chamoru term meaning elder.

U.S. marines to pick up a shovel and work to repair roads and build sewers. These are

the stories of Chamorus "mysteriously" acquiring alcoholic beverages and sharing them

with their marine friends even after it was prohibited. These stories often ended with a

heated fight that the prohibition was intended to curb from the beginning. These are the

stories of Chamoru families that tended to the Governor's aide at his home bringing him

food and plants and over a good conversation managed to get their complaints about the

marines, the civil orders being issued, and even their fellow neighbors heard and

resolved. These are the stories of the many Chamoru families who befriended military

personnel that could provide them with tobacco, liquor, and countless supplies that made

it easier to deal with the fast pace of change that was sweeping the island. The stories

continue with Chamorus encountering Americans and their curfew mandates, dancing

and partying restrictions, and prohibitions of public religious celebrations.[20]

    A large part of History, however, has turned a deaf ear to these fragments or

pieces of the Chamoru experience or perhaps has simply failed to hear that which it was

not already inclined to hear. The "small voices" of those who are seemingly wealthy but

utterly poor, those who are resourceful but uneducated, those with healthy spirits but

sickly bodies, those who appear childlike even in their old age, those who are subjugated

by power, those who are an overwhelming minority in status rather than numbers, those

displaced in their homelands, those exploited by others—the Native—are not just

---

[20] Accounts like these and others come from a lifetime of stories the author was told as a child. They can also be found sporadically in history of Guam texts such as *Guam: Past and Present* (Beardsley, 1964); *A Complete History of Guam* (Carano & Sanchez, 1964); *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam* (Rogers, 1995); and *Guahan Guam: The History of Our Island* (Sanchez, 1987). Although these stories of Chamorro agency are not prominent in the historian's accounts, they are the pieces that shed light on the Chamorro experience.

fragments in history.[21] They are the points of rupture or the disturbance in the story that

pierces through the very flesh of a historical narrative of colonization. These parts of the

whole have made us conscious of an alternate story, an alternate history. Just as the

Chamoru narrative breaks through the hold of early Americanization, it is left to rise from

the smoke of the colonial bomb that falls upon the Chamoru people in the next chapter of

history.

Guam in WWII

        Prior to the attacks on Pearl Harbor, the atmosphere on Guam was already filled

with a sense of fear. Fear that seemed to stem from what was considered by American

administrators as a menacing Japanese presence in the Marianas and eventually

contributed to the overwhelming patriotism the Chamoru people had for a country that in

a time of war surrendered its island colony to the enemy. Chamorus, in the 43 years

before the war, had undoubtedly become American without ever really becoming

American (Rogers, 1995).[22] They had learned to speak as well as read and write in the

English language, they had developed a strong work ethic—many Chamorus had even

become wealthy businessmen and early political figures, they were "healthier" and

---

[21] These are all common mis-conceptions about native peoples as they were referred to in
History. The "small voice" reference comes from an article entitled *The Small Voice of
History* (1996) by Ranajit Guha where Guha argues that historiography is a project
guided by statist concerns that does not allow for the "small voice" to be heard.
[22] Although Chamorus were complying with measures to promote military presence on
Guam, they were denied American Citizenship when it was proposed in 1937 to the
Seventy-fifth Congress of the United States. In the opinion of then Governor Benjamin
McCandlish, "the Chamorros needed more time…'to develop the intelligence and
managing ability to progress,' before they could undertake the self-government that
American citizenship would entail…Chamorros did not merit political rights
because…they 'do not work hard to improve their economic conditions" (Rogers, 1995,
p. 156).

"cleaner," and they had accepted and in most cases were already living the "American

lifestyle." And these "Americans" stayed loyal to "their" country while the world went

to war.

These are the stories about Chamorus in wartime Guam that are told to our

children but remain as fragments in history books for future generations to read. The

following comes from Charles Beardsley's book, *Guam Past and Present* (1964),

> The occupation, inhuman as it seems in retrospect, did not find the Guamanian population unprepared against Japanese persuasion. They had seen the growth of Japanese infiltration in Guam and had protested volubly to the authorities about it.
>
> The goodwill of the natives seemed of paramount importance at the time in the face of increasing Japanese victories throughout the Pacific; and the few Guamanians who resented the American influence on Guam went over to the Japanese cause.
>
> Severe food rationing was enforced, and supplies frequently were cut off in an entire community as retribution for the misconduct…of one individual. Although this made it very difficult for natives to care for and feed large families, the majority bore up under this sort of excess. The compensation was that in most cases families stayed close together and could spend their evening hours at home…But later even the opportunity to gather together under familiar roofs and the time to till their land were denied them.
>
> With the slim maintenance force on the island the enemy naturally turned toward the Guamanians to supplement the labor forces. Soon all able-bodied men and women—and often children—were doing arduous work, helping to build airfields from the American plans laid in 1941.
>
> Guamanians who had worked to raise even the thinnest of crops often had nothing at all from the harvest for their families and were forced to scour the bush for the wild nuts the aborigines had mashed into pulp during times of typhoon famine.
>
> Although the natives knew that this meant the beginning of their darkest period, they also knew it meant that Japan had decided, like the Americans before them in 1941, that it would be impossible to hold Guam against numerically superior forces once it was invaded. But the Guamanians also knew that the Japanese would be prepared to make stubborn resistance.
> The Japanese evacuated all Guamanians from these strategic areas and huddled them together in fetid concentration camps without food, sanitation, or medical care for the sick and aged. Hundreds of natives died.

> Torture and death became a daily incident in almost every large community, and the degradation of a gentle, peaceful people became a chronic affair…Many stories of heroism and brutality have come out of the Japanese occupation of Guam, and whatever their implication, it is possible that even the most outrageous of them are true. The Guamanian people suffered every possible kind of humiliation and many of them the most unspeakable and degrading death at the hands of the enemy. But the most heartening story of the occupation is the narrative of George Ray Tweed's harrowing hideout on the island in the thick of Japanese aggression. (pp. 207-219)[23]

So much can be said about the offensive nature of History in Beardsley's account. In the chapter about the "Japanese Occupation," no "Guamanian" has a name or face and in the most malnutrition cases even much of a body. But rather the only person given a presence is an American by the name of George Ray Tweed for his exceptional survival skills that we later find out from Beardsley is due to the accompaniment of a *taotaomona* helper who built him a shelter among the trees on the island or so the natives say. Beardsley goes on to say that: "There is not space enough here to recount the many incidents of loyalty and resistance of the Guamanian people under brutal coercion, but it is worth knowing that although they were not yet United States citizens at the time of the Japanese occupation, there were no more than 200 anti-American persons noted during the entire period from a total population of over 25,000" (1964, p. 219).

From Paul Carano and Pedro C. Sanchez's book, *A Complete History of Guam* (1964), we see somewhat of a mixed portrayal of the war. Some of what Carano and Sanchez write is common to the narrative of wartime Guam; while some of what is presented is not part of this dominant discourse about the time period. These fragments instead work against the prevailing sentiment surrounding Japan and the war.

---

[23] These excerpts come from Beardsley's Chapter, "The Japanese Occupation," where Chamoru presence is a mere bi-product of the larger story of Japanese and American forces at war.

By 6 a.m. top American and Guamanian civilians had been officially informed of the hostilities between Japan and the United States. There was, however, no way of informing the general public.

The Insular Force Guard, composed of young Guamanian men, was assembled at headquarters on the Plaza de España in Agana and prepared to defend the palace and government buildings.

News of the bombing of Sumay and Piti signaled the beginning of a mass exodus of approximately 11,000 Guamanians from Agana. As the people poured out of their homes and from the cathedral and other churches in Agana, survivors from Piti and Sumay began streaming into the capital. They spread frightening and exaggerated stories of the Japanese attack on the military installations…Panic resulted, and the cries of women and children could be heard everywhere…In the rush to escape, houses were left open, husbands were separated from their wives, and children from their parents. All was in utter confusion.

Guamanians fleeing from Agana before dawn met head-on with invading troops on a lonely stretch of the road. Without warning, the Japanese opened fire on them. Later, the bodies of about twenty men, women, and children were found piled on the road beside their overturned cars and jitneys.

On the day of the invasion, several Guamanians were captured by Japanese troops and taken to Agana, where they were given identification passes…It bore Japanese inscriptions indicating that the bearer was a native. Upon receiving their passes, these few Guamanians…were released and sent out to call the people from their hiding places. For several days the Guamanians came by the thousands and stood in lines for hours waiting for passes. The old Leary School and the plaza areas were crowded with frightened islanders. They were unprepared to face their conquerors, for they had never fully believed that Japan would really fight against the United States. That Japan would ever capture Guam was something no Guamanian ever thought possible. Now that the war was really upon them, they did not know what to do. They were confused and they were frightened. Getting the pass and the first encounter with the Japanese was, for many, a terrifying ordeal.

In their quest for the Americans, the *keibitai* searching parties were overzealous. Scores of Guamanians were punished until they were near the point of death. Many more suffered permanent injury. Innocent men, women, and children were questioned. In the process they were slapped, hit with fists, or clubbed. Many were taken to Agana for more questioning and grilling. The more vigorous the denial, the more brutal the punishment. For many people there was simply no way to escape punishment. (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, pp. 267-289)[24]

---

[24] These excerpts come from Carano and Sanchez's (1964) Chapter, "Guam During World War II," (pp. 267-318) as examples of how the authors have allowed Chamorus to

We continue to read from the authors in *A Complete History of Guam* (1964) that the

Japanese Occupation of Guam may not have been as brutal as it is portrayed to be.

Carano and Sanchez argue that in comparison to the Japanese Army, the Japanese Naval

Rule on Guam was much less violent. Tucked neatly in the narrative of brutality and war

is this unseeming rupture in the dominant assumptions about wartime on Guam:

> During the first year and a half of naval rule, Guam was "governed tolerably well." The people were left pretty much to themselves. Except for those who were accused of aiding Tweed and other Americans, or those who were accused of committing crimes, the majority of the people were not bothered at all. Those who worked for the Japanese were paid for their work…Those who wished to remain on their farms were permitted to do so…Throughout this period, the people of Guam managed to live off the land and the sea…Guam was able to produce, in time, enough food for its population—and some over for the Japanese army. The period of Japanese occupation was not all work and struggle. (pp. 277-278)[25]

This excerpt from the Carano and Sanchez text and the details provided in their original

account gives us a somewhat different perspective of Japanese rule on Guam during the

early years of war. The experience may not have been as harsh as has been portrayed in

other historical texts about the time period; at least, not in its entirety. And Chamoru

---

move in and out of the larger narrative of war between Japanese officials and American soldiers on Guam. Never really the main actors in the story, Chamorus are given a presence; however, it can be seen as.

[25] The account goes on to say that "In the evenings the people, most of whom had moved away from Agana and other towns to their farm areas, amused themselves with dancing and singing. Parties were held on numerous occasions. Movies could be seen without charge by those who cared to see Japanese films. On various occasions the Japanese authorities presented variety programs for the entertainment of the *keibitai* officers and men and for the general public as well…Baseball games and other games of sport, such as Japanese sumo wrestling, were usually open to the public…The vast majority of the Guamanians, however, entertained themselves in their own ways. Novena parties were frequent. So were birthday parties and wedding feasts—when priests were available. Dancing in the moonlight and other forms of merrymaking and entertainment were plentiful throughout the first year and a half of Japanese naval administration" (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, pp. 278-279).

intuition did play a rather significant role for survival during the war no matter how insignificant it appears to have been from historical texts.

> During the peak of his propaganda activities, Homura [a Lieutenant Commander in the Japanese navy] told the people that "never in a hundred years" would the Americans return to Guam. He told them that California was a Japanese colony and that the fall of Washington, D.C., was just a matter of time. Some of his statements were so ridiculous that they offered the people of Guam their only comic relief in a rather difficult situation. Toward the close of the war, Homura was more helpful to the Guamanians than he intended to be…During the closing months of 1943 and the beginning of 1944, Homura announced the results of various battles in the Pacific. According to his story, Japan was winning all of them. Little did he know that each "victory" seemed, to some Guamanians familiar with Pacific geography, to be drawing the area of conflict closer and closer to Guam. From such information they concluded that the Americans were winning some battles and were slowly pushing across the Pacific toward Guam. (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, pp. 280-281)

The remainder of Carano and Sanchez's account on World War II on Guam in many ways mirrors the accounts of other history texts about this time period. We are presented with numerous accounts of forced labor and education, maltreatment and hunger, harsh punishments and death and fragments of Chamoru survival. We also learn from the authors that more feared than the Japanese military were perhaps the civilian officers who were accompanied by Saipanese interpreters tasked with maintaining "peace and order" among the people.[26]

The harshest of times are reported as the Americans' draw closer and closer to Guam. We continue to get a sense of some of the realities Chamorus faced during the war from Robert Roger's book, *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam* (1995). Roger's accounts of the war attempts to give Chamorus a presence in History.

> The Japanese immediately put the Chamorro men of the local military units to work as unpaid field-workers and as stevedores to unload ships. (p. 170)

---

[26] Chamorus from the island of Saipan were brought to Guam to aid Japanese officers in the interrogation of the Chamoru people on the island.

The entire population of Sumay was swiftly evicted in the first few days to make way for a Japanese garrison, and five Chamorritas were raped by Japanese troops in the takeover. (p. 171)

Signs were quickly posted all over Guam in English, mainly handwritten…with the words, "You must stop here and bow to us." Bowing was alien to the Chamorros, but they quickly learned that they must stop, turn, and bow to where the signs were posted, even if the place was unoccupied…If the bow was too perfunctory or too obsequious, it brought a swift kick or some other punishment. One Chamorro, Juan Manibusan, the father of five children, had his spinal cord broken by Japanese and Saipanesee policemen who beat him brutally when he failed to bow properly to the Dededo Police Station. Paralyzed, he died as a result of the beating. (p. 171)

More severe punishment was equally swift when two Chamorro youths were arrested for crimes…The Japanese authorities apparently decided to make examples of these boys. On 6 January, a large group of people, including family members of the accused, was rounded up and marched to Pigo Cemetary. There the two Chamorro youths were made to stand in front of freshly dug graves…blindfolded, and they waved goodbye…The two were then shot by a firing squad and fell back into their open graves. (pp. 171-172)

The islanders adopted an attitude of guarded, submissive neutrality toward the Japanese while hoping for the return of the Americans. A number of Chamorros secretly listened on shortwave radios to war news broadcast out of San Francisco. (p. 173)

With these documented accounts we are able to get a sense of a dominant narrative that stresses American loyalty and Japanese brutality in History. The angle presented by History is that the Chamoru people longed for American soldiers to return in a salvation effort from the evils of Japan. Chamorus did not have a presence outside of this larger story; likewise, no Chamoru is ever able to move against this narrative except of course for the "200 anti-American persons noted during the entire period from a total population of over 25,000" that Beardsley is sure to mention to the reader (1964, p. 219). But does this reflect the sentiment felt by Chamorus during the war or was this part of a later agenda to perpetuate American dominance on Guam? Was History on Guam part of the

colonizing project of the Chamoru people? What would a history of Guam look like if

they were the actors in their history?

These are some of the *other* stories. The stories that remain in the memories of

our *manamko* but never seem to make it onto the pages of a history text or a newspaper or

appear in a documented film or presentation about the war-torn island of Guam. These

are stories of survival amidst the war, and the actors are our Chamoru *manamko* who

survived the war and lived to tell their stories. This is the story of one Chamoru man

(personal communication).

> At the time of the invasion of Guam by the Japanese, I was eleven years old. I was forced to go to school in the first part of the Japanese occupation, because it was mandatory to learn how to read and write Japanese. I reached third grade, but shortly thereafter, the Japanese enforced a forced labor from ages 10-60. When that was implemented, I had no choice but to be pulled out of school to do forced labor. I worked in various military projects that normally are assigned to adults. I got assigned to work first at what they call the Alaguag Air Base project, which is what is now known as the Guam International Airport. We built that. I got involved in the building of that facility, military facility, with thousands of people, Chamorus and Koreans and Okinawans and Japanese.

> When the Americans started bombarding Guam, it became extremely dangerous. They pulled us out of the Alaguag project, and they assigned us to my hometown, which is Machananao, what is now known as the Agafa Gumas area. They assigned me projects at the sawmill building roads for the military vehicles and constructing Japanese bunkers and pillboxes.

> Following those days, we were ordered to meet in front of the police station in Machananao for a forced march to concentration camp in Mannengon. At that point, my father gathered all of us and told us what he highly suspected the intention of the Japanese for that concentration camp was. So he told us that his decision was for us not to comply and go and hide out in the jungles. Everyone of us, including me, was in objection of hiding out in the jungles because in our family there were 9 adults, 3 of us were pre-teen, and 6 little children from ages 1 through 5. Hiding out in the jungle with 6 little children was awfully risky, but my father is a stubborn old man. And he already made up his mind that we were going to hide out in the jungle. So no one could object to that because in Chamoru culture when your elder says something, right or wrong, you do it because that's what they want. So, instead of marching to the police station in Machananao to join the whole community of Machananao to march to

Mannengon, we headed in the opposite direction. We all packed up and headed for the jungle.

When we didn't show up to join the people of Machananao for the forced march, they sent a bunch of Chamoru men to our area to try and find us and to bring us in. And they could have found us, but they all pretended that they looked but they couldn't find us.

But it was a tremendous hardship. One of the biggest problems was securing water for our daily usage. We had food in abundance then because our ranch was well developed with crops. But every time we go out, me, my brother-in-law, and my oldest brother [to gather water and food], we almost get caught because, at that point, the Japanese were all over Machananao. Once when we went to get water at my uncle's ranch, just as a matter of curiosity, I went over to the side of the ranch and peeked through a crack in the bushes and saw two Japanese guys lying down sleeping. I signaled my brother and my brother-in-law, so we all took off. Each trip that we made, we almost bumped into Japanese patrol [officers]. Fortunately, we were so cautious, that we saw them first.

This is the story of another Chamoru man (personal communication).

At the time of the Japanese occupation, they wanted us to register in Agana. So my brother rented a car and we went. The first thing the Japanese asked when all of us went there was, "Who knows how to drive?" So I raised my hand. And my brother said, "You don't know how to drive. You are just learning how to drive." So I went up and got my license. And they gave my brother the keys to a truck. So, the next day we picked them up in up the truck. They asked, "Can you take us to the hide out of the military?" I said, "Yes." We went up to Andersen. We started working on the landfill. They gave us a shovel. I was only a 17-year old, but I worked hard. After this job was finished, we went back to Agana. There they asked us again, "Who knows how to drive a truck?" I got used to driving an American truck which is on the left hand side but the Japanese truck was on the right hand side. So, I knew how to steer it at least. They gave me the truck, and the Japanese sat next to me. We went to Barrigada, and he was watching how I shifted the truck. I stepped on the gas and made it go 65mph. I didn't know that there was a bomb hole in the hill. As soon as I got to the top of the hill, the truck fell in the hole and crashed. The Japanese slapped me and beat me up. So I ran. When I got back to Yigo, I told me father. He asked me, "Why are you home so early?" I said, "The Japanese beat me up." And I started crying. My father took me to my aunt's house and told my uncle to shave my head. So the next day, I went back to work and stood in line. The Japanese asked, "Where is the driver from yesterday?" The Japanese came to me and said, "It was you." I said, "No it wasn't me. It was my brother." I always played around with the Japanese.

In another incident, the Japanese were looking for someone who knows how to use dynamite. My pare' said, "Let's do it." So we went to the side, and he

showed me how to connect it. So finally, they chose eight boys including us and everyone was given a partner. So we started connecting the dynamite. One of the guys didn't connect it at the end. So when it was ready to blow up, here came the number one guy. He said, "We are going to blast it." So he connected the battery, but it didn't blow up. He looked around, and then he started walking and checking. He found the thing that was not attached. He picked it up and attached it. The bomb exploded. So I ran to my car and quickly left back to Yigo.

They told us that everyone had to go to the camp at Mannengon. So my mother and father and us children gathered all the chickens and put them in a cage. Every day we were able to eat chicken. I was given the job of transporting again. On July 17, the Americans had already started bombing. So the Japanese told us to pick up the chickens and go straight to Manngenon. They did not want us to go anywhere else. We got to Dededo. The Japanese Army was there, and they accused us of running. Two days later, they made us line up, and they beat us. They slapped us. They kicked us. When I fainted, they left. They didn't finish the job. When I woke up, I thanked God that I was still alive. I check for blood, but there was no blood. So I went back to Yigo and got the cow. When I was ready to go back to Mannengon, I saw my brother and he said, "Let the cow go and go and hide. The Americans are already here. Go and hide."

This brief story comes from the memory of a Chamoru woman (personal communication). Her story is limited because she was rather young during the time of the war. But the little that she has chosen to remember is perhaps more revealing than her experiences that have been lost in time.

My ears were good and my senses were good because I could hear the bombings. I always cried every time I would hear it, and I was always muzzled with a hand because we weren't allowed to cry. If it weren't that my father worked for the Japanese government and [we] befriended a [Japanese] family…if it weren't for that particular family, we probably would have starved because they were getting us food…They found out where we were, and they were giving us food. I'm sorry to say I don't remember the name of the family, but they were very kind to us. That is all I remember about the time of the war.

The inconsistencies found in many of the stories read and heard may be more a result of what happened late in the war rather than a true representation of the Japanese "occupation" of the island. Chamorus, in the last few months of war, experienced an extreme portrayal of human brutality. In the early months of 1944, the U.S. military was

preparing its attacks on the Japanese battalion on the shores of Guam after having already

captured the rest of the Mariana Islands (Peattie, 1988).[27] While further inland, the

Japanese were preparing for a large-scale massacre of the Chamoru people. With the

threat of loss looming over this proud people, the Japanese forced Chamorus to leave

their homes bound for a containment camp in Mannengon Hills. This would allow the

Japanese soldiers to have better control over the local population who they believed were

a security issue for troops especially during this desperate time in the war.

> We were living down in Agana before the war. And all of a sudden, we hear this siren going on and on, and planes flying over, and everybody was running away. Once the Japanese attack your house that means you have 24 hours to move out. So, my parents had to take five children, and we had to move out and look for another place. There was a friend of ours that we moved in with, and then the war came. Then, we went up to Agana Heights going up to Mannengon. And that is where we stayed for a couple of months.
>
> And when we are up there we hardly had any food. There wasn't any food to eat. When my father went out, he'd get a small breadfruit that was not even ready to be eaten. You'd boil that and feed your kids. Two weeks later, I was so sick. I got malnutrition, but the Japanese were already looking for the Chamorro people. My parents thought that I would not make it. They had four other children to take care of so what happened was they abandoned me right there in the bokongo in Mannengon. I remember that my mother kissed me. I was eight years old at that time, and my mother kissed me. She told me that she loved me, and God would be with me. And then with all the bombings and all kinds of commotion going on at the bokongo, people were going in different directions. I noticed that my parents left, and my brothers and sisters all left. I was alone.

---

[27] U.S. forces gained control of the islands in Micronesia beginning with attacks in the Marshall Islands and Caroline Islands from February to April 1944. Continuing into Saipan and the rest of the Maraina Islands, the American fleet launched a disastrous battle of the Marianas in June 1944. The United States successfully neutralized Japanese threat in the Northwest Pacific, including Guam, by the end of the summer 1944; however, Japanese soldiers were still scattered throughout for several years following the end of WWII (Peattie, 1998).

And then a young man was walking by with his wife and daughter, and he heard a child cry. So he told his wife to hold the baby while he goes and sees who is crying. When he went inside, he found me. So he picked me up and told me not to get scared. He told me that he was going to take care of me, and we were going to go down to where the Americans were at.

He came out and his wife and his daughter were gone. Somebody was telling them to go down south because that is where the Americans were at. So everybody was heading towards Agat. It was about two and a half days of walking when we saw people start coming up from the south because it was already liberated. The man handed me over to the American doctors, and he went around to look for his family. That was the last time I saw the guy. I didn't even know his name or anything.

I was sitting outside of the tent [of the Americans] watching all these people go by. I was looking for any familiar faces, and finally I noticed my sister. She was carrying something on her head. I stood up and started yelling at her. I'm sorry…after sixty years it still hurts. When I saw my sister, I started yelling at her, and then my mother ran over with my dad. When they saw me, they thought I was a ghost.

After the war, we moved to Agana Heights where we stayed before. (personal communication)

It was during these desperate times that Chamorus experienced the worst of Japanese discipline.

When human will is driven to a pitch of extreme anxiety, it tends to snap suddenly when faced with overwhelming stress, even in seemingly well-disciplined military units…The American bombardment eroded Japanese discipline to a point where the behavior of many Japanese policemen and soldiers degenerated into a kind of destructive nihilism. (Peattie, 1988, pp. 178, 181)

Many Chamorus were brutally beaten, raped, ravaged, and murdered at the hands of impulsive Japanese soldiers. And it is these stories that are used to re-present wartime on Guam. It is these stories that are told and it is these stories that are heard.

The "Liberation" of Guam

But what followed the pointless yet frantic actions of the Japanese toward the
Chamoru people was destructive in both its means and ends.

> The American bombardment of Guam had gathered momentum from 18 July on
> to become by the morning of 21 July the most intense crescendo of conventional
> firepower ever inflicted on any locality in the Pacific war. On that date, W-Day,
> the island once more experienced an invasion by the Americans, this time in a
> shattering apocalypse of death and destruction that far surpassed the Japanese
> invasion of December 1941. (Peattie, 1988, p. 181)

On July 21, 1944, U.S. Marines landed on the beaches of Agat and Asan in the southern
part of Guam and shortly after, the island was leveled. Numerous lives were lost to the
Japanese. But the Chamorus who survived the Japanese occupation did so only to have
their homes destroyed or even worse lives lost as their American "liberators" fought to
reclaim control of the island. The U.S. soldiers were welcomed nonetheless.

> The memory of the Japanese regime lingers as a fresh one and will not be
> forgotten in Guam for many decades. A number of Guamanians were beheaded
> for merely smiling at an American plane as it passed overhead in reconnaissance
> during the last days before the assaults of Asan and Agat. Many more lived
> through the occupation only to die in the final Japanese orgy of slaughter as
> American troops debarked along the western shores of the island and began to
> fight their way inland. The joy and genuine feeling of welcome expressed in the
> native reception of American troops was overwhelming to the liberators. They
> had not expected this, since they had been forced to annihilate Guam's flimsy
> civilization and much of its natural beauty in order to liberate it. But the
> Guamanian friendliness was omnipresent as American troops advanced, and it
> could not be denied, recognizing this loyalty, that the people of Guam had
> unequivocally earned their right to be called Americans. (Beardsley, 1964, p. 219)

So, why is it that the memory of the Japanese occupation during in the war haunts the
memories of the Chamoru people while the Americans, who not only abandoned the
people at the beginning of the war but also destroyed the island at the end, are
remembered in the war as being the liberators—the heroes. The generation that had lived
through the war was the same generation that had spent the 43 years before the war

becoming American. America, therefore, was familiar to the Chamoru people and Japan was the unknown. War came upon the Chamoru people without much warning, and in a quick instant, their future was filled with uncertainty. Chamorus, thus, held on to that which was familiar—not necessarily better but definitely familiar—America.

But I believe the answer lies more in the fact that the role of History and discourse in the memory of the Chamoru people is not as innocent an actor as we make think. How much of what is remembered about the War a product of History rather than the events of the past? If a large part of the stories we remember come from what we've heard, what we've been told, what we've been taught, and what we've read, how much of the cruelty and despair that the Chamoru people remember about the War and the happiness and joy surrounding the liberation is a result of the (re)telling of the past? It is the texts, images, and stories that continue to (re)present themselves to an eager audience. We are an incredibly rich people anchored in time by our ability to remember as well as forget our past. History, however, has not given Chamorus the ability to choose those parts of the past that will aid in reconciling the colonial impetus. Instead, History has done the remembering and forgetting for us. This does not attempt to discount the pain and suffering that comes with war. This is merely a way to suggest that History plays a much bigger role in what we remember about the past than just simply documenting events so that we can remember. How we choose to remember something is quite possibly more important than what it is we really remember.

Rehabilitating the "Grateful" Chamoru

The hardships of war experienced during the Japanese occupation continue, even

as generations become further and further detached from this part of Guam's past, to be

compared to the apparently generous nature of prior American rule. The words of an

underground song "Uncle Sam Please Come Back to Guam" illustrates this point. It was

popular as a sign of hope among Chamorus during wartime, but even though it became

cause for punishment then, the memory of American kindness lives on as Chamorus

serenade dear Uncle Sam every year on July 21.

> *Early Monday morning*
> *The action came to Guam,*
> *Eighth of December,*
> *Nineteen forty-one,*
> *The people went crazy*
> *Right here on Guam.*
>
> *Oh, Mr. Sam, Sam, My dear Uncle Sam,*
> *Won't you please come back to Guam?*
>
> *Our lives are in danger*
> *You better come*
> *And kill all the Japanese*
> *Right here on Guam.*
>
> *Oh, Mr. Sam, Sam, My dear Uncle Sam,*
> *Won't you please come back to Guam?*[28]

And as a result, the Japanese and American occupations of the island are often defined as

two opposite poles of colonization with the former being oppressive and the latter

benevolent. Discourse presents the opposition as such: "economic development by the

---

[28] This is an underground song, "Uncle Sam Please Come Back to Guam" popularized at the time the Japanese occupied Guam during WWII. The Japanese forbade both adults and children from singing this song urging the return of the Americans. Although different versions of this song are sung, it depicts the fanatic image of the loyal Chamorro subject at the time of the occupation and American "liberation" of the island.

Japanese is seen as forced, whereas economic development by the U.S. was portrayed as progressive. Forced learning of Japanese is seen as indoctrination, whereas forced learning of English was portrayed as educational" (Perez, 1994, pp. 20-21). As a result of the suffering that occurred during the time of the Japanese occupation, Chamorus seemed willing to establish peaceful relations with the Americans and eager to once again become American even if that meant as subjects. "Grateful for their renewed sense of freedom, Chamorros created a collective sense of obligation to the United States, thus strengthening the bonds of reciprocation between Chamorros and Americans. Many Chamorros internalized the liberation of Guam into their ways of thinking, receiving, and sharing. At the end of the war, they committed themselves to perpetuating the liberal aspects of American democracy, and to 'aiding' Americans at some point in the future" (Camacho, 2011, p. 63). It is at the point that American troops arrived on the island to "save" the people that we are presented with an image of Chamoru children happily receiving candy from military troops, and since then discourse tells us that we are a people in need of repair.

Chamorus have been written into history as overtly patriotic subjects under the American flag in an effort to strengthen an American identity. An American identity for the Chamorro subject would ultimately perpetuate the American military presence on the island.[29] The result is a history that speaks of "the benevolence of the American colonial administration and rehabilitation in a faraway God-forsaken place" and overshadows the narrative of the indigenous people and their ability to survive (Diaz, 1993, p. 5). This is a history that not only has served the interests of foreign dominance on Guam but has also

---

[29] The term "Chamorro" is being used to refer to the American colonial subject as opposed to "Chamoru" which refers to a cultural/ethnic group of people.

helped to make that dominance real for the people and the island (Guha, 1996). Colonization has determined *for* the Chamoru people who and what can and cannot be written into Guam's history. Guam history, thus, became a story of significant foreigners and insignificant Chamorus in their native homeland. And because history becomes entangled in identity formation, a discourse that implicates a people as complacent subjects inevitably defines them as such. Chamoru agency is, consequently, validated only within the dominant discourse of American history and change, and Chamoru memories are considered part of history only when they parallel American colonial discourse and share in the American colonial experience.

The memories that many Chamorus have of the seeming brutality of the Japanese occupation coupled with what appears to be the glorious coming of the American saviors have resulted in a patriotism unlike any other. It is difficult to understand the stories that weave in and out of this complex narrative of war, but it remains intriguing how an instance of fear brought on by war can create an experience—a memory—an identity— that is undoubtedly interwoven in, and in some ways a product of, colonization and a history that appears to be an inevitable part of the colonial process.

CHAPTER 3. CREATING THE CHAMORRO

In looking at the reflection of Chamorro identity
we find that it is not a smooth, glassy surface we see.
With all the forces of nature we find that we are looking at reflections,
as multi-faceted, as full of color, texture and moods, and depths
and as ever-changing as the ocean's surface. (Perez, 1994, pp. 22)

Chamoru identity is not an entity nor is the formation of Chamoru identity an

isolated process. It is a reflection of a continual process of finding meaning in history

and in the memories of Chamorus. Chamorus have used these markers to (re)imagine an

identity embedded in American colonization. Chamoru identity, then, became contingent

upon the historical experiences that are particular to the people of Guam and the

Chamoru culture. As Camacho notes,

> the return of the American military forces to Guam reinforced most Chamorro
> loyalties to the United States…many Chamorros continued to showcase their
> loyalties toward the United States and their faith in Yu'us. The notion of
> American liberation soon became entrenched in the English political vocabulary
> of Guam Chamorros, as did memories of Chamorro appreciation for the American
> elimination of Japanese occupational forces. (2011, p. 82)

This identity of Chamorus that Camacho describes is marked by the return of military

forces and continues to be implicated by the discourse of American colonial history. This

is an identity that was constructed within the experience of World War II on Guam and in

relation to the Japanese occupants and the American military and, shortly thereafter, was

further reinforced by the rehabilitation of a war-torn island. This Chamorro identity

presupposes a prior background that pulls Chamorus into a web of influences that was

already being fashioned by a dominant American influence that began over forty years

before the start of World War II. But "like the Japanese forces that occupied Guam from

1941 to 1944, this more recent invader would need only a few years to accomplish what

the US Naval colonial government could not do in the fifty years before World War II:

glue Chamorros to America like there was no (Chamorro) tomorrow, and inspire the

island's slogan of 'Guam, Where America's Day Begins" (Diaz, 2010, p. 182)

As Chamorus began to rebuild their lives after the devastation of war, their

political, social and cultural realities took on new shapes. Chamoru identity became a

product of the WWII memories of fear and has been reaffirmed by the many exchanges

that Chamorus have had throughout their history. The stories that we have of this era

shed some light on the inter-contextualized nature of identity found in our histories.

American colonial histories of the island, however, have tended to privilege a dominant

discourse of fear and loyalty to maintain a particular order.[30] The history of the Chamoru

people, especially that of the war and post-war era has inevitably been masked by the

history of the United States, and more specifically, the American military, to preserve a

hegemonic identity and help create a Chamorro identity that was rooted in maintaining

American dominance on the island.

> [H]istory is blind. It cannot see beyond the particular global tales of European
> and American action on Chamorros, action which is wishfully seen as success of
> national yearnings. It cannot see how it figures local culture, how it figures local
> history. And if it is blind to anything beyond its own moves, and if it is blind to
> its own local moves, it certainly cannot see how local cultures structure local,
> even restructure global histories. (Diaz, 1993, pp. 5)

American colonialism has had a great impact on the process by which Chamoru identity

was, and continues to be, used to protect a dominant identity—which is more often than

not that of the colonizer. The dominant American identity is, thus, defined against those

---

[30] For more on the use of fear and loyalty in discourse, see Vincent Diaz's *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, and Indigeneity in Guam* (2010) and Keith Camacho's *Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory, and History in the Mariana Islands* (2011), respectively.

differences—in the colonized Chamorus—that threaten the integrity of that identity. The creation of a Chamorro identity was useful for the American colonial project in the early twentieth century and was increasingly important to help perpetuate a hegemonic identity. Chamorus needed to also be made clean and robust in order to sustain a large military base in the Pacific immediately after World War II. Strategic military defense was the driving force that in turn resulted in strategically defining identity politics for Chamorus in the years following the war. By claiming that Chamorus were distinct from their American counterparts and subordinate, the American military was able to gain control over them. And by consciously making them healthy and strong, the American military was able to create a community that would aid in the military presence on the island. American colonization made Chamorus increasingly conscious of their differences and since then has continued to reaffirm that difference not only to dominate but to also privilege a sense of identity that would ensure successful and continued rule.

Chamoru identity through a specific experience became embedded in the continual perpetuation of the traditions and practices of American naval rule and social practices. Chamorro identity was formed out of this process of perpetuation and eventual (re)creation. This is reflected in what Keith Camacho suggests, in *Cultures of Commemoration* (2011), is the active engagement of people in both remembering and commemorating their past (p. 17). Camacho argues that what Chamorus remember, "forget or remember to forget" is illustrated by symbols of commemoration displayed on the island (2011 pg. 22). An analysis of the (re)created identity found in commemoration links the everyday organization of production and reproduction and acknowledges the social and political interactions of individuals and their surroundings. This American

post-war time period changed identity for Chamorus, and this identity has been further articulated in the many interactions, perceptions, and altered relationships embedded in colonization inevitably (re)imagining a Chamorro identity for Chamorus.

In the American post-war encounter, identity became a means for identifying Chamorus as distinct from their American colonizers. Chamorro identity provided the means for the assimilation of Chamorus into the American colony while never truly assimilating this colonized people into the American family. This was the basis for a Chamorro identity that was synonymous with the American post-war experience of fear and loyalty, and in the end, subsumed all other personal identities into one collective Chamorro identity that has helped to sustain over 60 years of American domination.

In the interplay between internal and external factors within the social environment, Chamorro identity depended on the whirlwind of colonial power that has come in the form of civilization, militarization, and modernization and has inevitable consumed the Chamoru people. The formation of this identity, however, was largely a result of outside forces. Chamorro identity was formed on the partial knowledge, real or imaginary, translated into the dominant discourse and became characteristic of the group and the basis for which all Chamorus belonging to that group identified. As a result of the American post-war experience and memory, identity for Chamorus has become the tool to situate Chamorus in a more desirable Chamorro community that is capable of sustaining American rule.

And in an effort to maintain and foster this particular dominant identity, Chamorus have been presented, not only to others but to themselves as well, as happy followers of imposed religions, cultures, educations, governments, and economies. The

continued (re)presentation of Chamorro identity resulted in the inevitable creation of a

Chamorro that is not entirely representative of pre-war Chamorus nor is it entirely

representative of what happened after the rebuilding of the island. The immediate

American post-war experience, however, has naturalized a Chamorro identity for the

Chamoru people.

Creating the Chamorro by Re-creating Chamorus

Shortly after Guam was "liberated" by American soldiers, efforts toward reviving

the island and its people got underway.

> Well right away we noticed even if we weren't US citizens at the time, I noticed it right away—the difference [in comparison to the Japanese]—and the difference is that we are more free to more or less roam around wherever we are, and the American people don't even bother. Oh, they ask you where you are going for safety measures and that is why they put us in one certain area. It's an entirely different situation because at that time we don't have to worry about getting up in the morning, making our own food, going to work because we were free so we just more or less sat back, relaxed, ate a lot of candy and got diarrhea. (personal communication)

Much like this Chamoru man's sentiment toward the American military presence, many

Chamorus were pleased by what their future may hold. Uncertainty, however, may have

been the stronger message within these happier stories of post-war Guam.

> We were on our way out because we were liberated. It's so fast that we didn't have time to think. We didn't even think of taking everything we had. At the time, people are jubilant—hollering, singing. We were excited. I mean we were jumping up and down though we didn't know what's in the future for us. But the feeling and the idea was that we didn't have to endure the hardship anymore— seeing people being punished. In a way I enjoyed [the liberation]. We enjoyed that kind of life to a certain extent. (personal communication)

The future began to unfold as Chamorus were led out of Mannengon and into another

containment camp of sorts before homes and villages were rebuilt.[31]

> You can't explain really how the people were so happy when they saw them [the Marines]. They wanted to take us away from there because they already had a place for us in Agat. They had their rations with them see, and we haven't seen chocolate and all those rations. We were spoiled by the Marines. But to see how the people felt…it is indescribable really. We walked all through the mountains, and then when we got there they provided us with little tents for each family, and if you had a big family, you had a couple of tents. I think we were there for a month or so. And then when they felt like there were no more Japanese or hardly any danger to the people then we were authorized to come down to our place in Agana. But most of the houses were down there. We had to build a shack and have our family stay there because most of the houses were bombed. We tried to build up what we needed for the family, and then later on we were sent to Sinajana where the government built the houses in the villages. The Americans condemned the properties and they built houses for us and that is when we lived more comfortably. (personal communication)

> We were jubilant because we were liberated from some atrocities that I've seen going on. We hadn't had a better living condition. We were more or less free to do what we wanted to do. Like when we were finally given clearance to come up here to Yigo we were all over the place, and the marines over there, they don't bother us. Matter of fact they help us out, whatever they had over there, they brought it over to our little shack. Yes, to me it's a better life because right now we're enjoying all the freedom. (personal communication)

Many Chamorus much like the woman and man in this story were overcome with joy at

the thought of the American military presence on the island. The experience of

(re)creation that followed, however, is one of struggle—perhaps, a different sort of

struggle, but a struggle nonetheless.

> Well, the only thing about that was when we were under Navy regulations—military rule—there was control. At the same time, you are given freedom to go and build your house somewhere, wherever you want to, but you have to follow

---

[31] The attention of the military, at the time, shifted from the mere liberation of a small group of people to claiming world victory in the war. During this time, the United States military planned and executed the detonation of the H-bomb. The Enola Gay departed from the neighboring island of Saipan on bound for Japan where thousands were killed. After the war officially ended, the United States focused its efforts toward turning Guam into one of the strongest American military forward bases in the Pacific.

the governor which was a navy officer and whatever he dictates. So there is the control, and yet there is freedom. You are free to do [something], but there is control…

Every time we open our mouth Uncle Sam is there. You cannot do that with another country. They gave us all the money we want too, but there is a stipulation. You can go so far with this but when you get there…whoa…come back again, and we will start all over. Yes, there are many things that the U.S. controls though we have freedom, but like I said you have freedom but only so far. I give you this much rope, but don't try to break that rope (personal communication).

In the excerpts above, the Chamoru man sheds some light on the irony of American freedoms that were to be granted and then presumably guaranteed by their colonizers. The same people who were proclaiming freedom were also implementing control—the Americans, more specifically, the American Navy.

In the early years after the war, the American Navy quickly assumed their positions. In a speech given by former Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, at a meeting of the Institute of Pacific Relations entitled "Our Pacific Dependencies and the Peace Crisis: Navy Rule," Ickes points out some of the inconsistencies with American democracy and the rule of its oversees colonies.[32] During the time immediately following the war, the Navy imposed rule on the Chamoru people that was no less arbitrary and senseless than the traumatic experience they had had with the Japanese a few months earlier. This heavy naval rule, however, was necessary to re-create the Chamoru people as Chamorro (that is, of course, Chamorro with an O-R-R-O) subjects in order to aid in the military build-up. Among the early rehabilitation efforts, American

---

[32] Harold L. Ickes resigned as Secretary of the Interior shortly after the War to establish himself as a newspaper columnist. Ickes later addressed the Institute of Pacific Relations on May 29, 1946 in order to appeal to the United Nations in support of removing military rule in the colonies and placing them under the purview of the United Nations General Assembly (Cogan, 2008, p. 39).

Naval officials established laws and mandates that would (re)create the war-torn community as well as ensure the successful (re)militarization of the island. It was their job not only to facilitate material progress among Chamorus but physical and mental transformation of Chamorus as well. They were to become Americans in an American colony.

The Move Toward Citizenship

What followed the early American "rehabilitation" efforts was the granting of United States citizenship to the Chamoru people, the implementation of a legal system that mirrored the United States Constitution, the establishment of an American standard of education for Chamoru school children, the commemoration of American heroes and symbols by "loyal" Chamorus, and the influx of American mainstream culture to which many Chamorus continue to aspire to, but this did not come with ease. Chamorus faced little progress and many obstacles before finally being granted a level of self-government and citizenship in from the U.S. Congress in 1950. The Chamoru people of Guam continued a battle that began before the Japanese capture and did not see an end until years after. The United States' desire to not only acquire but also maintain hold of the island after WWII resulted in the creation of a community and an identity that is undoubtedly implicated in this colonial context; and the relationship between the United States and Guam has produced great changes for both the island and its people. The way in which a community identifies itself tends to be (re)imagined in light of a change that occurs in space and at a particular time. This is why communities, especially indigenous communities, often become imagined in the context of colonization. Identity is imagined

through the discourse a particular reality, and it becomes defined by the means through which it has been (re)imagined. In the American colonial context on Guam, the Chamorro identity that has been (re)constructed out of the context of WWII has become the perceived reality of the community; and since the Chamorro community has been constructed in the American colonial context, it is what has defined it as well.

The American colonization of Guam in its desire to gain power over the land and its people created a Chamorro community which in turn created a Chamorro in order to perpetuate the colonial community that continues to sustain the colonial subject. As Chamorus traveled the long road toward self-government and citizenship, they inevitable became Chamorros (with an O-R-R-O). This Chamorro community, in turn, helped to cultivate a Chamorro that would become the desired American subject for the colonial community. The project thus became the transformation of the degenerate and troublesome natives of Guam into upright and moral subjects to prevent a physical, mental, moral, and social degradation of not only the military and local population but the nation as a whole.[33] Inherent in the perpetuation of colonial rule, therefore, is the embodiment of the "subject" by the people. It is at the point of assuming that sense of identity that colonization is able to gain power over a people. And it is in the (re)creation and constant reinforcement of the "subject" by the colonizer, that the colonial community is maintained once again sustaining the identity of the "subject" creating a perpetual loop.

---

[33] Vicente Diaz argues that this "local (or hemispheric) anxiety" became a national concern and was the driving force for much of the health mandates on the island. "Not just the man, but the entire nation, was to be endowed with masculine virility" (2002, p. 180).

American colonialism has attempted to erase the threat of Chamoru otherness by bringing the people under its control and then recreating them into complacent subjects. As a result, contemporary Chamorro identity is a product of the many "gifts" of colonization. Chamorus, since WWII, have been further entangled in American institutions of politics, education, society, and economics that have helped sustain colonization, and Chamoru identity is implicated in this colonial experience. The U.S. became the center from which Chamorus could define themselves as not only as Chamorus but more importantly as loyal war survivors. Chamorus were, then, encouraged to assimilate as Americans by becoming a particular kind of Chamorro—one that reaffirmed the idea of a "proud" subject pledging allegiance to the U.S. flag. "[T]o establish an identity is to create social and conceptual space for it to be in ways that impinge on the spaces available to other possibilities" (Conolly, 1991, p. 160). Thus, becoming Chamorro was only possible at the expense of the Chamoru.

There, however, continues to exist a tenuous bond between Chamorus and the United States that is reinforced by the many American ideals that continue to prevail, but are also undermined by the Chamoru persistence to survive. Ironically, American colonialism, which has threatened to breakdown the Chamoru community, has also brought Chamorus closer to understanding their history and identity. By understanding the role the colonizer played in colonizing a community, it is possible to understand the forces at play in the formation of an identity. The Chamoru quest for self-government and citizenship has been and continues to be a tenuous part of this search for the Chamoru self. This, however, is only possible if we understand what role American colonization played in the creation of a Chamorro self.

The years and years of cries of Chamorus that went unheard eventually led the Guam Assembly to force the United States Congress to pay attention. On March 5, 1949, the Guam Assembly walked out of session and refused to reconvene in protest against the injustices of the current American Naval administration. What started as a demonstration against the Navy's refusal to permit a civil service employee from answering to the congressional committee ended in the Assembly garnering national attention for their desire for an organic act that would provide local self-government and citizenship to the people of Guam.[34] Chamoru leaders staged this walkout to bring national attention to problems with Naval rule on the island. Chamoru leaders expressed their frustration with the appointed Governor over arbitrary rule and threats toward personal security. They refused to watch as the little power they had diminished through the efforts of the Naval administration. In their efforts to bring to light these issues, Chamoru leaders rallied support from Chamorus on Guam and Chamorus abroad and American friends living throughout the United States. The walkout gained national attention through American media sources, and helped build momentum for what was to be a turning point in the American colonization of Guam.

In addition to the efforts of local officials on the home-front, numerous Chamoru men and women traveled to Washington, D.C. to appeal to the American democratic principles of members of the U.S. Congress on behalf of the people of Guam. Prior to WWII, efforts to achieve self-government and citizenship were thwarted. U.S. officials

---

[34] Information about the Guam Assembly walkout can be found in an article entitled "Navy Action Protested by Guam Assembly" printed in the Washington post and reprinted *We Fought the Navy and Won: Guam's Quest for Democracy* (Cogan, 2008, p. 132, 112-115). For more on the Guam Assembly walkout see *Righting Civil Wrongs: The Guam Congress Walkout of 1949* (Hattori, 1996).

believed that granting citizenship to the people of Guam would negatively impact international relations in Asia. "Citizenship for the Chamorros would 'aggravate the danger to peaceful international situations.'"[35] The desire to secure defense and establish peaceful relations prior to the war and the war that would last less than 4 years stalled these efforts in the U.S. Congress for the next two decades. Immediately after the war, the desire to attain U.S. citizenship was renewed by the sense of patriotism and loyalty paired with the fear felt after the American military successfully re-captured the island from the Japanese.

Efforts to improve local authority in an American colony included repeated appeals to the Naval governor as well as other Naval Officials. Chamoru leaders already frustrated by the powers of the Naval governor were also faced with taking of land by the Navy from Chamorus without just compensation.[36] This added fuel to their demands for justice. In response to the appeals by local officials, the Superior Court of Guam was established to settle disputes involving the Navy, and in 1947, a proclamation was issued granting limited powers to the Guam Congress. These powers which consisted of the ability to submit proposals for laws did little to make the Guam Congress more than simply an advisory board. Authority to make such changes was still under the direction of the Naval administration. Given the circumstances of the Cold War and the political frenzy spreading throughout the nation, it is easy to see that granting greater political powers would lead the United States to believe that Chamorus may potentially compromise any strategic defense that was being established in the region.

---

[35] Quote from Secretary of the Navy Claude A. Swanson in 1936 (Hattori, 1996, p. 59)
[36] For more details on land compensation by the Land and Claims Commission *Righting Civil Wrongs: The Guam Congress Walkout of 1949* (Hattori, 1996).

As a result of this struggle between local and naval officials, Chamorus were caught in the pull for power. Chamorus used the walkout of 1949 as a means to address the greater issue of citizenship. And so, the creation of a Chamoru community led by a Chamoru government under the direction of an American administration that mirrored an American system was created. Chamoru identity was the motivating factor in this social mobilization effort to achieve self-government and U.S. citizenship. It was the means by which Chamorus were able to act upon social and political issues that affect them. Because social and political relationships inherently involve power dynamics, groups often seek action. "Exclusion of officially specified groups has the unintended consequence of defining, legitimating and provoking group identity and mobilization, forging struggles for inclusion between state agents and emerging political actors" (Marx, 1995, p. 159).

Paradoxically, the formation of this Chamorro identity was a means for attempting to improve the subordinate relationship of the Chamorus while continually strengthening the power relationship between them and the United States. Chamorus adopted the political tools within the dominant discourse in their struggle against their colonizer. Because identity formation and mobilization are often discussed using western concepts and in the terms of the dominant power, groups, such as Chamorus, who desire rights and improved statuses tend to get caught up in a web of unrelenting discourses with no way out. Issues surrounding rights to land and property, citizenship, equality, and a recognized status are inherently linked to the need to preserve identity and ultimately, survival. The (re)creation of both Chamoru and Chamorro identity, in post-war Guam, was a strategic choice within a changing world.

The Organic Act of Guam

Opposition to Guam's present situation by Chamorro politicians was increasingly visible on the island. Chamorus were concerned with protecting the island's indigenous cultural background and at the same time sought American citizenship and civil government. These Chamorus believed that American citizenship and self-government were the only way to guarantee equality and a sense of security under the protection of the United States government. Chamorus were eager to gain political recognition as they continued to uphold their traditions under the American flag. Appeals to justice and American ideals made on behalf of the Chamoru people to the Congress necessitated the recognition of rights stating that the people of Guam were neither citizens nor aliens of the United States.

After six years of negotiation, Congress passed the Organic Act.[37] And on August 1, 1950, President Harry Truman signed the Organic Act of Guam into law declaring the island as an unincorporated territory of the United States. This marked the end of military rule and the beginning of local self-government for the people of Guam. The law, which became effective on the sixth anniversary of the end of WWII on Guam, also granted United States citizenship to the people. "It was not a benevolent gift from a generous colonizer or a prize awarded to the Chamorros…Rather, its long-overdue passage in an era of decolonization was due to many factors, in large part to a half-century of Chamorro protest" (Hattori, 1996, p. 57). This was the first and last time,

---

[37] The Founders of the Organic Act of Guam passed in 1950 were members of the political community of Guam: Baltazar Bordallo, Francisco B. Leon Guerrero, Carlos P. Taitano, Governor Carlton Skinner, and Antonio B. Won Pat (Troutman, 2002).

however, that the United States made any effort toward self-government with respect to the island and its people.

The Act declared the inhabitants of Guam as American citizens. Although the issuance of citizenship status permanently bound the people of Guam to the United States, Congress made it clear that this Act was in no way a promise of inclusion into the Union. This, however, helped mask the impossibility of the colony ever truly becoming part of the union. Many Chamorus held this newly gained political identity as citizens of a "great" country in high esteem. Although the years immediately after the passage of the Organic Act resulted in incredible transformations in the island's government, it meant little to the reality of the relationship between the people of Guam and the United States government. Chamorus were still subjects under the American flag and Chamorus would still have to contend with a new reality that was increasingly at odds with their reality. Chamorros, on the other hand, saluted with a renewed patriotism their relationship to the United States.

Chamorus now carried United States passports and were entitled to financial and military assistance from the United States, but they were still not a completely self-governing people, they were not completely a part of the United States or outside of it, nor were they particularly clear about the future of Guam with the increasing rate of in-migration and out-migration and the continued dependence on the federal government. Guam's Organic Act made Guam an unincorporated territory of the United States giving the U.S. colonial administration over the island and its people and making Guam subject to the laws of the country. The local government has authority over all local matter in as much as it does not interfere with the national or international interests of the United

States or contradict U.S. law. The people of Guam are citizens of the United States and have been afforded limited rights and privileges under the flag that are subject to the geographic location of the citizen.[38]

Chamorro identity and legitimacy have since, to varying degrees, become centered on the notions of nationhood, statehood, and citizenship. Identity formation, in general, is a result of state and national policy and action. And so social constructions of Chamorro identity, then, get placed in the political arena where U.S. citizenship becomes the collective identity for the people. Chamorro identity meant U.S. citizenship. This identity defined through citizenship was symbolic of the experiences and representations of Chamorros in the larger context of the United States. U.S. citizenship was the means by which Chamorros thus identified with and became tied to their community and possibly more importantly their nation. Often times, this Chamorro political identity and U.S. citizenship rejected any other construct of identity such as cultural and social as irrelevant or insignificant and placed primary importance on the identity that was constructed by and within the political institution.

Political notions of Chamorro identity are then shifted to individual notions of identity and often expressed through values based on race, language, religion, ethnicity, and culture. A Chamorro identity that is contingent upon these ideas is constantly asserted to solidify the community and defended against claims by other groups. This

---

[38] Statutory citizenship, as the status that is granted to citizens of the U.S. territories is known, is the result of a U.S. Congressional Act. The bill of rights does not apply in its entirety to statutory citizens nor do statutory citizens have the right to vote for representatives to the national government. The only rights that are afforded to statutory citizens are those to which Congress deems are fundamental. Statutory citizens may claim complete rights and benefits once they are residents of one of the 50 states of the union.

accounts for the unstable nature of Chamorro identity. Ironically, this same identity is also thought of as a means for solidifying and stabilizing a community. Chamorus come together as members of the community with a unifying identity—a Chamorro identity.

The construction of some kind of identity—Chamoru and Chamorro—is a fundamental aspect of the power of the state (Merry, 2000, p. 262). What is important about a Chamorro identity constructed within the state—or in this case, the territory, however, is the way in which it has been shaped, authorized, and deployed. New notions of the Chamorro self may be created within state discourses through defining and labeling, but what is the context in which this same identity is articulated? Chamorro identity begins with self-perception. Chamorus come together to constitute the collective identity. The shift in the formation of Chamoru identity from the social and the cultural to the political—Chamorro identity, however, locates identity in a different context. Chamorro identity in its political sense was tied to the discourse of WWII memory and shaped by the power dynamics within the community. Those in power, in this case the U.S. military and eventually the federal government, defined ideas of identity using the political institutions and the terms of the state. Chamorus then assumed this identity as a means for legitimacy within both the community and in the national and global arena. Chamorro identity was then spread by the powerful and self-consciously deployed by those who have internalized it. And thus, the Chamorro was created out of the Chamoru.

By defining a Chamorro identity within the context of American colonization, Chamorus became legitimate actors within their colonial context. Defining this identity within the set of terms given to them by their colonizer locates them in a fixed understanding of who they are and where they belong. It also became a strategy,

however tenuous, for creating and solidifying associations—creating unions within the community, perpetuating relationships between those in power and those subjected to power, and gaining rights and benefits.

We are Americans or are We?

Chamoru and Chamorro identity continue to be in constant tension with American colonialism. The highly political, contested nature of identity formation in colonies such as Guam are an indication of the multiple and competing nature of what is at stake in the relationship between colonizer and colonized (Diaz, 2010, p. 8). As changes occur in the American colonial context on Guam, changes inevitably occur in the perceived identity of the Chamoru people. Political, social, and cultural factors affect one's interactions and inevitably affect the way in which identity is located within the larger discourse of colonization and in the case of Guam, American political and social influences paired with Chamoru society and culture continue to be entangled with identity. As Chamoru reality shifts, identity is changed through based on new experiences, new events, and new memories that lead to alternate understandings of reality. Chamorus constructed, created, and transformed their identities as their world changes, and the creation of a Chamorro identity was part of that process. American colonialism has not been innocent in its role in the formation of a Chamorro identity. Chamorro identity, as a result, is now as increasingly political as it is embedded within American institutions. But by coming to terms with the extent to which American colonialism affects the Chamoru community, Chamorus once again become active agents in the formation of their identity.

This Chamorro identity has emerged through a lifetime of memories of the experiences associated with World War II and the years immediately after; and contemporary Chamorus on Guam have lived their lifetime under American rule constantly reminded of wartime experience and feelings of fear and gratefulness (replace with patriotism). In the exchange between Chamoru culture and American society a Chamorro identity has been (re)constructed through a process that has involved more than just learning a dominant discourse and accepting a set of rules. It is also a process by which Chamorus have learned to remember certain ideals and chosen to forget others. Throughout this part of Guam's past, this Chamorro identity has been contingent upon how the past was remembered. In the exchange, particular memories were privileged over others thereby determining the path through which Chamorro identity was defined. The memory of American troops storming the beaches of Guam to "save" the Chamoru people from their Japanese captors is still prevalent in the minds of many Chamorus and will continue to be as long as the stories are passed to us from our grandparents.

The questions that contemporary Chamorus now face are whether or not it is possible to be Chamoru in an American context on a Chamoru landscape and what kind of Chamoru will they be. Or is being Chamorro in an American colony our only means of survival? "One lives through events. Some become stuck in memories. Some memories are heavy and momentous. Others are light and touching" (Conolly, 1991, p. 169). The memory of WWII and the many changes that have come since are embedded in the minds of Chamorus, and Chamorus continue to struggle with who they are within this complex space they now inhabit making the many stories that they tell about their lives symbolic of their identity and identity contingent upon those very stories.

CHAPTER 4. EDUCATING THE CHAMORU—THE IMPACT OF AMERICAN

EDUCATION THE COLONIAL PROJECT

The sad part of [American] education is that there was nothing, because of the lack of written material, on the history of the Marianas. There was nothing that taught me about where I am or where I lived. Piti and other villages that we visited as a family was all I knew about at the time. The worse part about it was when I became a high school student, and I took home economics. I wasn't taught about the foods that I was eating. And I really thought back at the age, why am I cooking celery, cabbage and carrots. What happened to taro leaf? We weren't even told that what you have is good. In a way, I don't blame those stateside teachers that were teaching at the time because the school system was just being set up. They didn't know anything about taro leaves. They didn't know anything about pumpkin tips. And the sad part is that they didn't try to learn because they were only interested in teaching about the stateside culture. And that is what colonizers do. They teach about their culture. It is bittersweet. The stateside education foundation that I received was sweeter because I learned about a lot of things about the United States and every time there was a test it was always about the United States and for that part I am extremely thankful. But they were good teachers. They were good to me, and I appreciated that part. Except for the first day of the third grade this teacher. I will never forget her name. You remember the good and the bad but mostly the bad. Our textbook was called Pilgrim and Progress. She just opened it to a page and she said, "Read." I didn't know a single English word. I just looked at the book, and I just cried. I just cried. I didn't even know how to speak English. I didn't even know what to say. The teachers recommended that I be held back. So I had to study extra hard. You know about the feelings of the Guamanians against the Saipanese during the war. It was discrimination time so I had to work extra hard. It got so bad that I denied my heritage. I had to deny my heritage to survive on campus with the children and some of the teachers too. It made me question the fact that I was learning so much about the United States, and I didn't learn much about what to do as a person in this Chamorro community. I never learned that. I only learned the how-to of the American culture. (personal communication)

Education Before the War

　　Education is the process by which we acquire knowledge. It is not limited to the

exchange of information between the teacher and the student in a traditional classroom

setting. Education is much more. It is the process by which we learn the norms that have

been established by society. It is the process by which "truth" is established as truth and

"normal" is deemed normal. Education as an institution is not a natural process of

learning; it is a process by which we learn the ideology as well as the pedagogy of the

institution.

Education in Guam prior to the Second World War was more about learning how

not to be a native, a savage, an uncivilized man—a Chamoru—and less about learning

how to be an educated, civilized American. Pre-war Guam was not a defining time in the

Americanization of Guam. Rather, it was a precursor to the transformation of Chamorus

into American subjects—Chamorros. During this time, the American colonizer educated

its subjects in Guam to aid in the establishment of the military outpost on the island. This

was to insure the safety and health of U.S. Navy personnel. The civilizing project was a

product of the effort. Education, therefore, was important not simply because it educated

a people, but it also helped to transform a community for the benefit of the United States.

This same sentiment is articulated in the *Politics of the Textbook* (Apple & Christian-

Smith, 1991).

> For others, teaching 'the masses' to read could have a more 'beneficial' effect. It
> enables a 'civilizing' process, in which dominated groups would be made more
> moral, more obedient, more influenced by 'real culture.' And for still others, such
> literacy could bring social transformation in its wake. It could lead to a 'critical
> literacy,' one that would be part of larger movements for a more democratic
> culture, economy, and polity. The dual sense of the power of the text emerges
> clearly here. (p. 7)

Michael Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith suggest that dominate groups teach "the

masses" for their benefit, and with education comes a transformation, or a movement,

that is characteristic of the dominate culture—in this case, the American culture.

Teaching is, however, not limited to the textbooks we are giving in a classroom. They

are not just books with written words and images that students and teachers use as a guide

for learning. Rather, these "texts" are the medium through which engage in the exchange between teaching and learning. If we see texts as "part of a system of enforcing a sense of duty, morality, and cultural correctness," then texts become much more than books (p. 8). They are also embodied in laws and mandates that have been enforced by the colonizer, in stories and songs that were taught about the colonizer, and in every day exchanges we have with the other that contribute to our understanding of our identity. And probably most important is the discourse embedded within these texts that provide us with an insight into the nature of identity formation for a people. Each of these "texts" teaches a sense of morality and enforces the duty we have as American subjects to be obedient to our colonizer. Although they were used to move us closer to our colonizer, this period in American colonization was not marked by assimilation. Chamorus continued to remain distinct from their American colonizers.

This 43-year period can be likened to a child's "formative" years. It was these early influences that ushered in the Americanization of the Chamoru people after the war. A report from Lt. Cottman stated, "If the government intends to make Guam a self-supporting island and credible colony, it would be necessary to commence immediately and use heroic measures" (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, p. 181). Of the necessary means to achieve the ends, Cottman suggested mandates such as the establishment of health and work rules as well as what to do with Spanish and Filipinos who moved to Guam during the Spanish administration of the island.[39]

Ultimately, schools were needed to replace the educational system of Spanish priests who were "still ultraconservative, opposed coeducation and other practices

---

[39] For the entire mandate, see page 30.

introduced by the Americans. Worst of all from the American view, the Spanish priests

helped perpetuate the Chamorro language in their sermons and writing" (Rogers, 1995, p.

159). With the banishment of priests, also came the prohibition of religious instruction in

schools. In January 1900, Governor Leary issued a general order placing public

education under the exclusive control of the government while removing all forms of

religious training from instruction. GO #12 ordered the use of English in all schools and

established compulsory education for children 8-14. These new mandates would be

subject to the recruitment of suitable teachers. The Governor "expected that the present

force of native teachers will cheerfully and harmoniously cooperate with the teachers of

English in order that the greatest benefit be derived by both scholars and receptors"

(Sanchez, 1987, pp. 89-90). Specific qualifications for teacher recruitment included a

"clear voice, distinct enunciation, patience, good clear handwriting, and an ability to

teach all common English branches" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 100). This was necessary to aid

in the acculturation of Chamoru children. A later general order also required all adult

residents to learn to read, write and speak in English.

During this period of transition, several Navy personnel spent their evenings after

work giving English lessons to Chamorus. Reading and writing English was a priority

for the new American Administration. Among other priorities were hygiene and

discipline. "There was a program of widespread preventative sanitation in the works,

from a variety of sources to arriving American troops and personnel, and it was

imperative that steps be taken to safeguard these future sojourners by island-wide public

hygiene" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 201). In addition, mandates prohibiting the sale of alcohol,

implementing a curfew and stopping religious celebrations had been implemented to help

create a community that was suitable for naval personnel. From the perspective of the military officials, "the public schools were immediately popular with the local people. They wished to learn American ways as well as the English language" (Carano & Sanchez, 1964, p. 407). As was the case for most of the Naval governors to follow, little to no training and inadequate funding greatly impeded the effectiveness of the administration of island affairs.

By 1908, Governor Dorn was pleased with the rapid advance of the Americanization process. He felt that "with the spread of the public school system and the sentiments thereby inculcated in the minds of the younger generations, the United States will have in Guam, a most loyal and devoted possession…The passage of time proved him correct" (Sanchez, 1987 p. 102). Education remained the largest activity of the Naval Government using a large portion of all government revenues with sanitation and hygiene as a close second. By 1922, the Navy, under the direction of Governor Althouse, continued to strictly monitor the curriculum of school textbooks. "'No teacher or administrator was allowed to deviate from the course of study.' Tougher steps were taken against use of the Chamorro language in the classrooms and on school grounds. Incredibly, the naval authorities had Chamorro English dictionaries books burned" (Rogers, 1995, p. 147).

Like most of the Naval Governors in Guam's pre-war history, free education remained at the top of each administrations priority list. Governor Alexander's support for education was "in keeping with true American tradition…gradually showing its effects in a more enlightened Chamorro people" (Sanchez, 1987, pp. 136). Secondary schools, however, were available only to a select few amongst the local population.

"Only the best are chosen by competitive examination. The others are urged to follow agricultural pursuits before too much education destroys the incentive for such employment…The Chamorros resented this policy but they were powerless to do anything about it" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 136). This led to the introduction of agricultural classes for young men who would eventually enter the work force and adult evening classes for the primary purpose of teaching the English language. During this time, many children were allowed to attend primary schools but most never completed secondary education.

Education efforts on Guam before the war were also affected by the depression in the United States. Attention paid to educating Chamoru children became secondary to the larger national crisis (Rogers, 1995). Nonetheless, Governor Willis Bradley felt it "essential that the people receive a minimum basic education which will enable them to read and write the English language, to keep their finances in order, and to participate in local affairs" (Sanchez, 1987, pp. 118). And although Chamorus were opposed to segregation in public schools, the Governor justified the separation by saying that "experience in the past has demonstrated that the best curriculum for children who normally expect to spend their lives in Guam is unsuited to the best interest of American children who are only here temporarily…subjects needed for natives are somewhat different from those required by those in the US and the degree also placed on these students are also differ widely" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 118). This rationale was used to further solidify the separation of the local population from the military one.

In 1938, a local board of education was established, "but only was advisory to the governor, and had no authority over personnel and curriculum. An informed

commentator would later write, 'Not a single textbook adapted to the local customs and everyday experiences of the Chamorro child had been developed. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, had prepared a number of such books…including some in Chamorro'" (Rogers, 1995, p. 159). Teaching the English language, however, remained the focus of education. It was "probably the greatest effort on education of the teaching of English since real progress is impossible without a thorough education in the English language" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 123).

Until 1941, American curriculum remained focused on academic instruction paired with industrial courses with a curriculum that consisted of reading, arithmetic, writing, history, geography, and hygiene in the schools. Although English had replaced Spanish in schools, government offices and most public places, education remained "inadequate and an issue of contention on Guam right up to the war" (Rogers, 1995, pp. 134, 159). By the end of this pre-war era, the use of the Chamorro language in public schools was still forbidden. "The navy interpreted the Chamorro resistance on speaking the indigenous language as a cognitive deficiency on the part of the local people. Chamorro children were thus being raised in a kind of schizophrenic half-English half-Chamorro social environment that denigrated their Chamorro culture and made them feel inferior to Americans" (Rogers, 1995, p. 160). Pre-war education, however, did serve to create amongst Chamorus a sense of nationhood with Americans. This becomes clear in the years to follow when they were faced with a new "education" of sorts.

Education in Wartime Guam

Although the laws, mandates, and influence found during the first American

colonization helped pave the way for the Americanization of Guam, it wasn't until the

Japanese occupation that we actually see a turning point in this process. These next 4

years in Guam's history are marked with sentiments of fear and pain, and it is at this

point that Chamorus willingly chose to associate with their American colonizers. It is at

this point that Chamorus chose to be participants in the American colonization of Guam.

It is at this point, and in the years immediately following the war, that Chamorus became

Chamorros.

The new Japanese administration, not unlike their American predecessors

concerned themselves with the cultivation of Chamorus. Education, again, would be the

key to creating subjects among these people. Although Japanese officials believed their

purpose in the Pacific was for "the purpose of restoring liberty and rescuing the Whole

Asiatic people and creating the permanent peace in Asia…to establish the New Order in

the World," it is subject to the view of the colonized within the context of the

colonization. [40]

> Dominant culture gains a purchase not in being imposed, as an alien external
> force, on to the cultures of subordinate groups, but by reaching into these cultures,
> reshaping them, hooking them and, with them, the people whose consciousness
> and experience is defined in their terms, into an association with the values and
> ideologies of the ruling groups in society. Such processes neither erase the
> cultures of the subordinate groups, nor do they rob 'the people' of their 'true
> culture': what they do is shuffle those cultures on to an ideological and cultural
> terrain in which they can be disconnected from whatever radical impulses which
> may (but need not) have fuelled them and be connected to more conservative or,
> often, downright reactionary cultural and ideological tendencies.[41]

---

[40] From a proclamation by order of the Japanese Commander-in-Chief (Sanchez, 1987, p.
184).

[41] A quote from Tony Bennet (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991, p. 10).

Education in wartime Guam, in many ways, can be characterized by this association with Japanese rule. Additionally, it is a time when Japanese culture re-shaped, even for a short time, the Chamoru conscious perhaps not into a Japanese one but definitely into a different one.

Japanese education

Three months after the Japanese invasion, Guam was turned into a military camp. Japanese forces took over most of the island's operations, and the island became the "staging area" for Japanese maneuvers. "It was at this point that the military character of the enemy had revealed itself in classic form. Schools were closed and the Catholic Church was forbidden to hold services on the island" (Beardsley, 1964, p. 215). Although many Chamorus believed the Japanese invasion wouldn't last, Japanese had intended to stay for centuries to come. Japanese rules soon brought teachers and their families to the island. "Most elementary schools on island were reopened and a social program was started for advanced students, those who would later become instructors and interpreters" for Japanese officials (Palomo, 1984, p. 78). Like the early years of the past American Administration, "schools were segregated and the educational apex for young adults was 5th grade….If a bright young Chamorro or Carolinian wanted to go beyond the 5th grade, they had to be sponsored by a Japanese family" (Palomo, 1984, p. 44). Japanese schools were exclusive to the needs of Japanese officials.

Pro-American sentiment surfaced among the local population, and many Chamorus were critical of Japanese rulers and their rules. But did Japanese anti-American policies help to create a pro-American sentiment among Chamorus? Or did it

make Chamorus more critical of Americans? Frank Perez, a businessman-farmer, loved

America but was critical of the attitudes some personnel had toward Chamorus. "One

naval chaplain maintained that the local people did not need education. As long as they

know how to say yes or no and 'sign their names, that's enough.'" Perez recalled, "the

schools were segregated and the navy school in Agana had a six-foot fence around it,"

and "any time an American attempted to socialize with the local people, he was

ostracized" (Palomo, 1984, p. 89). So how was this different from America's attention to

educating Chamorus prior to the onset of war? By its definition, education is the process

of teaching to improve knowledge and develop skills.[42] Education is the term often used

to describe this process of teaching Chamorus in an American context. This idea of

education generally uses references to support information that is passed from teacher to

student. Education attempts to present ideas from many different sources with many

different views and encourages the receiver of these ideas to contribute to the knowledge

base or to enhance a skill. Indoctrination, on the other hand, is the process of forcing a

set of beliefs on someone without giving them an opportunity to accept or reject them.[43]

Indoctrination is the term that is often used to describe the process by which Japanese

taught Chamorus during the war. So what makes these processes different?

Indoctrination is usually synonymous with propaganda spread for a political use. But

within the context of colonization, can education and indoctrination be considered

interchangeably? What happens when the process by which information is passed from

---

[42] The complete definition of education from the Oxford Dictionary is "a process of teaching, training and learning, especially in schools or colleges, to improve knowledge and develop skills" (2010).

[43] The complete definition of indoctrination from the Oxford Dictionary is "to force somebody to accept a particular belief or set of beliefs and not allow them to consider any others" (2010).

one person to the other? Does this implicate the teacher who comes from a dominant group and who is charged with imparting information onto a subordinate for the political reason of colonizing them? If this is so, why do we often use the term education when speaking within the American colonial experience on Guam, but choose the term indoctrination when describing the same process within the Japanese colonization of the island.

A month after the invasion, Japanese authorities began to concern themselves with the daily functions of the island beginning with education. This did not change the attitudes of Chamorus toward Japanese officials. "To show the entire island of Chamorro cooperation, with Japanese authorities, officials sought out for Agueda Johnston, prewar principle at GW." Johnston would, hopefully, be the bridge between Japanese and the local population (Sanchez, 1987, p. 196). Chamorus were still very skeptical of this new system. When schools reopened in 1942, enrollment was low. Japanese sailors taught the Japanese language before "Japanese civilian teachers replaced the soldiers and Chamorro assistant teacher were trained." Soon after, schools grew, "but the war years left a gap in education in many of the islands children since the main subject was how to speak the Japanese language" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 171). Similar to pre-war American teaching styles, Japanese education utilized daytime classes to teach children to read and write the Japanese alphabet, math, and Japanese songs and games. One of the biggest changes was in discipline. Rather than hygiene mandates and punishments over language, the Japanese period was marked by the vivid memories that "young students were required to bow to the emperor before classes commenced in the morning" (Palomo, 1984, p. 116).

More advanced students were placed in an "intensive training program" as trainees. This would "enable them to read and write katakana and hiragana with relative ease" (Sanchez, 1987, pp. 197). Chamoru trainees would eventually serve as Japanese instructors and interpreters. "Upon completion of training the teaching assistants helped Japanese teachers with chores. They taught first year with Japanese printed textbooks and lesson plans prepared by the central education office and the Japanese instructors" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 197). A special school was also opened for first generation "Guamanian" children.

> It was Japanese belief that children with Japanese blood, even if impure, were naturally more advanced than Chamorro children, a concept shared by pre-war American naval administrators, who believed that American children were more gifted than the local breed and established a school in Agana whose enrollment was restricted to children of American personnel. (Palomo, 1984, pp. 119-120)

Unlike pre-war times, Chamorus did not feel a need to send their children to school. Many children, instead, stayed home and tended to the chores of the house. In the years prior, Chamorus had a great deal of respect and admiration for teachers and principals. Teachers were considered to be leaders in the community who were capable of working beyond the classrooms to solve problems amongst the locals. This was not the case during the Japanese occupation. Chamorus feared the teachers and avoided them as much as possible. But because much attention was paid to reading and writing during the early years of the war, many locals were proficient in the Japanese language (Sanchez, 1987).

At the height of the war, however, education was no longer a priority. Most schools were closed and older children and adults were sent to work in farms planting rice and other crops or construction building runways and caves for the Japanese.

> Most of the local male population were used either at the two operational air strips…Some of the younger males were utilized to help construct pillboxes and man-made caves. Still others were used to install real and dummy cannons at several coastal areas, and to transport food and ammunition to key defense outposts. The women were used primarily to plant and harvest farm crops. (Palomo, 1984, p. 147)

The war shifted with the bloody battles of Americans in the Pacific, and the goal of the Japanese occupation drastically changed as Japanese authorities prepared for the onslaught of American troops. "By this time, the Japanese were totally preoccupied with the defense of the island and the Chamorros were mere tools to be utilized without regard to their safety or well-being." And now we see the narrative of wartime Guam shift from uncertainty and discipline to fear and hardship. Japanese officials used Chamorus to help fight the war.

> Twenty-one-year-old Benito Wesley's dual assignments were to dig graves at the Sumay cemetery, where some of his relatives and acquaintances were buried after execution, and to help dig a deep hole on the side of a hill next to the cemetery, which the Japanese used as an underground radio communication center.
>
> Manuel Calvo was among twenty local men who were forced to dig a massive and elaborate underground tunnel at Milalag, Yigo, a project which required the men to work virtually 24 hours a day for several weeks. Calvo's younger brother, Tony, was among a group of young local men who helped install cannons along the promontories at Pati Point, the easternmost end of the island. For every real cannon, there were five dummies. The dummies actually were twenty-foot coconut trunks painted black. It was Tony's job to cut down coconut trees and to help carry them to designated points along the coast. (Palomo, 1984, pp. 147-148)

And when times became even more desparate, the narrative becomes even more grave and interestingly, more vivid.

> And without any provocation, and while holding onto his empty gunnysack, several Japanese grabbed Charfuros and pushed him to the ground. The soldiers cleared the area, and for no apparent reason, one of the Japanese pulled out his sword and began slashing Charfuros on the back, including his neck. After eight slashes, Charfuros went down and lost consciousness. The Japanese left, obviously believing the man was dead. A few hours later, Charfuros awakened. He pulled himself up and forced himself to walk to a nearby ranch…Charfuros

was found a week later, still alive. Maggots were crawling all over his eight open wounds, eating away at the flesh, and ironically keeping the wounds clean.

When Pito Santos and Pedro Cruz Santos saw two unarmed soldiers at their friend's ranch, they went after them and beat them up…A few days later, two armed soldiers came to the ranch, and upon seeing Pedro, one of the soldiers grabbed the local man from the rear and the two Japanese began beating him up…Pito quickly came down from the coconut tree and told the two Japanese to cease beating up his cousin…When one of the Japanese loosened his hold on Pedro, the Chamorro quickly moved aside and grabbed a lance from the beam of a nearby shelter and plunged it into the back of the Japanese. The Japanese gave a gasping wail as he went down, mortally wounded. Pedro then told Pito to kill the other Japanese, or he would. Pito pulled his machete and struck the disbelieving Japanese on the shoulder and across the back. He went down also, and died. (Palomo, 1984, pp. 150-151)

Amidst the atrocities of war, most Chamorus never lost their affection toward the English language and their American colonizer. Many stories such as that of George Tweed and this story of a local man are told of Chamorus and their connection to Americans:

Japanese and Saipanese investigators were more subtle in the handling of Ramon Baza, a highly respected and affluent Yona farmer, who was among several suspected of aiding the American fugitives. Several Japanese officials, accompanied by Martin Borja, visited Baza at his ranch…Borja quietly slipped behind Baza and then shouted:
'Hands up! Stick 'em up!'
Instinctively, Baza raised both arms.
'So you know English, Mr. Baza," Borja said. 'You can talk to the Americans.'
Baza was giving a bad beating.
In truth, Baza was among the first Chamorros to harbor and feed the American fugitives.[44]

This affection for Americans, coupled with the grave atrocities felt by Chamorus, in many ways led to the cries of celebration at the end of the war on an island that was leveled beyond recognition by the bombardment of American troops and ammunition.

---

[44] George Tweed is an American who hid out in the jungles of Guam with the help of Chamoru families. Tweed was a symbol of America for Chamorus during the hardships of war (Palomo, 1984, p. 131).

Rebuilding through Education

Post-WWII Guam was a time of great devastation, and the years immediately after the war was a time of re-building—politically, economically, socially and culturally. But what marked this period? As Frantz Fanon argues,

> man cannot be explained outside the limits of his capacity for accepting or denying a given situation. The problem of colonization, therefore, comprises not only the intersection of historical and objective conditions but also man's attitude toward these conditions (Trans. 2008, p. 65).

In the case of Chamorus, what happens when fear—produced by war—is overcome suddenly by a new feeling of gratefulness—not because of a re-occupation but because of "liberation?"[45] Did this help contribute to the successful re-emergence of the American colonial project on Guam? And in many ways did this make it easier to sustain it in the long term? A renewed sense of purpose quickly set in on the island. And emphasis on education was, once again, a key mission of American officials. Five schools opened in pre-war buildings, and "immediately following the re-establishment of the naval government, the Department of Education was headed by a naval chaplain. He was assisted by a Guamanian superintendant of the schools. The governor, however, as a director of education established school policy, decided how all monies will be spent, and selected key personnel" (Carano, & Sanchez, 1964, p. 321).

Some changes were made, and children of American personnel were now attending public schools on Guam. The new military governor proved to be more responsive to education than pre-war governors. "By the end of the war 21 new schools were in operation with 167 Chamorro teachers and over 7000 students" (Rogers, 1995,

---

[45] Many Chamorus still refer to the end of WWII as the American "Liberation" of Guam. Very few acknowledge it as a re-occupation or re-colonization of the island. This, in many respects, is due to the sentiments of the war.

201). The Department of Education continued to maintain all public schools and was

tasked with supervising private schools. And in 1948, the first private Catholic school

was opened by the Bishop (Sanchez, 1987). A focus was also placed on higher education

in hopes of training teachers for the island's school system.

> The territorial college of Guam was established in 1952 and conducted its first summer session. It offered college credits applicable to specific institutions of higher learning in the United States to all students who can meet its requirements. The unit was set up for the commendably practical purpose of training local students in the field of education. (Beardsley, 1964, p. 240)

This emphasis on education was similar to that used to educate non-literate

Chamorus prior to WWII except this time Chamorus were not illiterate. However, when

one is thrust into an education system that has enabled him to write about his reading of

the world, he is also inclined to "rethink" his original reading of the world in a way that

now more closely resembles the world that taught him to read. As Paulo Freire argues,

"One of the violences perpetrated by illiteracy is the suffocation of the consciousness and

the expressiveness of men and women who are forbidden from reading and writing, thus

limiting their capacity to write about their reading of the world so they can rethink about

their original reading of it" (2005, p. 2).

This begins with a knowledge base that is subject to the creation of that

knowledge, but before you even get to your destination you already have preconceived

assumptions of what you think you know. In the case of Chamorus on Guam, this

knowledge was relative to the American education thrust upon them.

> The use of linguistic manipulations to hide a particular ideology does not necessarily mean that the dominant class schemed to develop discourses disguising concrete situations…However, even if the ideological fog has not been deliberately constructed and programmed by the dominant class, its power to obfuscate reality undeniably serves the interests of the dominant class. The dominant ideology veils reality; it makes us myopic and prevents us from seeing

reality clearly. The power of the dominant ideology is always domesticating and when we are touched and deformed by it we become ambiguous and indecisive. (Freire, 2005, pp. 10-11)

When speaking of education, Friere continues this argument by saying that "we are programmed but not predetermined, because we are conditioned but, at the same time, conscious of the conditioning, that we become fit to fight for freedom as a process and not as an endpoint" (2005, p. 125). Americans saw the potential benefit of educating Chamorus prior to the war, and continued with this same mission after. This helped to create a people who would best serve the needs of the militarization of the island and the region.

"Meanwhile, Governor Skinner expanded the Guam public school system and revised the curriculum to reflect stateside standards. Classes continued to be in English, but Chamorro was no longer forbidden" (Rogers, 1995, p. 225). Many children had already learned to read and write in English. Chamorro, however, remained the prominent language used in most homes. "During the entire period of its [earlier] administration of the land, the Navy had always given the highest priority to education. By 1940, the literacy rate was 84.4%. The rate went up the last 4 years of the naval administration…in addition, the navy newspaper and the armed forces radio increased Guamanian exposure to English. All this greatly enhanced the Guamanian's desire to read write speak English" (Sanchez, 1987, p. 288). Literacy rates during the early years of the second administration continued to increase as military officials could once again focus their attention on education. Ironically, however, "textbooks and classroom materials were nearly non-existent. Somehow the military did not include materials and

classroom equipment in their rehabilitation plans" (Sanchez, 1995, p. 257). This was

remedied quickly.

Post-war American education policies helped to reinforce some of the pre-war

policies that helped to create American colonial subjects but this time for a different

generation of Chamorus. It becomes imperative when discussing the American colonial

project to understand that even something as seemingly benign as teaching a child to play

a game (in this case, football) can be seen through a critical lens as part of a larger

educational agenda that ensures the success of colonization. As Vicente Diaz writes,

football was a tool of the colonizer to address "not only personal, but also collective (read

'nationalist') concerns for upright civic and moral character through proper physical

maintenance" (2002, p. 180). The problem lies in the community's struggle to reconcile

the often opposing beliefs of two selves—the Chamoru and the Chamorro. Diaz

continues,

> Not just the man, but the entire nation, was to be endowed with masculine virility.
> But in American possessions like Guam, the anxiety also reflected an interest to
> uplift and discipline natives who were typically characterized as degenerate and
> potentially troublesome…For these and other reasons the Navy recognized the
> benefits of sports for the so-called 'benevolent assimilation' of the
> natives…Organized sports and daily calisthenics quickly became key vehicles to
> modernize (meaning "Americanize") the Chamorros . (pp. 180-181)

Other tools such as health and education mandates, music, dance and songs were crucial

to the "modernization" and "Americanization" of Chamorus. In this narrative, the

tension exists within the context of the colonization and militarization of Guam and both

have overshadowed the story of the Chamoru struggle to be Chamorro.

Politics of Texts

When we speak of tools used to educate the native or the colonized, it is important to frame it within the context of power/knowledge (Foucault, 1980). Michel Foucault argues that knowledge is a tool of power. The same is true of power since the acquisition of knowledge necessitates the use of power. The end goal of both power and knowledge are the same—through the use of force one is able to establish truth about another and through the establishment of truth one is able to control the other. It is through the discourse of historical events—or one historical event—that we have been created as a people. In this case, Americans used American knowledge to perpetuate colonialism among the colonized. The narratives we get from texts written *about* Chamorus on Guam are crucial to our understanding of education as a significant part of the lasting influence any colonizer can have on a people. Identity is given meaning through the narratives embedded in the texts written about Guam. Similar to Vicente Diaz's argument about the interplay between the Catholic Church and the Chamoru people in the 1600s, it is also through the complexities embedded in colonial discourse that we see the struggle between Chamorus and their American colonizer (Diaz, 2010). These earlier texts about Guam and Guam history are born out of the dominant discourse of WWII triumph and American heroism. They are what have created Chamorros and what continue to perpetuate the experience Chamorus have with that moment in history. The power of these texts continues to exist through the acceptance of the written word as reality without an understanding that these same texts are a product of a power—American colonization—that decides what we know and eventually, who we become. The discourse presented in these texts is then manifested in the lives of Chamorus. The

assuming absence of an alternate text or even alternate texts has inevitably resulted in an

unconscious rejection of the other narrative—the narrative not of fear and gratefulness

but rather of struggle and resistance. Therefore, we are only able to understand ourselves

and our identity in within the confines of the texts that are part of a colonial education.

Chamorus are as much subjects of the texts that are written about them as they are

subject to these same texts of colonization. But to what extent is the Chamorro in these

texts the same Chamoru that learns this narrative? "It is in experiencing the differences

that we discover ourselves as I's and you's" (Freire, 2005, p. 127). And when we look at

colonial education, we can see that we are taught that clearly I am different from YOU.

In many ways, I—Chamorros—was not only created in texts as different from you—

Americans—I was also created for you. Frantz Fanon says, "to speak is to exist

absolutely for the other" (Trans. 2008, p. 1). Chamorus learned to speak English in an

English-speaking educational system using English-speaking tools so that they would be

able to speak for an English-speaking American world—to exist as subjects for this

American world. This also helped to create a new consciousness among Chamorus—a

Chamorro conscious. This is why Chamorros were able to, as Fanon points out was the

case with black identity, "position themselves in relation to the civilizing language"

(Trans. 2008, p. 2). A popular text written by a local educator was used in Guam's public

school system until the late 90s. As the title may suggest, the book is "The History of

Our Island," but a closer look at the text may indicate a more specific history that is being

told—a *colonial* history of our island. Chamorus in this text not only perpetuate

longstanding stereotypes of the native but are also overshadowed by a larger story that

aggrandizes the colonization of Guam. Quoting a Spanish priest, the text explains under the heading "A robust and happy people" that:

> The Marianos are in color a somewhat lighter shade than the Filipinos, larger in stature, more corpulent and robust than Europeans, pleasant and with agreeable faces. They are so fat they appear swollen. They remain in good health to an advanced age and it is very normal to live ninety or one hundred years (Sanchez, 1987, p.6).

In a section titled, *Adoflak'gue siha*, the story of the "Immediate Post-War Years"[46]

> It was characteristic of the Chamorros that even under the most difficult of conditions in the refugee camps, they did not complain. Indeed they were very grateful for what help they received. And for good reasons. Compared to what they just went through under Japanese occupation and more recently in Japanese concentration camps, the situation at the refugee centers was easily accepted. First of all, they were free from Japanese domination for the first time in almost three years. They had shelters of a sort. They found plenty of food to eat. And salvaged Japanese rice went well with their newly found diet of spam, corned-beef hash, powdered eggs and other C and D rations. Chocolate bars were plentiful. So was fresh water in canvas bags and Navy-issue hot coffee with all the cream and sugar they could take. For the first time since they were forced to leave their farms and homes and sent to Japanese concentration camps in early July, the Chamorros had plenty to eat (Sanchez, 1987, p. 249).

In the following chapters, the reader is given a look into the American Administration and the eventual "self-government" of Guam. A curious glance at the contents reveals section after section named after Naval and appointed governors and the work they did to help shape Guam. Chamorus are implicated in this text as the lesser objects of what claims to be their history. This story moves independent of the people the story is written about. Like the reality of colonization, this story of colonization has enveloped Chamorus in a way that positions each colonizer in the main role and Chamorus merely as the supporting actors in this larger story of Guam.

---

[46] *Adoflak'gue siha* is a Chamoru phrase meaning "they over-indulged."

Education not only created the knowledge for the subject; it also enabled the receiver of that knowledge, the subject, to re-create the text for himself. "Another important aspect, and one that challenges the reader even more as 're-creator' of the text he or she reads, is that text comprehension is not deposited, static and immobilized, within the pages of the text, simply waiting to be uncovered by the reader. If that were the case, we could not say that reading critically is 're-writing' what one has read" (Freire, 2005, p. 55). It is important to note the power of the written text in 're-creating' knowledge. The writer creates knowledge. The reader reads that knowledge, and then re-creates it thereby also re-creating their self.

Chamorus, in this sense, re-created themselves into Chamorros but not simply for the sake of the colonizer. Chamorus created the Chamorro as a way to understand his place within this colonial context. "The more the reader makes him- or herself a real apprehender of the author's comprehension, all the more he or she will become a producer of text comprehension, to the extent that such comprehension becomes reader-created knowledge rather than knowledge that is deposited in the reader by the reading of the text" (Freire, 2005, p. 56). (Re)creation for his own sake. One does not simply memorize the subject of knowledge. He instead knows the subject and reproduces the subject when he reproduces the knowledge of that subject. Only then can he become the co-author of that knowledge. But what would a co-authored text look like? What would a (re)authored text look like? And is this sort of text even possible? In 1996, the Political Status Education Coordinating Commission released the *Hale'-ta* series that was a result of a law to mandate the development of "a comprehensive curriculum in political

status studies for grades 5, 8, 9, 12 and the post-secondary level."[47] The commission is

made up of local educators, members of the Commission on Self-Determination, and

members of the community. The series begins with *Inafa'maolek: Chamorro Tradition*

and Values (Political Status Education Coordinating Commission, 1996), a text written

for elementary school children. More reminiscent of education in an oral culture, the

book resembles a tale told to young children at the foot of their grandparents. The story

begins with two curious children, Ti'ao and Ha'åni who want to learn more about the

Chamorro culture. Lessons of respect, family and *inafa'maolek* are recurring themes in

this story.

> Nånan Biha said that there are many other ways that people practice the values of
> inafa'maolek. You show respect, for example, when you let people with high
> positions, or leaders, eat first at a fiesta. Respect also can be shown by dressing
> properly for different occasions. For instance, Nånan Biha said as she pointed to
> Ti'ao and Ha'åni's zories, "You're not supposed to wear those to school or to
> church" (1996, p. 28).

In the lesson about *Taotao Sanhiyong*, Tun Pepe says,

> The biggest new change [during Spanish Rule] was that the Chamorros were
> taught to be good Christians (p. 42).

During American rule,

> Many of the Chamorro leaders seemed to be excited about the Americans. They
> had hoped that the new rulers would give them more freedom and bring a higher
> quality of life than what the Chamorros had under Spanish rule…The Americans
> believed that their way of life was the best in the world, and the only way the
> Chamorros could become better was to leave their old language and customs
> behind, and become like the Americans. Americans also introduced Chamorros
> to many new things. They taught Chamorros to enjoy sports like baseball and
> basketball, tennis and boxing. They brought electricity to light up street lamps,
> and brought the first telephones to the island. They brought new medicine that
> helped many people feel better. They brought other things, like sodas and ice
> cream, different kinds of music, and new ways of dressing. They brought movies

---

[47] *Hale'ta* is a Chamoru term meaning our roots.

and concerts, and even new musical instruments. These changes and new activities were very exciting to many Chamorros, Tun Pepe explained (pp. 46-48).

In response to his granddaughter's question of survival, Tun Pepe explains:

"This is the secret of our story," he said. "We survived through years of wars and forced change by holding onto old values and ideas and adding on some new customs and activities as they have arrived on our shores. Since the arrival of the *taotao sanhiyong*, we have created a way of life that seeks to balance the old things and the new, although we haven't always been successful" (p. 56).

Values adapted from religion and colonial influence have made its way into the Chamorro story validating the need for teaching culture. Even if we were to write a decolonized educational policy, would we be heard? How different would it be? Can we break free from the colonial chains that bind us to western education? It remains unseen whether or not the desires of the people to decolonize will prevail over the norm that has come from colonization. Decolonized education has the power to change the minds of a people and thus is a threat to power making decolonized education the dream by which many can only hope to conceive and the tool that indigenous culture and identity desperately needs.

This problem is manifested in the struggle of people to have their voices be heard so as to become part of the narrative of history. This problem is two-fold. First, there is very little written work about Chamoru history or even Chamoru identity that breaks free from the binds of colonialism. There are several sources on Histories of Guam but it remains a subject of debate as to how much these really reflect the lives of Chamorus past. Like texts, "curriculum always represents somebody's version of what constitutes important knowledge and a legitimate worldview" (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p. 51). To see this, we can look to the text used for many years by students of Guam history at the University of Guam. *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam*, written by Robert F.

Rogers (1995), situates its place among other texts by first explaining that it was

"researched, written, and published independently of any Guam governmental,

foundation, or business involvement, and at no cost to any Guam taxpayer through grants

or funding other than the author's salary as a full-time teacher at the University of Guam"

(p. ix). This sets the stage for the book's prologue which points to Guam's location and

land as its significance to the rest of the world. This lends itself to the title of the text

which implies that colonization was the fate of the island, and this began with Magellan's

pivotal landing in 1521. The story tells of the inevitable landing of colonizer after

colonizer marking over 400 years of Guam's past beginning with "The Spanish

Conquest" continuing with "The Anglo-Saxon Way," "The Way of the Samurai," and the

"Return of the Americans." The reader is left with the impression that colonization

landing on the shores of Guam was the only possible Destiny for the people of the island.

The story ends with "Unfinished Quests." 1980-1990 mark a period in Guam's history

that is filled with stories of prosperity and frustration. The government and the people of

Guam experienced significant financial promise as well as political hardships.[48]

Implications can be made here for the future of Guam. Who or what is next to make

landfall on the island and how will this story be written?

What one deems legitimate in knowledge and truth only marginalizes those of

whom the knowledge or truth is created. It is in the creation of knowledge and education

that people learn only one reality. In this sense, American curriculum can be seen as a

---

[48] Some of Guam's unfinished quests outlined in the final chapter are a result of land claims, war reparations, political status movements, a growing tourism industry, and elected political leaders (Rogers, 1995, pp. 265-289).

form of social control that helps to perpetuate the continued colonial relationship on

Guam.

> Textbooks participate in social control when they render socially constructed
> relations among groups as natural…Textbooks further participate in social control
> when they 'select in' some ideas and domains of knowledge and 'select out'
> others. (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p. 99)

Second, if these decolonized histories and knowledge existed, would it change the

dominant curriculum? Curriculum is limited to the knowledge that has been deemed

necessary and appropriate by those responsible for education. It does not encompass all

knowledge whether in content or form. Curriculum is simply a guide for what is to be

taught in school. Creating a post-colonial curriculum will warrant the desire of a people

to re-create not only what is taught but the ways in which knowledge is presented. This

desire can only be fueled by the recognition of a people of the usefulness of the

knowledge. Colonial education won the minds of Chamorus because it was presented as

a vehicle to progress and success amidst a war torn island. In the same manner, post-

colonial education has the daunting task of winning the minds (and hearts) of a people

who are struggling. In a colony that may no longer be rebuilding after a war, the people

in many ways remain torn by financial hardships, a deteriorating infrastructure, limited

resources, increasing military presence, and a rising cost of living. Not only does

decolonizing education have to battle with the forces of the colonizer, it must also battle

with the woes of "resources" better spent elsewhere.

The tendency for education, however, has been to relegate colonized histories and

knowledge to the periphery of the dominant curriculum of the colonizer. Greater

importance is placed on certain pieces of history and certain types of knowledge while

causing other histories and knowledge to be less important perhaps even invisible.

Students of these histories may without question internalize the knowledge present in these texts. The problem with this is that while it privileges the narratives in existing texts "it withholds, obscures, and renders unimportant many [other] ideas and areas of knowledge" (Sleeter & Grant, 1991, p. 97). Those in power then remain different from those subject to the power. Although the knowledge is the same, the distance between the colonizer and the colonized is maintained to give the illusion of sameness while still maintaining a separation. Education attempts to assimilate them into the center of power while continually perpetuating the impossibility of true assimilation. The lesson here is to be more like me, but you can never truly be me.

Education, Identity and the Possibilities

Much like education makes colonization possible, education, too, manifests itself through identity. Education creates within the individual a sense of self that is learned and continuously reaffirmed by the process. It becomes easier and more desirable to mask one's identity in favor of the more dominant colonial identity found in texts or even an altered form of that colonial identity. Identity is thus created out of colonial discourse by the colonial subject to reconcile the inescapable differences between him and his colonizer and more so to escape from the realities of oppression created by colonization. This is why it is imperative to understand the nuances involved in "how culture and identities are produced historically in relation to structures or discourses of power" (Diaz, 2010, p. 8). Like the experience of blacks living in a white world, Chamorus were forced to re-imagine identity while coming to terms with colonization. Fanon says that there is "a refusal to face up to the fact of one's own blackness. Black children raised within the

racist cultural assumptions of the colonial system, can partially resolve the tension between contempt for blackness and their own dark skins by coming to think of themselves, in some sense, as white" (Trans. 2008, p. ix). What impact does this have on the colonized? If an identity is assumed as a means to cope with the tension of colonization, then it is interesting to note that both the colonized and the colonizer share in the creation of identities that have been implicated in colonization. Fanon continues, "both the black man, slave to his inferiority, and the white man, slave to his superiority, behave along neurotic lines" (Trans. 2008, p. 42). This is simply because both have been alienated by the colonial experience—the latter by his doing and the former at the hand of the latter.

Education, thus, is not an innocent actor in the creation of identity. "It is true that education is not the ultimate lever for social transformation, but without it transformation cannot occur" (Freire, 2005, p. 69). This is why American education was and still is so crucial to the transformation of Chamorus into Chamorros and the continued existence of the Chamorro. Identity, then, crosses the boundaries of conventional teaching into questions of learning. What is taught? What isn't taught? What is found in texts? What is left out of texts? What is seen in the narrative? What is hidden from the narrative? What is remembered? And what is forgotten? Education created identity through these narratives of remembering and forgetting. But the only acceptable self in this colonial experience was one that aided in the success and perpetuation of the colonizers power— the Chamorro. Ignoring one identity and favoring another aided in the alienation of both. No longer are we just Chamorus yet we will never be completely American. We are not

one or the other. And we can never truly be both as long as one remains subject to its

more powerful counterpart.

To what extent is post-colonial education in a colonial society even possible?

Fanon speaks of Jean Veneuse in his text as "the Other." "To be 'the Other' is to always

feel in an uncomfortable position, to be on one's guard, to be prepared to be rejected

and…unconsciously do everything that's needed to bring about the anticipated

catastrophe" (Trans. 2008, p. 57). Is this our fate? Is this our destiny? Or is there hope

for "the Other?" Can the colonized come out of their oppression to re-imagine an

identity that is not embedded within the colonial context? It is not hard to see the need to

cut ties to the colonial education that keeps us subject to an external power, but to take

this necessary step we need to re-imagine a new education of sorts.

> The impediments to our freedom are much more the products of social, political, economic, cultural, historical, and ideological structures than of hereditary structures. We cannot doubt the power of cultural inheritance, cannot doubt that it makes us conform and gets in the way of our being. But the fact that we are programmed beings, conditioned and conscious of the conditioning and not predetermined, is what makes it possible to overcome the strength of cultural inheritance. (Freire, 2005, p. 126)

This is all a complex part of what we have become. Simply empowering one to reclaim

his histories is not enough. We need voices capable of being heard especially by those

who have been least inclined to hear it. This type of education will require the

knowledge of past events, the acceptance of our present circumstance, and the desire to

transcend both so that an alternate system can be created for the future. Rather than

laying claims to a troubled education system in need of reform where programs that teach

language, history and culture are sacrificed to raise reading and math scores, it is

imperative that the system be reoriented in a way that places the same (if not greater)

value on the knowledge found in indigenous language, history and culture that has helped

to sustain communities for hundreds of years. This is not to suggest a return to ancient

civilization or a complete disregard for the cultures that have helped influence a modern

Chamoru community. It is simply a statement about the value of a body of knowledge

that may teach us things that cannot readily be articulated or have been dismissed by

colonial education. Decolonizing education has the ability to help us recognize the

circumstances of our present situation so that we can carve out a place for alternate ways

knowing and doing.   This opens the door for further research in the areas of indigenous

epistemology and post-colonial education. Hundreds of years of colonization on Guam

has resulted in the loss of indigenous knowledge. Reclaiming this knowledge for the

future of education can potentially build effective cultural programs in the curriculum or

create cultural charter schools and language immersion schools that can help usher in a

language revival and cultural renaissance for a generation who may, in fact, never have a

chance to speak Chamoru or live Chamoru as a result of a historical circumstance that

dictated that their parents and grandparents be forbidden from doing both. Teaching

people to speak in a particular language teaches them to think in that language too.

Perhaps the first task at hand must be to convince people to change the way they speak so

that we can then create in them a desire to want to know, to want to change, and to want

to decolonize.

CHAPTER 5. CHAMORUS NEGOTIATING THE CHAMORRO

A critical look at Guam's history reveals the contested nature of identity for the Chamoru people. For many years, Chamorus have had to contend with being a pawn in the larger context of American colonization on Guam, but recent post-war efforts toward greater self-government have led Chamorus to negotiate power through the creation and (re)creation of laws and cultural practices. Although colonization had a hand in creating identities that are often times at odds with each other, the conflict between a Chamoru identity and a Chamorro identity has become evident in law and culture today. Laws were created as mechanisms to support Chamorus living in an American colony and have been used as a means to achieve greater self-government while situating Guam closer to the United States. This has resulted in a perpetual limbo that dictates that Chamorus privilege their Chamorroness to achieve certain rights and benefits not fundamentally guaranteed to all peoples on Guam—i.e. citizenship and the right to self-determination. Chamorros were now a people recognized by law as having been established by history and have used this identity in their struggle to revive culture and language. Using culture to reconcile issues of identity has presented Chamorus with the challenge of reaching for nostalgic views of identity or (re)creating a culture that resembles contemporary Chamorus.

The island of Guam has been a space of negotiation where both the American colonizer and the Chamoru subject have taken part in the reconstruction and reassertion of identities. Identity is a complex construction of common understanding of a people in a particular place at a particular time sharing a particular struggle. Chamoru identity has, thus, been reconstructed through both political and cultural acceptance and resistance.

The idea, however, is to also recognize all the uncertainties, oppositions, tragedies, and paradoxes as part of the history of the Chamoru people and, thus, part of the reaffirmation of a Chamoru identity. This acceptance of a colonial past fused with the recognition of alternate perspectives may shed light on the contested nature of being for many colonized communities.

It is important that we explore the means by which we have become constituted as who and what we are. How identity is experienced and how it defines itself in relation to different identities is crucial to reconciling the forces that have helped shape identity (Connolly, 1991). By unmasking the impact of colonization, Chamorus are able to establish their own strategies for identity formation and clearly (or unclearly) define who they are. We must, therefore, engage History as it has been established and naturalized and question the forces that have sustained the hegemonic identity. A Chamoru history of colonization, as opposed to a colonial history of Chamorus, would be one of struggle, resistance, and negotiation with the forces of civilization, capitalism, individualism, and modernity, especially in the American context. And a look at Chamoru history would uncover the power dynamics that produced the colonial history that shaped identity and in which the domination of the subordinate by the powerful becomes evident. It would also show Chamoru identity as it emerged in response to the encounter and articulate the ways in which Chamorus have made sense of the reality of colonization in order to negotiate their changing identities. At times, however, the problem lies in the often competing nature of two identities. Can a Chamoru identity be (re)imagined from a new moment in history—one that speaks to Chamoru survival and against the colonial

encounter—to counter the Chamorro identity that continues to be part of the dominant discourse on the island?

The Law and the People of Guam

The law is intended to be a system of rules that is meant to instill in people a sense of order and equality, but law is also a manifestation and an instrument of power. And for the people of Guam this means a democratic form of law that mirrors those established in the United States. This form of law established by the United States Navy early in their colonization effort was meant to control actions and encourage a level of justice among the local community. It was also meant to ensure a particular kind of behavior in those it is intended for. "Chamorros hit upon an irrefutable argument for civil government. The Chamorros were patriotic. They survived the [war] ordeal. They proved their loyalty. In fact, the Chamorros not only deserved political rights, the U.S. owed it to them…The war experience soon became a hammer to obtain political rights, and, subsequently, to obtain federal funds."[49] This is the same form of government that Chamorus fought for in the years after WWII. And it is this form of law that continues today. "The law is real, but it is also a fragment of our imaginations. Like all fundamental social institutions it casts a shadow of popular belief that may ultimately be more significant, albeit more difficult to comprehend, than the authorities, rules, and penalties that we ordinarily associate with law" (Feeley, 2004, p. xi). Law on Guam has helped to create in the Chamoru people the citizen subject.

---

[49] Robert Underwood, "Red, Whitewash and Blue: Painting over the Chamorro Experience" quoted in *Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory and History in the Mariana Islands* (Camacho, 2011, p. 91).

Laws are created through our understanding of our position within the community and in relation to the institutions that govern us. "Forms of knowledge and bodies of information are always particular ways of seeing the world, with particular premises, agendas, omissions and genealogies" (Gilliom, 2001, p. 37). It is these forms of knowledge and bodies of information that aid in the construction of laws. Laws are also "conventions that constitute social life less by dictating or impeding thought than by inviting, encouraging, privileging, and facilitating certain types of interpretive constructions over others. Ideology matters because every way of seeing, understanding, and doing is [also] a way of *not* seeing, *not* understanding, and *not* doing" (Haltom& McCann, 2004, p. 21). And it is through these laws that Chamorus have gained political ground for understanding their place within and in relation to the government of the United States of America.

The law has become commonplace for the Chamoru people and are now an important part of our political and social world. It impacts the ways in which Chamorus move within the community, but they have also been used as tools for power. They are defined by long-standing assumptions about the relationship between the Chamoru people and their American colonizers. Although laws are meant to serve the community, they also make it possible for the community to exist and are, at the same time, subject to the conditions of that community's existence (Weisbrod, 2002). The Organic Act of Guam signed in 1950 is the most obvious example of this. This undoubtedly paved the way for the eventual emergence of the political identity of the Chamorro out of the Chamoru.

If culture is "'[that] complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society,'" then identity is that which relates the individual to the knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and capabilities that he has acquired.[50] Like Chamoru culture, Chamoru identity is also challenged, contingent, and developing within the context of law and politics on Guam. "[L]aw…creates the conditions of culture," is a form of culture, and is subject to that culture (Weisbrod, 2002, p. 2). And law on Guam has created the condition out of which political identity is formed and has a prominent presence in the political nature of the Chamorro identity.

In this struggle for identity, Chamorus have had to negotiate their place as inhabitants of an American colony. As was the decree with the passing of the Organic Act, Guam holds the status of an unincorporated territory of the United States, and Chamorus are identified as "United States citizen." The relationship between the United States and Guam and between Americans and Chamorus, however, remains tenuous as Chamorus continue to make sense of their colonial past.

This brief overview of the U.S.-territorial relationship may help to shed some light on the problems that continue to arise in this colonial context. Although the territorial clause in the constitution gave power to the United States Federal government to acquire territories and regulate them as necessary, it failed to address the issue of the inhabitants of these territories.

> [T]he United States has the right as a sovereign, independent nation to acquire territory or property…The United States does not, however, possess the right to acquire, purchase, own, claim, or dispose of human beings living on that land or

---

[50] Terry Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, quoted in *Emblems of Pluralism: Cultural Differences and the State* (Weisbrod, 2002, p. 1).

real estate. Human beings possess certain natural rights, which no government can rightfully give or take away…To contend that the Constitution (and the Territorial Clause in particular) gives complete power over and ownership of territorial acquisitions and their inhabitants is to treat inhabitants as property to be disposed of at the pleasure of Congress. (Statham, 2001, p. 177)

The right to govern the inhabitants of the newly acquired territories was assumed as being inevitable as a result of the acquisition. Although the people of these territories were culturally and racially different from those in the States, Congress decided to hold on to these territories in hopes of not only expansion but also strengthening its power and defense. Laws were thus made in each case for governing the inhabitants of the territories as they were, generally, powerless in the political and colonial processes. The problem, however, was and continues to be defining the relationship between the United States government and the inhabitants of its territories most of whom come from distinct cultural traditions that vary greatly from American values and principles. Despite these differences, laws continue to be made within the American context in these territories regarding issues of rights and identity.

Identifying Laws as a Means of Negotiation

Because local and federal laws played a prominent role in establishing the island as a colony of the United States, they have also had a major role in the way that Chamorus participate in the community and the (re)imagining of their identities. In the early years of American colonization, the United States government quickly established control over the land and its people. Proclamations were signed and laws were passed in an effort to "clean up" Guam. "The colonizing process entailed new ways of managing the body, of presenting and displaying it" (Merry, 2000, p. 15). Similar to the first

American colonial period on Guam, the laws enacted shortly after the war were aimed at addressing issues of land, education, health, religion, and other social relations. Although some questioned the jurisdiction that the United States government had over the island and the people in the desire to gain local self-government, many Chamorus were in favor of these laws because they seemed at first glance to protect them from the injustices they had experienced not only from their Japanese rulers but also from American military officials that had overstepped their authority. In fact through these early years continuing into later times, Guam has been denied a place in the United States, but has become increasingly dependent upon it with traditions that are distinct from American traditions and at the same time tied to those same traditions that place them on the periphery. This dependency can be seen throughout contemporary Chamoru society.

The fight for local self-government meant that Chamoru involvement with island politics was at its peak. The people of Guam, as a result of continued injustices on the part of the United States Congress, attempted to change the island's political status. While many Chamorus were proud to identify themselves as American citizens, they wished to be afforded all the rights and privileges that are usually taken for granted by fellow Americans. As a result, Guam held its first plebiscite in 1976. Although a majority of the eligible voters wanted the island to remain in status quo, the issue of becoming a Commonwealth of the United States was the topic of political debate. After the second plebiscite in 1980, an overwhelming majority of the people chose Commonwealth over other options as a way to further solidify their ties to the United States of America.

In 1984, the people of Guam submitted a draft Commonwealth Act that would

allow the island to become a more self-governing entity while never really severing its

ties to its American colonizers. The aim of Guam's proposed status change was not only

political but also military, but the Act was quickly turned down because of its requests.

> There is in Guam's quest for political identity a fundamental contradiction in what Guam is trying to accomplish. The Chamorro activists belatedly seized upon self-determination as the major principle behind commonwealth. But self-determination marches under the flag of freedom, whereas commonwealth marches under the banner of equality…The ordinary Guamanian, on the other hand, regardless of ethnicity, appears to be seeking equality with other U.S. citizens as a first priority; not immediate full political equality, but an equality of opportunity with fellow Americans. (Rogers, 1988, pp. 25-26)

The idea of indigenous Chamoru rights soon emerged after the Draft Commonwealth Act

failed. The political status issue on the island rekindled a sense of Chamoru identity and

gave indigenous rights a newfound purpose.

Chamorus soon expressed their objection to the continued dominance by

Americans and the changes happening around them as a result of over a century of

American colonialism. For most of Guam's history, the Chamoru people have been the

island's majority ethnic group. They have been *the* island's leaders, educators, citizens,

and children, and the plight of the people of Guam concerning self-determination has

been that of the *Chamoru* people. In the past ten years, however, the reality is that the

Chamoru population has seen drastic changes. Chamorus are now fighting to develop an

understanding of their rights in relation to the rights of others within the community.

They are making laws and using the idea of rights to create a sense of unity (or disunity)

in the community. Tensions arise when Chamorus claim the necessity for maintaining

cultural traditions. What is not explicitly stated in these arguments is that many

Chamorus fear losing their place within the community to others.

Chamorros fear that their race will be "swallowed up" in a sea of foreigners, or

> perhaps even worse, that they will become a permanent underclass in their own homeland. Painful lessons from history of such demographic shifts are all too clear…Chamorros recognize that time is working against them. Unless they achieve self-determination soon, they reason, the odds are that they will not achieve it at all, for their political position weakens with each passing day. (McLauren, 1990, p. 24)

Chamorus, motivated once again by a fear for survival, have asserted their rights in order to protect their identity.[51] This assertion of rights has led to the creation and passage of legislation establishing entities such as the Chamorro Land Trust Commission, Department of Chamorro Affairs, the Chamorro Language Commission, the Guam Preservation Trust, the Commission on Decolonization, the Chamorro Registry Board, and the Decolonization Registry to protect the many interests of Chamorus on Guam.[52] By creating these political institutions for Chamorus, these laws have provided a space for negotiating place and being. These "new political spaces are opening up…and these spaces have become arenas for contesting…change…The existence of arenas or spaces within which…agendas might be negotiated takes place in the context of larger, global changes in which…[Chamoru identity is] being reconstituted" (Buss & Herman, 2003, p. 131).

---

[51] For more on the role of rights in the issue of identity see *Governing Out of Order: Space, Law and the Politics of Belonging* (Cooper, 1998) and *A Nation by Rights: National Cultures, Sexual Identity Politics and the Discourse of Rights* (Stychin, 1998).
[52] The laws that created these are as follows Guam Code Annotated Chapter 75, Guam Code Annotated Chapter 87, Guam Code Annotated Chapter 47, Pub. L. 27-89, Pub. L. 23-147, and Pub. L. 23-130 respectively.

Do You Spell that with an "ORRO" or with an "ORU"?

There is definitely an irony in the spelling of the word used to reference the indigenous people of Guam. Is it Chamorro or is it Chamoru?[53] The narrative that follows, although a bit confusing, will lend itself to the irony of the local experience.

Chamoru leaders set out to clearly define an identity for themselves in order to demand legal recognition and resources that aid in preserving and protecting their culture and their place. But because the law sometimes demands that these groups "deny the very identity that resistance is supposed to assert," this group of leaders were forced to establish a particular identity that is recognized by the state and the community (Gilliom, 2001, p. 114). Political identities have become a means to dispute, challenge, and reassess the standards of society, and by legally defining identity, a community has an "agreed-upon" standard for evaluating access to rights and benefits. For Chamorus, this meant legally defining themselves as the sole possessors of certain rights to gain access to these rights and privileges but at the same time linking them with a particular political, historical, and colonial premise of reality instead of a cultural or social one.

In 1998, the leaders of Guam attempted to have a Chamorro-only vote that would determine Guam's choice for a future political status. The island's Commission on Self-Determination established the need for a plebiscite to determine Chamorros' preference on a future political status. As declared by Public Law 23-130, all eligible Chamorros

---

[53] The "Chamorro" spelling of the term used to reference the indigenous people has existed in texts, law, and other official documents since the journals of Spanish explorers became public to the rest of the world. This continues to be the spelling of the term for all legal and official purposes. The "Chamoru" spelling of the term, however, has become increasingly popular among the local population. This spelling attempts to acknowledge a standard orthography in the indigenous language and correct the inconsistencies that have resulted from the popularization of the first spelling by. For a more detailed explanation see reference in footnote 1.

would register with the Chamorro Registry Board and then vote in a Chamorro-only

plebiscite to determine the future of the island.[54] The intent of the law states,

> The Guam Legislature recognizes that the indigenous people of Guam, the
> Chamorros, have endured as a population with a distinct language and culture
> despite suffering over three hundred years of colonial occupation…The Guam
> Legislature, in fulfilling its responsibility, endeavors to memorialize the
> indigenous Chamorro people by establishing a registry of the names of those
> Chamorro individuals, families, and their descendents who have survived over
> three hundred years of colonial occupation and who continue to develop as one
> Chamorro people on their homeland, Guam. (Pub. L. 23-130)

As the intent notes, the purpose of the Chamorro Registry is to "educate Chamorros about

their status as an indigenous people and the inalienable right to self-determination which

they possess." Additionally, the Registry was intended to remind the United States of

their obligation to "the indigenous people of Guam" as an administering power and to

increase "local awareness among the people of Guam of the current struggle for

Commonwealth, of the identity of the indigenous Chamorro people of Guam, and of the

role that Chamorros and succeeding generations play in the island's cultural survival and

in Guam's political evolution towards self-government."

Much of the resistance to this law lies in the definition of Chamorro and the right

of Chamorros to be self-determining. This law uses a definition of Chamorros that was

constructed in historical terms privileging a particular colonial past. It was used as a

means for invoking and reaffirming "inherently romantic, even nostalgic images of

shared moral community" (Haltom & McCann, 2004, p. 22). The rights of Chamorus to

achieve self-determination were masked by the claims made in the name of Chamorro

---

[54] The legal definition of the term "Chamorro" states that "all inhabitants of the island of
Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date,
who were Spanish subjects, who after that date continued to reside in Guam or other
territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty, and have taken no
affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign nationalities." (Pub. L. 23-130)

rights. Chamorro rights advocates believe that "the right of the Chamorro people—

colonized for hundreds of years—to decide how to decolonize themselves shouldn't be

taken lightly…Chamorros have a right to determine their political status, and it's an

important and historical process" (Babauta, 1998b, p. 3). The argument has become one

of clearly defining identity on the island, but identity for whom?

This identity that was formed within the American political context remained

embedded in the same American colonial context that created it. The Chamorro-only

vote has since been postponed indefinitely, but the issue of identity remains crucial to

understanding Chamorus within the American colonial context. This argument becomes

much more complex in the years following this initial legislation creating the Chamorro

Registry Board and the Chamorro-only vote. We will return to this discussion in the next

chapter.[55] What is important to note here is that shifts in population over the last two

decades resulted in dire efforts toward the preservation of a culture and an identity.

Who are the people of Guam?

When asked "who is Chamoru?" and "are you Chamoru?" many Chamorus pause

before reluctantly providing an answer. To live as a Chamoru is easy. To be a Chamoru

is easy. To define a Chamoru is not. One man's response to these questions was:

> The legal definition of it, like I told you nai dear, I am not really at par with the
> legal interpretation of the word Chamorro. You know, speaking about that word
> Chamorro, I remembered in school, again a teacher that we had, an American, a
> guy named Carano, Paul Carano. I never forget, he was my history teacher in
> high school and you know what born the word Chamorro that he told us in
> school? When the Japanese, I mean, the Spaniard landed in Guam, the Spaniard
> noticed that almost all the men hair was shaved off, and one of them said, Hey

---

[55] A more detailed discussion of this argument and the changes in the law can be found in
Chapter 6: Identifying the Future-Chamoru Self?-determination.

look! They're Chamorros, they're without hair. That's how I remembered Mr. Carano used to tell- and I never knew that. But he told us, that's when they call us Chamorro. Other than calling us the Islas de Ladrones. But he was – look they're Chamorros, they're without hair - so that's how we ended up like that. I heard-I don't know whether Mr. Carano was – but he was a history teacher in high school. I heard that from him in our lectures in class, you know. But other than that, dear, I don't know much about the legal terminologies of Chamorro. (personal communication)

Another man simply said:

I am a Chamorro. I don't know [what that means]. But I am Chamorro and I am proud of it. It is important to me. It is my life. I am Chamorro." (personal communication)

Chamorus find themselves in a complex relationship that is governed by both local and national laws. More importantly, this relationship is defined by the larger territorial relationship that governs the island. The United States Congress continues to exercise authority over the island. Guam as an unincorporated territory of the United States does not have a self-governing body nor does it have full protection under the U.S. Constitution, but it has been trying to change its political status.

Too small to become a U.S. state, too strategic to be permitted independence, Guam lives on in a kind of neocolonial limbo. This condition is quite satisfactory for U.S. national security interests, but is increasingly anachronistic as all other islands of Micronesia have moved toward resolution of their final political identities…Guam's case is notable not only because it concerns the fate of one of the world's last small colonies, but also because it significantly conditions the durability of the American presence throughout the strategically important western Pacific Ocean. This is a region heretofore considered an "American lake," but now quietly undergoing political decentralization. (Rogers, 1988, pp. 1-2)

The United States continues to be interested in Guam's geographic importance. As a result, America has found great success in satisfying the needs of the people of Guam by feeding money into the island instead of promoting self-determination for the people. Movements promoting Chamoru rights have been quick to emerge but have been resisted

by older generations and other minority groups who have enjoyed this continued security, financial support, and stability from Uncle Sam. The island, as a result, has become bound to the United States through not only a strong economic dependency but also through its institutions, principles, and traditions. The issue of colonization has greatly affected all aspects of the island. "The everyday effects of colonialism are so prevalent that we almost accept them as part of our lives. We have become nearly numb to the turmoil in our community."[56] Politics on Guam has been and continues to be extremely personalized. Many Chamorus still desire self-determination and a new political identity despite the self-inflicted problems that exist within the community. Many Chamorus, however, continue to hold their ethnic and cultural identities as well as a strong tie to their American colonial past/present as important parts of their political being. This has become a means for claiming status or a lack of status.

With Guam's current struggle for self-determination, we continue to see the struggle for a Chamoru identity distinct from other groups on the island. In 2000, the Guam Legislature clarified the right of self-determination in Public Law 25-106 with the creation of the Guam decolonization registry different from the Chamorro Registry law.[57] While the Chamorro Registry Board would continue to compile names of Chamorros, the Guam decolonization registry would register eligible voters for a self-determination plebiscite according to a single qualifier: an eligible voter is a native inhabitant or people of Guam. This standing definition for the "native inhabitants or the people of Guam" is

---

[56] Ronald Rivera, the Vice Chairman of the Guam Decolonization Commission, quoted in *Guam appeals to U.N. on decolonization effort* (Loerzel, 2000, p. 3).
[57] This registry is different from the Chamorro Registry created by Pub. L. 23-130. For a more detailed discussion of Pub. L. 25-106 and the differences in the Guam laws relating to self-determination see Chapter 6: Identifying the Future-Chamoru Self?-determination.

based on a political distinction rooted in colonization. This classification, however, ignores the complexity and diversity that exists among the community by attempting to label the native inhabitants as *the* people of Guam leaving all others outside of the right to self-determination. All people on Guam who became U.S. citizens with the signing of the Organic Act in 1950 whether or not they are Chamoru are, by virtue of this definition, native inhabitants of Guam. The definition makes no mention of Chamorus or Chamorros but it does create a means to include and exclude certain peoples leaving non-native inhabitants in a political limbo of sorts having no claim to indigeneity or historical continuity as the legal definition requires. The exclusive right of the native inhabitants to self-determination has left a huge question in the minds of those living on an island where the population of the indigenous group is well below the majority and the populations of other ethnic groups namely Filipinos and citizens of the Freely Associated States is on the rise but also where the legacy of colonization has never been resolved. This exclusive right of the native inhabitants to self-determination also does not account for Chamorus and Chamorros who because of a circumstance of time are not native inhabitants in the eyes of the law. Nonetheless, this political identity was created as a response to the present reality of migration, modernization, and globalization in an American colony.

Chamorus Resisting Chamorros

Symbols of shared experience have become important signifiers of an identity for Chamorus especially in light of contending identities. These symbols of history and the community are used to reaffirm and sustain the (re)imagined identity, and it is in the

people's desire to maintain a Chamoru identity that symbols of an ancient Chamoru order

are paired with American patriotism. Chamorus are reaching for the past at the same

time coping with modernity. The struggle between the ancient and the modern is

revealed by the winds of a typhoon.[58] In the recent efforts to revive Micronesian

seafaring, Chamorus are re-discovering a sense of who they are and where they came

from. For many, this has been a means to reconnect with themselves. Navigating the

ocean using the stars as a map, however, becomes almost impossible with all the lights

generated by the modern advancements of electricity. As quickly as we flip the light

switches on our island, our ability to see the stars in our skies fades. "To shed light in

order to see something clearly is to also simultaneously cast a shadow in some

diametrically-opposed area and thereby obscure what's also there" (Diaz, 1998, p. 54).

Similarly, the symbols of American patriotism have inexplicably blinded us from seeing

the United States government as a colonial regime. Instead, the American government

continually "energizes" the people of Guam with financial resources, military protection,

and nationalistic propaganda to mask the increased dependency, destruction of land, and

crisis in Chamoru society, culture, and identity. So, when Chamorus sing the lyrics to

---

[58] This statement refers to an article written by Vicente Diaz where he addresses the tension between tradition and modernity. In the article Diaz recalls the energy felt by the people of Guam when the power is restored after a typhoon and how this causes tension with the Chamorro tradition of navigation. "For having power meant refrigeration and the termination of the epic quest for ice. It signaled the end of battles with the throngs at the Laundromat; of finally being able to read again at night. Having light at your command to see clearly. But as more and more of the island's power lines began to juice up, as we began to re-accustom ourselves to the technological wonder of lighting the island nights, something also vital to our island heritage began to just as quickly fade from our view: the rising and setting stars that traditional Micronesian navigators observe every morning and evening, a celestial canopy which – as I'm only beginning to understand – constitutes an ancient mirror of the many cycles of life that take place below on land and see." (1998, p. 54).

"Uncle Sam Please Come Back to Guam" or when they put stickers on their cars that say "Guam U.S.A., Where America's Day Begins," they are unconsciously recalling and reaffirming American colonialism.[59] Chamorus have been blinded from the ills of colonial power by the light of benevolence.

Despite four hundred years of colonization, Chamorus continue to reaffirm their identity through innovative representations of their beliefs and realities. Chamorus use symbols from their indigenous past to find meaning in their present. Symbols like the ancient Chamoru galaide (or flying proa), the Chamoru latte stone, signs displaying Chamoru terms, Chamoru chiefs from the pre-contact era, and even Chamoru *manamko* (or elders) have become increasingly meaningful in a time of change and a time when Chamorus are trying to grasp for anything from their past that may help them understand the space in which they now inhabit as well as cope with the present conditions on their island.

In an effort toward cultural renaissance, Chamorus have turned to reinventing indigenous traditions using art, music, dance, poetry, and seafaring. These emerging art forms are new but are representations of things old. They have not been passed down from generations but have, instead, derived from traditions that have been passed through time. Chamoru weavers and musicians are now being joined by artists who meld Chamoru traditions of singing and dancing with popularized dances and Chamoru

---

[59] The following is another version of the song *"Uncle Sam Please Come Back to Guam"*: "Uncle Sam, I'm sad and lonely…Uncle Sam, come back to me. Uncle Sam I love you only…Oh, please come back and set me free. Early Monday morning the action came to Guam, eighth of December Nineteen forty-one. Oh, Mr. Sam, Sam, my dear Uncle Sam won't you please come back to Guam? Our Lives are in danger…You better come and kill all the Japanese…right here on Guam. Oh, Mr. Sam, Sam, my dear Uncle Sam won't you please come back to Guam." (Perez, 1994, p. 8)

traditions of storytelling with foreign concepts of plays and poetry. Chamoru men and women perform Chamoru chants while dancing hula. Images of Chamorus drinking coffee and taotaomo'na crying appear in a poem about the struggle to understand Chamoru past in the context of modern Guam.[60] Stories about Chamorus remembering their childhood are being written and published in collections. Plays written about ancient Chamoru legends are being performed at auditoriums in modern university settings. Chamorus are now finding ways to reconcile the tension that exists between things traditional and the modern world they now inhabit. By finding the knowledge contained in the living memories of the people, Chamorus are reclaiming their past in ways that are meaningful for their present.

Much of what we now see in the arts on Guam is a product of these (re)imagined notions of the past by contemporary Chamoru artists. In the midst of continued colonial rule, Chamorros are reinventing themselves through varied forms of art like song, dance, stories, and chant. It is in this renegotiation that Chamorus are realizing and recreating their past. It is easy to see this in the work of artists such as Flora Baza Quan, Johnny Sablan and J.D. Crutch—whose songs are have influenced the styles of other artists, Frank Rabon and the Taotao Tano' dancers—whose dances have been infused with a new local culture, Katherine Aguon, Clotilde Gould and Peter Onedera—whose stories and writings tell of a unique people and culture, and Leonard Iriarte—whose chants are changing the nature of Chamoru language on the island. Colonization and modernization have contributed to the erosion of Chamoru culture, but the appropriation of these new

---

[60] Refers to "Kafe Mulinu" a poem that appears in an original manuscript by C.T. Perez entitled *Signs of Being—A Chamoru Spiritual Being* (1997). Taotaomo'na are Chamorro ancestors.

ideas and new art forms have helped Chamorus reconnect with their past and adapt to life on Guam today. Chamoru art tells a story of a Chamorro awareness of Chamoru culture and heritage hidden under the many layers of colonization and acculturation (Flores, 2002). Contemporary Chamoru artists have borrowed not only from ancient Chamoru culture but from their Pacific brothers and sisters as well to (re)imaginet Chamoru art and thus Chamoru identity.

Not all art, however, is rooted in ancient traditions and histories. Some art use cultural ideas as a means to create a space for modern forms of expression. In 1997, radio personality Chris Barnett created a local talk show that eventually turned into a series of skits for radio known as "Malafunkshun." Malafunkshun is easily recognizable by most locals because of the distinct nature of the pieces and the unique voice behind them. Chris "Malafunkshun" Barnett, as he is now popularly known on Guam, explains the meaning behind the name and the art, "'Malafunkshun' is a localized pronunciation of the word 'malfunction' and is adopted from the Chamoru word 'mala' which means 'bad' or 'not working.' Malafunkshun recorded skits that satirized local politics for probably the first time in Guam history" (communication with the artist). The show is an "in your face" attempt to use comedy to talk about issues that for some may seem taboo. In a culture that prides itself on respect and relationships, Malafunkshun, initially, caused great unease and tension. But for those who are at the wrong end of his jokes, the show can be a hostile environment for airing one's "dirty laundry."

Malafunkshun's 5 albums and numerous on-air performances continue to be an interesting outlet for local politics. Malafunkshun produces a wide variety of skits, but all with a distinct local flavor. Some skits make obvious references to politics directing

their message to top elected officials and others are subtle shots at the ill workings of the

government and still others reference the unique local culture and people. One example

uses humor to bring to light the conflict of a former Governor and Lieutenant Governor

and former Attorney General. Local slang references the problems this conflict has

caused for the government and the "*matapang*," childlike nature of the fighting.[61] The

message of the skit is intended to encourage these public officials to work together to

"make Guam better" rather than "fighting with each other." Escalated by the courts and

the media, the conflict has become the butt of many jokes.

Malafunkshun's use of satire, sarcasm and humor help to provide insight and an

interesting point of view into the local culture and people on Guam. "I think it's opened a

lot of doors and made things we used to not talk about the center of conversations,"

Barnett said of the material he has written over the years. "Every culture has a 'trickster'

who serves not only to make people laugh ...but also to 'enlighten' if you will...by using

humor…after all satire has been used to say a lot of things that needed to be said

throughout history...things that if said in a normal way could get a person hung by the

powers-that-be" (communication with the artist). In another example, Malafunkshun

dedicates a song to Guam's *manamko* who are unable to retire because "someone stole

money" from the retirement fund.[62] The Malafunkshun Boys sing to the tune of another

local song, "I wonder where the money went for our own retirement." The song pokes

fun at double dippers, COLA payments as well as government agencies that have not

---

[61] *Matapang* is a Chamoru word meaning "silly."
[62] *Manamko* is a Chamoru word meaning "elder."

paid the retirement contributions for their employees.[63] As a result, *manamko* find

themselves in a predicament where they cannot buy food, take care of their children, and

are forced to sell their land.

Malafunkshun also uses humor to address Chamoru customs surrounding religion.

One Malafunkshun skit is performed in a whispered song that details Chamoru traditions

surrounding the Catholic celebration of Holy Week. Topics of other Malafunkshun

satires include the Chamoru love of partying, Chamoru farmers, the infamous Chamoru

atan baba, Chamoru families, and issues of dating, crime, and government abuses.[64]

Although these skits are less political in nature, they too reveal a perspective and

criticism of Chamoru culture and identity that may not be readily consumed by Chamorus

without the use of humor such as this. As Barnett points out,

> Malafunkshun's impact on local politics is not easily determined. Politicians now
> have to consider that their wrongdoings can be featured on a satirical skit that is
> played over the radio 10x a day or uploaded onto various social media sites.
> "Whenever I run into senators, mayors…governors they always say 'hey, don't
> make fun of me,'" Barnett said. "I don't think my skits are going to prevent any
> wrongdoing but they certainly have the ability to make someone regret
> wrongdoing…Who knows if Malafunkshun can change minds or influence
> people…but it can definitely drive a point home…and every time I write
> something, whether its cultural or political…my point is to influence whether
> through my opinion or the satirizing of BOTH sides of an issue." (communication
> with the artist)[65]

The good, the bad and the funny, Guam still remains "my island, your island, our island

of Guam" as one of Malafunkshun's more popular songs illustrates. It is in the unique

culture that Chamorus have successfully negotiated a space within our colonial

---

[63] "Double dippers" is the local term for people who have retired from the government
and are rehired to do the same or a similar job thus receiving two government checks.
[64] *Atan baba* is a Chamoru term meaning "bad look or dirty look."
[65] Emphasis original.

experience and continue to create a sense of strength and pride infused with a lot of humor.

There is a considerable growing consciousness of Chamoru culture and identity that has been coupled with an increased awareness of the political nature of both. Chamoru culture and Chamoru identity are becoming the means by which a political identity is created as part of a larger response to the colonial experience on Guam. Contemporary Chamorus have found useful ways of invoking their past and making it meaningful for their present. It is apparent, however, that much negotiation needs to take place before Chamorus are able to rise out of this colonial legacy. Through the use of art and other more creative and unconventional mediums, Chamoru culture and Chamoru identity has become more of a noticeable display of political movement towards self-identification. Chamorus are increasingly externalizing their culture as a way to begin a dialogue for redefining and achieving a unified political end that will be beneficial to all.

CHAPTER 6. IDENTIFYING THE FUTURE—CHAMORU SELF?-DETERMINATION

Since identity is the means by which we locate ourselves in society, it can be defined by the processes through which ideas and interactions are linked to everyday life. We "inhabit a particular place, which is the sphere of routine activity and interaction and is richly suffused with meanings, which in turn is the base for a dispersed series of networks of exchanges with others centered on particular interests, all of which are brought together in the sphere of continually reworked memory" (Preston, 1997, p. 44). Our social perceptions and the environment in which we live help shape our realities. Because identity is a complex process that involves aspects of the place we inhabit and the memories we have about a particular time and are articulated through the exchanges between people within their communities or with those outside it and our personal relationship with the past. This is why it is often contested. Identity is not "fixed or self-foundational," but rather its use is "inextricably tied to fluidity and movement across time and space" (Meijl, 2004, p. 12). Identity is a reflection not of what truly exists but a reflection of what we perceive to be the reality of the past. "Every individual has his or her own reality, and accepts or rejects new elements or dimensions that happen to impinge on it. Those that seem desirable and easy to cope with, for one reason or another, may be accepted or rejected at a particular time and perhaps later reassessed in light of new circumstances" (Thaman, 2003, p. 114). "One could think of identity as a shifting balance between what is privately remembered and what is currently publicly demanded" (Preston, 1997, p. 5). As our reality shifts, identity is re(imagined) and then articulated through new patterns and understandings of life. We create identities "by

reshaping and piecing together chunks of existing social structure rather than inventing whole new forms" (Tilly, 1995, p. 9). We construct, create, and transform our identities as new defining moments dictate a (re)imagined sense of self.

It is useful to think of identities as embedded in "the narratives whereby we constitute discrete events as belonging to a particular self" (Preston, 1997, p. 169). Because identity is "the way in which we more or less self-consciously locate ourselves in our social world," it is also in these narratives or stories of the past that our memories, our perceptions, and our identities are filtered (Preston, 1997, p. 169).

> Texts are sequences of information. Stories are imaginative arrangements of these sequences and the information they contain….It is the frame provided by the author that combines, presents, and interprets the narratives and the overall story…Stories are important where linear reasoning breaks down. Narratives provide exemplars for action. They lead to conclusions internal to context…They can also be instruments of reconstruction, presenting the views of living, particular individuals in imaginative renditions… (Frohock, 1993, p. 279).

Writing these narratives of the past in my research opens the possibilities for hearing the silent voices of history. These stories of the past become the counternarratives through which the dominant discourse about history and identity can be disrupted. The use of narratives is a strategy necessary to write a history of counternarratives in the present that may inform, enlighten and educate the reader. But it also runs the risk that as we tell a story that may not want to be heard we hope that other audiences at other times will be more open.[66]

Societies, like individuals, interpret their place in the world in their own ways, and people use these understandings to reaffirm the identity that has been constructed out of history. What becomes evident in the study of identity is the continual change in the

---

[66] For more on the narrative strategy see *When the State Kills: Capital Punishment and the American Condition* (Sarat, 2001, pp. 158-184).

personal, social, cultural, and political deployment of identities. We continually look to our past to make sense of our shifting self-image in the present. We, thus, use our "narratives to maintain a sense of personal and social continuity" (Fitzgerald, 1993, p. 24). These narratives are our identities and can be used to uncover some of the mysteries behind the changing signifcance of Chamoru identity. Chamoru history and Chamoru memories can be seen as contested sites on which indigenous identity combined with exogenous identity are created, challenged, and then recreated (Diaz, 2000). The accounts of Chamoru struggles and survival that are contained mostly in the fragments of stories that are still available are important clues to the very nature of Chamoru identity that is not discussed in the present discourse regarding what it means to be Chamoru.

Identity theory can best be applied to my research by looking at identity as a "dialectic of telling and living life" (Engel & Munger, 2003, p. 45). Because the present Chamoru reality is largely a product of Guam's colonial encounters, an identity that was (re)imagined out of the WWII experience continues to be reaffirmed by the articulation of a past as it relates to the present. It is the way in which Chamorus have lived and have chosen to tell that story of survival that speaks to the complex nature of identity formation because "to create a life is to create a life out of the materials that history has given you" (Appiah, 2005, p. 19). As a result of the past as well as the ongoing colonial encounter, Chamorus have faced the challenge of coming to terms with two, often, incompatible realities.

> The power differential between the competing collective identities is what makes the reconciling of collective identities so problematic. When one cultural group has complete power over another, the task of integrating the powerful collective identity with the much less powerful heritage collective identity is overwhelming…After all, the less powerful group does not voluntarily choose to place itself in a bicultural context: it's imposed on them…Groups that are

> overpowered by another cultural group do not choose to incorporate the new powerful collective identity. (Taylor, 2002, p. 71)

The reality of a displaced culture combined with the conflicting collective identity of the colonial power has been the compelling force for the continued reshaping of identity for the Chamoru people.

> The crisis in identity is one of both conflict and confusion arising from competing cultures that are devoid of fundamental values. Aboriginal people do not merely face the pushes and pulls of their heritage culture, on the one hand, and mainstream culture, on the other. Rather, they confront a heritage culture that is itself a confusing array of values and practices as a consequence of internal colonialism…Colonized people, then, have their identity conflicts compounded by the fact that the two competing cultural identities are themselves poorly defined templates…At best, [they] must rely on reconstructions of past idealized descriptions of traditional values and ways of life. This is precisely why Aboriginal people in the process of redefining their heritage culture hearken back to precolonial times for a romanticized image of collective identity. (p. 81)

Therefore, it has been almost impossible for Chamorus to clearly define a collective identity, which then leads to the inconceivability of a clear personal identity. "This disjunction between self-identity and that imposed by others may be especially harmful for people in small, powerless societies, who sense their latter identity as a patronizing colonialism dressed up as social science" (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 318). As Chamorus attempt to make sense of these shared but often competing aspects, they are compelled to (re)imagine identity.

Chamoru culture and history have also become the means through which identity has been (re)constructed through the need for distinction, resistance, and survival all shaped within the existing colonial context. "Throughout our lives part of the material that we are responding to in shaping our selves is not within us but outside us" (Appiah, 2005, p. 21). By looking at identity as both being produced by and producing these

instances of conflict between Chamorus and others, we can see how the colonial

encounter was crucial to the formation of a Chamorro identity.

When the Japanese took control of Guam in December 1941, reality for the

Chamorro people drastically shifted from one of relative peace to uncertainty and fear.

Chamorus used that sense of fear associated with the war during the Japanese occupation

as a tool to cope with the new circumstance. The reality was one of war, and the way in

which Chamorus chose to identify with that reality was a reflection of that time.

Chamorus looked to the alternative—the American colonizer—as a way to resist those

negative feelings. It is these memories of the past that Chamorus have used to relate to

the present conditions under American colonization. Chamorros, as a result, have come

to internalize many of the labels placed on them during and after WWII as the grateful,

patriotic natives who amidst the horror of war continued to sing songs for the Americans.

> *Oh, Mr. Sam, Sam, My dear Uncle Sam,*
> *Won't you please come back to Guam?*[67]

And whose images of children receiving candy from American military men at the end of

the war are accompanied by statements like "Happy smiles returned to once haggard and

worried faces" and "It was characteristic of the Chamorros that even under the most

difficult of conditions in the [American] refugee camps, they did not complain. Indeed

they were very grateful for what help they received" (Sanchez, 1997, p. 240, 249). Or

more general statements of American-Chamorro patriotism made by both Americans and

---

[67] This is the chorus to an underground song, "Uncle Sam Please Come Back to Guam" as previously mentioned in Chapter 2. For the lyrics to two different versions of the song see pages 48 and 110 (Perez, 1994, p. 8).

Chamorros such as "Guam, U.S.A., Where America's Day Begins!"[68] or "In the future this island will become one of the most important United States naval and air bases in the Pacific. Its people have been loyal wards of the United States"[69] and "Our loyalty has never been questioned. There has been and always shall be only one 'ism' in Guam and that is Americanism. We are proud of our record during peace and war"[70] As a result of these images and statements as well as many others like them, an identity that pledges allegiance to American loyalty was constructed and remains the collective identity for the Chamorro people. At the same time, for a Chamorro identity that is constructed out of an American colonial reality to exist, the "American colony of Guam" was created and is now being sustained by legal, economic, and social constraints.[71]

Identity theory allows for a more complex and more critical reading of our understanding of who we are in relation to the world around us. In the process of constructing a Chamorro identity in the context of American colonization, Chamorus have been implicated in "a historicized image of themselves as people of [an American colony]" (Gray, 2003, p. 224). Identity, thus, is contingent upon the relationship between the past and the present, and in this case, it is how a history of colonization and war relates to the present condition of life for Chamorus. Chamoru identity is particular to a place and a past, is constructed through perceptions of reality, and is linked to social and

---

[68] This is a popular phrase that appears on many brochures, handbooks, posters, and bumper stickers available in Government of Guam offices, the Visitors Bureau, and stores on Guam.

[69] This statement was taken from a United States Senate report accompanying the Meritorious Claims Act (Palomo, 1984, p. 239).

[70] This statement comes from testimony given by Francisco B. Leon Guerrero during a hearing regarding the granting of United States citizenship to the people of Guam (Carano & Sanchez, 1965, p. 357).

[71] "To establish an identity is to create a social and conceptual space for it to be in ways that impinge on the spaces available to other possibilities" (Connolly, 1991, p. 160).

cultural notions of being. It is in the events of the past and the present that we are able to better understand identity formation with a critical eye to the role that colonization plays in this process.

Chamoru Identity: A Narrative of Self-Determination

At the end of WWII, the world recognized the right of self-determination as a way to redress colonization and has since established this right as *jus cogen*.[72] In essence, these norms describe a minimum level of actions to which every state must uphold and no state can derogate. Self-determination is one such principle. Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights asserts the rights of people;

> All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. (U.N. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)

One can argue that the right of self-determination is a right that is given to "all peoples" equally. It is a right that is recognized and must be exercised no matter the outcome or the cost. But if this is true of the right of self-determination, then why does it remain such a contested issue? Why haven't the people of Guam become self-determining? Why isn't there a clear means to achieve this ends? The relationship between non self-governing territories (i.e. Guam) and administering powers (i.e. the United States) must

---

[72] *Jus Cogen* is Latin for "compelling law." It is a fundamental principle or "law" recognized by the international community, more specifically, the United Nations, as a set of norms that cannot be deviated, changed, or relaxed. In Article 53 of the Vienna Convention, *jus cogen* or "peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character."

be re-examined in light of the modern political climate in order to understand the struggle

for self-determination so that peoples can exercise their fundamental right to choose their

future.

Although self-determination is a right that has been bestowed on all people, what

happens when the world also recognizes this right as belonging to a specific group of

people—indigenous people? The indigenous people of Guam are Chamorus, but through

an Act of Congress, they are also Americans. Many Chamorus recognize their

obligations as citizens, and many of them have learned to be American. But as

Americans, Chamorus have limited rights. One right, however, that is not tied to their

rights as citizens of the most powerful nation in the world is the right to self-

determination. It is a right that transcends the borders of any country and a right that is

inherent to all peoples; or at least it should be. On Guam, this right has provided an arena

for the continued debate about Chamoru identity. Defining identity in terms of a "self"

with rights to be economically, socially and politically developed may require a new

narrative different from that of war which created the Chamorro identity. The future of

Guam, a future for the people of Guam, may in fact result in a new identity rooted in a

new narrative of self-determination.

In 2007, The United Nation's Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

was adopted.[73] The document's signatories echoed the awareness and recognition of the

rights of indigenous peoples throughout the world by "reaffirming [that] indigenous

individuals are entitled without discrimination to all human rights recognized in

---

[73] 143 member states signed this document; 4 voted against the Declaration; And 11
nations abstained. Among the Declarations critics were Australia, Canada, New Zealand,
the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. (U.N. General Assembly, 61st
Session, 2007).

international law." They also recognized the collective rights of indigenous peoples,

including that of self-determination. According to the *United Nations Special*

Rapporteur to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of

Minorities, the working definition of indigenous peoples is:

> those which having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial
> societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from
> other sectors of societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them.
> They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to
> preserve, develop, and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories,
> and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in
> accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems.
> (Henriksen 2001, p. 8)

The UN has not formally adopted this or any other definition of "indigenous peoples."

This has been problematic especially when the discussion turns to one of rights. How can

a people who are not clearly defined claim rights that have been reserved for them? It

can also be argued that defining "indigenous peoples" will inadvertently make the

definition not inclusive of ALL indigenous peoples leaving some out and allowing others

in. This will be further discussed later, in the case of Guam. But for now, it seems

logical that it should be the responsibility of specific groups of people within specific

geographic locations to create their own definition of "indigenous people." Another

problem arises, however, when the indigenous population is forced to create a definition

within the confines of the institution established for them by an external power. Once the

definition is created will it be recognized?

By virtue of their indigeneity, Chamorus are directly connected to the land on

which they were born—connected not only by their birth but also by their history, their

culture, their language, and most importantly, their ancestors. For many Chamorus, this

connection not only provides a sense of belonging but is also a part of their being. It is

who they are. Indigenous populations tend to have a strong physical, emotional, and

spiritual connection to their land. The land is vitally significant to them. Chamorus are

no exception. They belong to a place, find their identity in that place, and thus, find their

rights in that place. For Chamorus, that place is Guam, and their identities as Chamorus

are intrinsically tied to the island. In recent years, the global political climate on Guam

has meant a dramatic movement of people, whether by force or by choice. Immigrants

find themselves making a home in Guam. This movement of non-indigenous peoples

into an indigenous area has resulted in the creation of an insider/outsider dichotomy.

This was a subject of contention during the 1970 elections. In the run for Guam's first

elected governor, the debate surrounding "transient alien" workers was indicative of the

changing tide of political power among the people of Guam. One Democratic Party

candidate "promised to stop the inflow, which many Chamorros perceived to be a threat

to Chamorro culture and control of their island" (Rogers, 1995, p. 244). This stance cost

the candidate both Filipino and stateside votes resulting in a loss. In many campaigns

that followed, candidates often took special care to appeal to this smaller population of

voters. And as migrant populations grew, the indigenous population became a minority

in their homeland. This has meant a loss of land, a loss of traditional culture, and a loss

of power usually at the expense of the non-indigenous population.

Chamorus now comprise 37% of the population. This is a dramatic decrease from

90% prior to WWII.[74] This threat of loss often gets framed by negative feelings toward

non-indigenous people that are considered to be racist attitudes by the indigenous people.

In an opinion article that appeared in a local newspaper, Gerry Partido discusses the

---

[74] U.S. Census (1990) Total Population: 133,152, Chamorro Population: 49,935. U.S. Census (2000) Total Population: 154,805, Chamorro Population: 57,297

tensions between Chamorus and Filipinos similar to that found in the 1970 gubernatorial

elections. In "Opening Pandora's box," Partido (2011) is compelled to explain the

actions of a Filipino cabinet member who made reference to H2 workers and the potential

for Guam's first Filipino governor during her confirmation hearing. These statements

caused an uproar in the Chamoru community. Partido explains the comment made about

a Filipino governor for Guam:

> She was just expressing the same kind of ethnic pride that one would find with,
> say, the African-American community supporting a Barack Obama, or the
> Hispanic community's championing of a Sonia Sotomayor, or an Irish-American
> voting for a Kennedy.
>
> Doing so does not make one less American, or less patriotic, or less desirous of
> serving Guam as a whole. There is in fact extra pressure on ethnic officials to
> comport themselves in a way that would show they are not displaying any kind of
> favoritism in their policies.
>
> I'm sure there was never any offense meant against the Chamorros on island. In
> fact, Filipinos on Guam, even the oldtimers, have generally been cognizant of
> their place, fully accepting that Guam is the land of the indigenous Chamorros.
> But Tuesday's hateful remarks have made many Filipinos wonder whether it may
> indeed be time to organize politically along racial lines. (Partido, 2011)

This is not unlike what is happening in other places with similar circumstances nor is it

any different from the circumstances of the first colonizing efforts. The indigenous

population on Guam faces pressure from outside populations and is forced to

continuously adapt and adjust to changes in the world. In a separate article titled

"English, please" the editors of a local newspaper, take issue with Chamoru lawmakers

who have chosen to speak the indigenous language during legislative sessions. The

article begins by stating the fact that both Chamorro and English are official languages on

Guam. When setting the stage for the argument against the use of Chamorro in public

discussion, the article explains the problematic nature of the language choice of two

senators at a recent legislative session on the budget. The author claims that one of

which appeared more "animated and passionate" when speaking Chamorro suggesting

the possibility of "deliberately leaving a few of his colleagues out." The editorial then

goes on to argue why speaking English is more preferred to the indigenous language.

> However, the larger point is one of general understanding and representation. Whenever an important issue is being discussed, one that conceivably affects all Guamanians, the Legislature does the general public a disservice by conducting the public discussion only in Chamorro. They represent ALL of the people of Guam, not just Chamorros, and must carry out their business in ways which foster clarity and comprehension among the entire population, not one segment. (Editorial, 2011)

What is probably most interesting about this story are the comments posted by readers

that follow the article. One commenter posts:

> [The senator] is not ashamed to use the native language on Session Floor or on the notices of public hearings and the like. Hence his use and perhaps, over-use, of the native language. But that is something to be valued, precisely because it is not the dominant language on Guam as it was once used to be.
>
> As for those who do not know what is going on, they do not even know what is going on even when the conversation is in English. If, as some elected officials like to say that the future of economic growth is in Asia-Pacific, and it may very well be, then it behooves the next generation to learn Mandarin and other Chinese dialects (spoken in places besides PR China) and other languages such as Malay (spoken in South-East Asian nations in Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, Southern Thailand and even understood in Southern Philippines), while keeping the local language as vibrant as it can be alongside the global language of commerce, English.
>
> It is not an either or case with language. (Editorial, 2011)

In contrast to this comment, another reader posts:

> Points well taken and long a source of frustration for non-Chamorro speakers. This is part and parcel of the "we do it because we can" racial discrimination that includes mandatory Chamorro language instruction in public schools at the expense of more useful subjects and the publishing of official documents in Chamorro, as if there were anyone who reads and speaks only Chamorro and doesn't read or speak English. Chamorro should be offered as an elective in the public classrooms. Let parents decide whether their children need it. To force it

down the throats of students is no less demeaning and discriminatory than the reviled former practice of prohibiting the speaking of Chamorro in earlier times. Any time legislative sessions are conducted in a language the majority of members don't understand you can be sure that the speakers have something they don't want others to hear. It's an insult and an ego trip by those who feel the need to somehow impress others with their ability to obscure. (Editorial, 2011)

There is nothing new about this argument. It is the same argument that was made prior to WWII. It is the same argument that was made 60 years ago when the Americans re-claimed Guam. It is the same argument that is made every time the discussion surrounding Chamorro language curriculum arises in the public school system, and it is the same argument that is made every election when non-Chamoru speaking candidates begin to outnumber Chamorro speaking candidates.

The changing demographics of the island have resulted in a continued discussion of the insider/outsider dichotomy that began immediately after WWII. The individual and collective rights for indigenous people that were recognized by the world in 2007 was an issue for the people of Guam decades earlier as a result of the continued loss of land, traditional culture and most especially power of the indigenous people and continues to be an issue. With the recognition of indigenous rights for indigenous peoples, also came the distinction of and further division from another group of people, the non-indigenous people. This begs a new set of questions: Do the rights of indigenous people assume a level of privilege in clear distinction from other groups? If the distinction of indigenous peoples are made, and subsequent separation and distinction of non-indigenous people are made as well, does that automatically give certain rights to one group of peoples while dispossessing that same right from a separate group of people? And so, the debate becomes even more nuanced then it already is. Do groups of people who migrate into an indigenous area and are not considered "indigenous," but still

fall under the indigenous area's "territories and jurisdiction" share the same right to self-determination as indigenous people? Once the distinction of indigenous people is made and their rights recognized, the rights of all other people need to be defined. But what happens to the migrant populations? Can they be afforded a space in the place to which they move? Self-determination is a right that is bestowed on all peoples to determine their "political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development" (U.N.Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 1). Does this imply that a person, by choosing to move to a different place, willingly gives up this right? Should this even matter or is self-determination something that must be reserved for people whose political development was halted as a result of colonization?   If so, the right of self-determination may not be as fundamental a principle of international law as we may argue. Instead, it may be a right that is merely subject to the power of people to determine who can and cannot be politically, economically, socially, and culturally free.

The rights of self-determination assume, within its definition, that one must have, at some point in history, been deprived of a "political status" as well as the "freedom to freely pursue economic, social, and cultural development." Unlike indigenous populations, non-indigenous people cannot easily make this claim. And unlike indigenous populations, they cannot claim to have had an "historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies." So if non-indigenous people were to make a claim for the right of self-determination, what would be the basis of this claim? History? Territory? Cultural distinction? None of these qualifications appear to apply to this group. What happens to the 63% of Guam's population who do not claim indigeneity?

Does this mean that indigenous people have the sole right to self-determination in their homeland?

Indigenous people appear to have the right to self-determination based on a history of colonization that has resulted in either displacement or dispossession within the territory of origin. For Chamorus on Guam, that right is fundamentally tied to the American colonization of their homeland. This same argument does not readily apply to non-indigenous people; however, non-indigenous people by virtue of the territory and jurisdiction in which they live also have the same right as other people to enjoy their "civil and political freedom and freedom from fear and want," and this, as recognized by the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, can only be achieved "if conditions are created whereby everyone may enjoy his civil and political rights, as well as his economic, social and cultural rights." As stated in Article 2 of the Covenant:

> Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to *all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction* the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. (U.N.Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 2)

Does this imply that non-indigenous people share the same right as "all peoples" to self-determination? If "all peoples" within a territory and subject to its jurisdiction have the right to self-determination, then why is there a tendency for indigenous people to claim and be recognized as having privilege to this right over other peoples? And does this recognized privilege inadvertently deprive other people who have been and continue to be within that given territory and subject to its jurisdiction but cannot claim indigeneity of their right to self-determination?

Self-determination for Who?

Although the right is clear—self-determination is *jus cogen*—and those who have

the right is clear—"all peoples" have this right, the debate regarding the right is ongoing

and for many is cause for contention. The debate lies in the definition of "all peoples."

People have generally used law as a means for defining identity to gain access to rights.

But what happens when this results in a change in the identity of a people? What

happens when identity, especially for indigenous people, is no longer tied to a place, but

rather tied to a moment in time that was a direct result of events to which this particular

group of people had no control? What implication might this have for self-

determination? Late 1996 and early 1997, the Guam Legislature passed two laws that

defined the indigenous people, the Chamoru people of Guam. The first, Public Law 23-

130 (enacted December 30, 1996), established the "Chamorro Registry" for the purpose

of identifying the indigenous population.[75] The second, Public Law 23-147 (enacted

January 23, 1997), created the Commission on Decolonization with the task to

"implement" Self-Determination.[76] Both laws use the definition of Chamorro provided in

the Organic Act; however, the latter law adds a stipulation to this definition. Chamorus,

specifically, were persons "who have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire

foreign nationality," or a nationality outside of or different to that of their American

---

[75] Public Law 23-130 recognized "that the indigenous people of Guam, the Chamorros, have endured as a population with a distinct language and culture…" and carefully defined "Chamorro" as "those persons defined by the U.S. Congress in Section IV of the Organic Act of Guam (Act of August 1, 1950, 64 Stat. 384), pursuant to Article IX of the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain (signed in Paris, December 10, 1898, and proclaimed April 11, 1899), and their descendents."

[76] Public Law 23-147 defined Chamorros as "all inhabitants of Guam in 1898 and their descendents" but added a stipulation.

colonizer. In this law, the Guam Legislature also "recognized and approved the inalienable right of the Chamorro people to self-determination."

This was the first time since the passage of the Organic Act in 1950 that the government felt it necessary to legally define Chamorus as distinct from other groups, and through these definitions, tie their right to self-determination to the American colonization of Guam. For most of Guam's history, Chamorus have been the island's majority ethnic group, but in the second American colonial period, Chamorus have experienced a major shift in population due to the movement of people in and out of Guam. And so perhaps it is befitting that their right to self-determination be tied to this experience—an experience that has resulted in a significant decrease in Chamorus in relation to the increase in peoples of other ethnicities. Although these groups do not comprise a majority population alone, collectively they outnumber Chamorus, and this shift in population has resulted in attempts by Chamorus to not only secure their rights collectively but also empower their community politically. It is important to note at this point that both definitions of "Chamorro" make no reference to the cultural connections of the people.

In 2000, the Guam Legislature passed another law that would create the Guam Decolonization Registry for the sole purpose of identifying eligibility for a self-determination vote.[77] Public Law 25-106 was passed by the Guam Legislature on March

---

[77] Public Law 25-106 further defined "the native inhabitants or people of Guam" as those people who "have been recognized by the U.S. Congress in the 1950 Organic Act of Guam… It is the intent of *I Liheslaturan Guåhan* to permit the native inhabitants of Guam, as defined by the U.S. Congress' 1950 Organic Act of Guam to exercise the inalienable right to self-determination of their political relationship with the United States of America. *I Liherslaturan Guåhan* finds that the right has never been afforded to the native inhabitants of Guam, its native inhabitants and land having themselves been

9, 2000 and enacted on March 24, 2000 without a signature from then Governor Carl T.

C. Gutierrez.[78] The intent of the law states that the distinction made for the vote is not

one based on race, but instead "based on a clearly defined political class of people

resulting from historical acts of political entities in relation to the people of Guam," and

have clearly defined Chamorus based on historical events. This, unlike Pub. L 23-130

and Pub. L. 23-147, omits the term "Chamorro" from the language of the law in favor of

the term "native inhabitants" while still referring to them as the sole possessors of the

right to self-determination not because they are an indigenous people but because they

were historically deprived of the right through colonization. All other groups, as a result,

are excluded from this *universal, fundamental, jus cogen* right to self-determination

specific to the political future of Guam.

        This brings us back to an early argument about the "fundamental" nature of the

right to self-determination. Are there circumstances in the world that allow for

exceptions to a law's universality, and perhaps more importantly, it's fundamentality? Is

it possible to subject a right that has been deemed by the international community to be

---

overtaken by Spain, and then ceded by Spain to the United States of America during a
time of war, without any consultation with the native inhabitants of Guam. *I
Liheslaturan Guåhan* notes that the 1950 Congress acknowledged its United Nations'
responsibilities: 'In addition to its obligation under the Treaty of Paris, the United States
has additional treaty obligations with respect to Guam as a non self-government, and
taking 'due account of the political aspirations of the peoples." It is the purpose of this
legislation to seek the desires to those peoples who were given citizenship in 1950 and to
use this knowledge to further petition Congress and other entities to achieve the stated
goals. The intent…shall not be construed nor implemented by the government officials
effectuating its provisions to be race based, but founded upon the classification of persons
as defined by the U.S. Congress in the 1950 Organic Act."
[78] From a correspondence with Governor Carl T. C. Gutierrez: This law was passed by
the Guam Legislature at a time when there was rift between the two branches of
government. Governor Gutierrez believed the new law which cancelled the plebiscite
scheduled for July 1, 2000 and re-established the Commission without the Governor's
leadership would be an impediment to the self-determination process.

safe from deviation to the will of a government acting in response to and on behalf of a minority? Pub. L. 25-106 not only gave the people of Guam—the native inhabitants—the right to participate in a self-determination vote without mention of this right for any other group of people; it also creates an identity for all people connected to this history of American colonization rather than race, ethnicity, or culture and separate from those who came to Guam at a later date. The argument around the right to self-determination now centers on the right to belong to a place. All those who identify as a "native inhabitant" can claim rights to this place. For obvious reasons, this definition is problematic. First, are ethnic Chamorus the same as political Chamorros? This in many ways is contrary to the whole debate on indigenous rights. Second, what rights can Chamorus who, for lack of a better term, were "in the wrong place at the wrong time" claim? According to the legal definition of the term, these Chamorus are not "native inhabitants" and therefore, have no right to self-determination. And last, what claims can be made by people who may not claim ancestral ties to the indigenous population but were on Guam during the passage of the Organic Act? By virtue of the legal definition, these non-Chamorus are now "native inhabitants" and can decide the political future of Guam. Political pressure has produced this watered-down yet no less controversial alternative to the contentious debate surrounding the Chamorro-only vote and the right to self-determination.

In 1998, 2000 and again in 2002, elected officials on Guam attempted to hold a self-determination plebiscite that would determine the island's future political status. Each attempt was unsuccessful; however, symbolically, the vote would have represented a clear political division between "Chamorros"/the "indigenous population"/the "native inhabitants" and everyone else. Advocates for the right of Chamorus to be self-

determining believe that "the right of the Chamorro people—colonized for hundreds of years—to decide how to decolonize themselves shouldn't be taken lightly…Chamorros have a right to determine their political status, and it's an important and historical process" (Babauta, 1998b, p. 3). They believe that it is important for the Chamoru people to be the sole decision makers for the island on this issue. The idea that "we are one people, one nation, and we must be free" has been used in reference to the Chamorus (Babauta, 1998b, p. 3). One people is Chamorus. One nation is Guam. These advocates do not speak of the other groups on the island. And in many ways, Chamoru identity is defined because of the influx of, and in contra-distinction to, those who do not identify with the distinct culture or language of Guam and cannot make claims of displacement as a result of colonization.

Guam has dramatically changed from the first arrival of European explorers in 1521 to the signing of the Organic Act in 1950 to today's changing climate especially where migration is concerned.   The right of indigenous people to be self-determining has been politicized as a way to rally people around their discontents with the changes in the community. This awareness has developed "a new sense of efficacy: people who ordinarily consider themselves helpless come to believe that they have some capacity to alter their lot" (McCann, 1994, p. 90). And the only way to alter this is through the exclusion, and perhaps disadvantage, of others. But has this changed what we know about self-determination? Have we deviated from the importance placed on this right by international law?

Making the Case for Identity

The insider/outsider dichotomy on Guam is premised on the same idea that was argued in a 2000 court case, *Rice v Cayetano* (2000) regarding the issue of race. In this case, the Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional to exclude some people from a vote based on racial distinctions. The court stated that a rule based on racial distinctions "rests on the demeaning premise that citizens of a particular race are somehow more qualified than others to vote on certain matters. There is no room under the [fifteenth] Amendment for the concept that the right to vote in a particular election can be allocated based on race."[79] Unlike the definition of Native Hawaiian which includes descendents of the aboriginal people of Hawai`i who lived in Hawai`i prior to 1778, the definition of "native inhabitant" makes no specific reference to an aboriginal or indigenous population.

Although the group of people who are considered under Guam law to be "native inhabitants" may be assumed to fall under one of these categories that may include race and/or ethnicity, the definition legally incorporates this group of people under a common historical connection: American colonization and more specifically, the granting of citizenship under American colonial rule. Guam, like the State of Hawai`i, has based its law on the argument that the federal government has a unique relationship and obligation to colonial peoples—not racial groups or ethnic groups but rather colonized groups which may in fact result in the exclusion of some indigenous people and inclusion of some migrant populations.[80]

---

[79] Rice v. Cayetano, 538 U.S. 245, (2000)

[80] For an analysis of *Rice v Cayetano* see Precarious Positions: Native Hawaiians and US Federal Recognition (Kauanui, 2005, Spring), Colonialism in Equality: Hawaiian Sovereignty and the Question of U.S. Civil Rights (Kauanui, 2008, Fall), and *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Kauanui, 2008).

The relevance of this 2000 case for the people of Guam, therefore, is found in establishing who possesses what rights and more importantly whether or not the Fifteenth Amendment applies to people of the territories. In the landmark Insular Cases, the U.S. Supreme Court decided that the constitution of the United States does not necessarily apply to the offshore territories and the inhabitants of these territories, that only fundamental rights applied to the inhabitants, and that the territories of the United States would be considered "foreign in a domestic sense."[81] Instead, cases involving the territories would be handled individually as they arose to determine whether certain rights were applicable to the inhabitants of the territories. Ultimately, a case such as this could redefine the relationship of America to its colonies.

It is unclear whether the courts will consider Guam's "native inhabitant" definition a racial category or whether the ruling set forth by the Supreme Court in *Rice v Cayetano* (2000) is applicable to the local law based on the 1901 Insular cases ruling; however, not only will the right of the "native inhabitants" to solely participate in a self-determination plebiscite be debated but the debate will also be about the larger issue of fundamental rights.[82] The implications that upholding the current law will have will then be first, that all those who are not "native inhabitants" whether they be Chamoru or not do not share the same right to self-determination because they do not share the same

---

[81] For a more detailed discussion of the "Foreign in a Domestic Sense Doctrine" see *Foreign in a domestic sense: Puerto Rico, American expansion, and the constitution* (Burnett and Marshall, 2001) and *Colonial constitutionalism: The tyranny of United States' offshore territorial policy and relations* (Statham, 2002).

[82] In November 2011, Arnold Davis filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court of Guam against the Guam Election Commission and the Government of Guam alleging discrimination based on Pub. L. 25-106 which limits eligibility for the decolonization registry and self-determination plebiscite to the "native inhabitants of Guam." Davis is not ethnically or legally a native inhabitant of Guam and, therefore, was not able to register to vote in the plebiscite.

historical continuity of subjugation as a result of colonization, and more specifically

American colonization and second, that in fact the fifteenth amendment does not

necessarily apply to the people of the territories not because the US Congress extends to

the people of Guam certain rights and privileges but because the courts determine that the

right to vote without "discrimination" does not apply to a definition that has been created

out of a historical instance rather than a racial denotation.[83] The definition of "native

inhabitants of Guam" does not attempt to rectify the even longer colonial legacy at play

here, but a case such as this may, in fact, reaffirm the universality as well as the

fundamentality of certain rights within the current colonial landscape. If the courts

choose to strike down the legal definition of "native inhabitant," this may in fact raise

other questions regarding the applicability of U.S. law to the territories. A forced

redefining of the "native inhabitants or people of Guam" will drastically impact not only

the power relations on the island but the already contentious nature of identity for

Chamorus or Chamorros and those that don't necessarily fit into either classification.

Guam's Organic Act, patterned after and subject to the United States Constitution,

specifically states that "no discrimination shall be made in Guam against any person on

account of race, language, or religion, nor shall the equal protection of the law be

denied." Additionally, "no qualifications…apart from citizenship…shall be imposed

upon any voter" (Organic Act of Guam, §1421).[84] Are Pub. L. 23-130, PL 23-147 and

Pub. L. 25-106 inorganic? What happens when a local law is inconsistent with federal

---

[83] The US Congress has extended certain rights and privileges afforded to Native
Americans to indigenous people including those of Guam under the Native American
Programs Act. The Act recognizes the special relationship that the United States has to
these groups (Kauanui, 2005).
[84] The Organic Act of Guam, 48 U.S.C. §1421(b)

law, but falls in line with international law? Is what matters legitimacy and recognition? If Guam does not comply with the federal government's law, will the United States recognize the vote as legitimate? Or is what matters most the value placed on this right by the international community? Did the United Nations get it right when it allowed for the recognition of the rights of indigenous people and most specifically, their right to self-determination? Perhaps, this is a right that can be reserved for a specific group of people based on their connection to a specific history and a specific place. The self-determination vote that was scheduled for 2002 was postponed indefinitely, but one has to wonder whether the laws that were created to aid in the self-determination movement instead created the self-determination stagnation.

A New Identity?

It is now befitting that we end this search for identity, a self, with a new search of sorts. We end here with the same circumstances that got us to where we are today— colonization. History is indeed coming around full circle. In 2005, the Department of Defense (DoD) announced plans to relocate a Marine base in Okinawa to Guam. From the time of this initial announcement, details have been minimal; however, in November 2009, the DoD issued its Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the military relocation to Guam and the CNMI. This 11,000 page document was met with old feelings and frustrations that the island faced over 50 years ago, in the aftermath of WWII. The circumstances surrounding the narratives of Chamorus from generations before are the same circumstances through which we may have to revisit our notion of what it means to be Chamoru in light of self-determination. The Final Environmental

Impact Statement has been released. The Record of Decision has been signed. What

implications will this have on Guam's already strained self-determination movement?

The political landscape will undoubtedly change with the expected influx of 80,000

people over the next 10 years. Decisions are being made all around us, but one decision

is still pending—a decision that will determine the future political status of Guam. The

threat of the military buildup has generated a stronger sense of community and re-

stressed the need for self-determination, but it is still unclear what the future of Guam

holds? Protests opposing the buildup are now present alongside protests in favor of the

buildup. With recent shift in international relations between the United States and Japan,

the people of Guam once again find themselves in political limbo watching and waiting

for the main actors to make the next move.

In November 2010, we elected a new governor for our island who, during his

campaign, created the "Guamanian Dream" and who, in his inaugural address, used the

term Guamanian to refer to and identify not only himself but "the people of Guam" as a

collective "we."[85] Governor Edward B. Calvo said, "resting below latte stones and

ancient sites are the spirits of a people reawakened at this hour by the excitement of a

---

[85] As quoted from www.calvotenorio.com: "The Calvo-Tenorio platform is a plan to help every person who calls Guam home reach the Guamanian Dream." It is the Guamanian Dream that "you have the opportunity to own a home; you take home a paycheck you work for and deserve from a job that makes you happy; your child's school is the best it can be; your kids are given an opportunity to go to college, here or abroad, where the best degree programs are offered in every career possible; when your kids grow up, they will be prepared for the best careers and opportunities to own a business; you and your family are safe in your homes and neighborhoods, free of violence and drugs; everyone has the best health care here on Guam; you, your family and friends live healthier, happier, longer lives; and we never settle for less than the full measure and potential of our people." The term "Guamanian" the campaign defines as "everyone who lives here and calls Guam home." "The 'Guamanian Dream' is Eddie Baza Calvo and Ray Tenorio's vision for the future of our island, which centers on individual, spiritual, physical, and economic prosperity."

new century…a *Guamanian* Century of pride, prosperity and opportunity." The governor

has given birth to the idea of a new sense of self:

> It is time to embrace our identity as *Guamanians* [emphasis added]…There is
> nothing we cannot do. My fellow *Guamanians* [emphasis added], we can build
> the *Guamanian* [emphasis added] Century, and it will be built by the *Guamanian*
> [emphasis added] Dream…I have this impenetrable faith in our future, because
> we are *Guamanians* [emphasis added]…This is the land of the proa and the home
> of the *Guamanian* [emphasis added]…and I call on you, all *Guamanians*
> [emphasis added], to be strong and to stand tall…for the future belongs to us.

His erasure of the "Chamoru" could mean nothing, but if looked at with a critical eye to

the change in demographic coupled with growing tensions and shifts in power on Guam,

the increasing loss of traditional notions of culture and identity, the impending military

build-up and the need for a strong self-determination movement, could mean everything

for Chamorus. He refers to himself as a "proud Chamorro Guamanian" while still

claiming that this is the time for the Guamanian to emerge out of the challenges that face

Guam.

It remains unclear today which self Chamorus identify with. Perhaps it is an

ancient one. It may be a Spanish or Japanese or American identity. But most likely, it is

a blended version of each. With the increased awareness of the potential changes to our

island, Chamorus are desperately trying to make sense of who they are so as to situate

their place on the island and in relation to those who have since come to the island, the

Guamanians. We are amidst the storm that is about to hit Guam.[86] It is crucial that we

---

[86] The "storm" is a reference made to Walter Benjamin's Angel of History who is in the
midst of a storm called "progress." Benjamin says, "The face of the angel of history is
turned toward the past. Where we perceived a chain of events, he sees a single
catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel
would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a
storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the
angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly propels him into the future to

re-evaluate our present situation with an eye to the past so that we can create a self

capable of navigating our future.

---

which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. The storm
is what we call progress." (Anderson, 1991, p.162)

REFERENCES

Aguon, K. B. (1993). The Guam dilemma: The need for a Pacific island education perspective. In *Hale'-ta hinasso': Tinige' put Chamorro* [Insights: The Chamorro identity] (Vol. 1) (pp. 89-101). Agana, GU: Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.

Alfred, T. (1999). *Peace, power, righteousness: An indigenous manifesto*. Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.

Alfred, T. (2001). From sovereignty to freedom: Towards an indigenous political discourse. *Indigenous affairs: Self-determination, 3,* 22-34.

An Act to Advance Historic Preservation Programs in Guam by Repealing and Reenacting Article 6 of Chapter 76 of Division 2 of Title 21, Repealing §§87138 through 87141, and Adding a New §5117 to Title 5, Guam Code Annotated, Relative to the Guam Preservation Trust. Pub. L. 27-89, 21 GCA 76 (2004).

An Act to Create the Commission on Decolonization for the Implementation and Exercise of Chamorro Self-Determination. Pub. L. 23-147, 1 GCA 21 (1997).

An Act to Establish the Chamorro Registry by Adding a New Chapter 20 and a New §2108 to Title 3, Guam Code Annotated. Pub. L. 23-130, §2108, 3 GCA 20 (1996).

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

Appiah, K. A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. UK: Princeton University Press.

Apple, M. W. & Christian-Smith, L. K. (1991). The politics of the textbook. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (pp. 1-21). New York and London: Rouledge.

Associated Press, The (1998, August 11). Group seeks single definision of "Hawaiian". *Pacific Daily News,* p. 5.

Babauta, L. (1998a, April 10). Obstacles for Chamorro-only vote. *Pacific Daily News*, p. 5.

Babauta, L. (1998b, April 24). Chamorro advocate speak out. *Pacific Daily News*, p. 3.

Barcham, M. (2000). (De)Constructing the politics of indigeneity. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples*, (pp. 137-151). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Beardsley, C. (1964). *Guam: Past and present*. Tokyo, JPN and Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York and London: The Free Press.

Benjamin, W. (1999). *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Vol. 2, part 2 (1927-1934).* Cambridge and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bern, J. & Dodds, S. (2000). On the plurality of interesests: Aboriginal self-government and land rights. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples,* (pp. 163-179). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brunal-Perry, O. (1993). *A question of sovereignty: What legitimate right did Spain have to its territorial expansion?* (M. G. Driver, Trans.). Guam; University of Guam: Micronesian Area Research Center.

Burnett, C. D. & Marshall, Burke. (2001). Between the foreign and domestic: The doctrine of territorial incorporation, invented and reinvented. In C.D. Burnett and B. Marshall (Eds.), *Foreign in a domestic sense: Puerto Rico, American expansion, and the constitution*, (pp. 1-36). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Buss, D. &Herman, D. (2003). *Globalizing family values.* Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Calvo, E. B. (2010). The Calvo-Tenorio platform is a plan to help every person who calls Guam home reach the Guamanian Dream. *Calvotenorio.com*. Retrieved from http://www.calvotenorio.com/main/index.php

Camacho, K.L. (2011). *Cultures of commemoration: The politics of war, memory, and history in the Mariana Islands*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Carano, P. & Sanchez, P. C. (1964). *A complete history of Guam*. Tokyo, JPN and Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc.

Carter, P. (1987). *The road to botany bay: An exploration of landscape and history.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Central Intelligence Agency. (2008). The World Factbook: Guam. Updated August 23, 2011, Retrieved November, 2008, from http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/gq.html

Césaire, A. (1972). *Discourse on colonialism*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.

Chakma, S. (2002). The United Nations special rapporteur on indigenous human rights. *Indigenous Affairs: International Processes: Perspectives and Challenges, 1,* 31-35.

Chakrabarty, D. (2002). *Habitations of modernity: Essays in the wake of subaltern studies.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Chapman, M. (1985, April). Introduction. In M. Chapman & P. Morrison (Eds.), Mobility and identity in the island Pacific [Special issue]. *Pacific Viewpoint,26*(1), 1-6.

Chartier, R. (2011). History, Time, and Space. *Republics of Letters: A Journal for the Study of Knowledge, Politics, and the Arts, 2*(2), 1-13.

Cogan, D. C. (2008). *We fought the navy and won: Guam's quest for Democracy.* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Commission on Decolonization. [ca. 2000]. Decolonizing through the self-determination of a people: An overview of Guam's status and options [Special section insert]. *Pacific Daily News*.

Connolly, W. E. (1991). *Identity∕difference: Democratic negotiations of political paradox*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Cooper, D. (1998). *Governing out of order: Space, law and the politics of belonging*. London and New York: Rivers Oram Press.

Corbin, C. (2000). What future the United Nations' decolonisation process? *Indigenous Affairs: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs: The Pacific, 1,* 4-13.

Creation of the Guam Decolonization Registry for Native Inhabitants of Guam Self-Determination. Pub. L. No. 25-106, 3 GCA 21 (2000).

Cristobal, H. A. (1993). The organization of people for indigenous rights: A commitment towards self-determination. In *Hale'-ta, hinasso': Tinige' put Chamorro* [Insights: The Chamorro Identity] (Vol 1) (pp. 137-153). Agana, GU: Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.

Cruz, B. F. (1987). Chamorro voting rights. In L. Souder-Jaffery & R. A. Underwood (Eds.), *Chamorro self-determination: The right of a people (I derechon i taotao)* (pp. 69-81). Agana and Mangilao: Chamorro Studies Association and Micronesian Area Research Center.

Diaz, V. M. (1992, June). *Repositioning the missionary: The beatification of blessed Diego Luis de San Vitores and Chamorro cultural history* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com.eres.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/pqdweb?index=0&sid=2& srchmode=1&vinst=PROD&fmt=6&startpage=- 1&clientid=23440&vname=PQD&RQT=309&did=744422491&scaling=FULL& ts=1316495144&vtype=PQD&rqt=309&TS=1316495153&clientId=23440

Diaz, V. M. (1993, August 5). *Refiguring culture and history with disfigured native bodies.* National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar Presentation, Washington D.C.

Diaz, V. M. (1998, January 23). *Sacred tensions: Navigating tradition and modernity.* Speech presented at University of Guam Faculty Development Day, Mangilao, Guam. *Micronesian educator, 9,* 54-62.

Diaz,V. M. (2000). Simply Chamorro: Telling tales of demise and survival in Guam. In D. Hanlon & G. M. White (Eds.), *Voyaging through the contemporary Pacific*

(pp. 141-170). Laham, Boulder, New York and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Diaz, V M. (2002). "Fight boys, 'til the last…": Islandstyle football and the remasculinization of indigeneity in militarized American Pacific islands. In P. Spickard, J. L. Rondilla & D. H. Wright (Eds.), *Pacific diaspora: Island people in the Unieted States and across the Pacific* (pp. 169-194). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Diaz, V. (2010). *Repositioning the missionary: Rewriting the histories of colonialism, native Catholicism, and indigeneity in Guam* [Pacific Islands Monograph Series 24]. Honlulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Editorial: English, please [Editorial]. (2011, September 8). *Marianas Variety*. Retrieved from

http://www.mvguam.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=197 80%3Aenglish-please&Itemid=58

Education. (2010). *Oxford dictionaries*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved September 28, 2010 from http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/education

Engel, D. M. & Munger, F. W. (2003). *Rights of inclusion: Law and identity in the life stories of Americans with disabilities.* USA: University of Chicago Press.

Epstein, A.L. (1978). *Ethos and identity: Three studies in ethnicity*. London: Tabistock Publications.

Erni, C & Jensen, M. (2001). Editorial. *Indigenous affairs: Self-determination, 3,* 4-5.

Fanon, F. (2008). *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press. (Original work published 1952).

Feeley, M. (1974). Forward. In S. Scheingold. *The politics of rights: Lawyers, public policy, and political change* (2nd ed.) (pp. xi-xvi). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Findlay, E. J. S. (1999). *Imposing decency: The politics of sexuality and race in Puerto Rico, 1870-1920*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Fitzgerald, T. K. (1993). *Metaphors of identity: A culture-communication dialogue*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Flores, J. (2002). Art and identity in the Mariana islands: The reconstruction of 'ancient' Chamorro dance. In A. Herle, N. Stanley, K. Stevenson & R. L. Welsch (Eds.), *Pacific art: Persistence, change and meaning* (pp. 106-113). US: University of Hawai'i Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, et. Al, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Fragment. (2008). *Cambridge dictionaries online*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved August 10, 2008 from

http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/fragment_1?q=fragment

Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach* (Expanded ed.). USA: Westview Press.

Frohock, F. (1992). *Healing powers: Alternative medicine, spiritual communities, and the state*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Frug, J. (1995). Decentering decentralization. In D. Danielsen & K. Engle (Eds.), *After identity: A reader in law and culture* (pp. 165-183). New York and London: Routledge.

GIlliom, J. (2001). *Overseers of the poor: Surveillance, resistance, and the limits of privacy*. Shicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Gobien, C. (1993). Speech of Maga'lahi Hurao. In *Hale'-ta hinasso': Tinige' put Chamorro* [Insights: The Chamorro identity] (Vol. 1) (pp. 13-14). Agana, GU: Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.

Gray, J. (2003). Open spaces and dwelling places: Being at home on hill famrs in the Scottish Borders. In S. M. Low & Lawrence-Zúñiga (Eds.), *The anthropology of space and place* (pp. 224-244). Massachusettes, UK and Australia: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Gregen, M. (1992). Life stories: Pieces of a dream. In G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg. (Eds.), *Storied lives: The cultural politics of self-understanding* (pp. 127-144). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Greenhouse, C. J., Yngvesson, B. & Engel, D. M. (1994). *Law and community in three American towns*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Greenspan, H. (1992). Lives as texts: Symptoms as modes of recounting in the life histories of Halocaust survivors.. In G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg. (Eds.), *Storied lives: The cultural politics of self-understanding* (pp. 145-164). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Gresson, A. D. (1992). African-Americans and the pursuit of wider identities: Self-other understandings in black female narratives. In G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg. (Eds.), *Storied lives: The cultural politics of self-understanding* (pp. 165-177). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Guha, R. (1996). The small voice of history. In E. S. Amid & D. Chakrabart (Eds.),

    Subaltern studies: Writings on south Asian sociert and history (Vol, 9) (pp. 1-12).

    Delhi, Oxford University Press.

Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (1992). A beyond culture: Space, identity, and the politics of

    difference. *Cultural Anthropology, 7*(1), 6-23.

Haltom, W. & McCann, M. (2004). *Distorting the law: Politics, media, and the litigation*

    crisis. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hattori, A. P. (1995). *The navy blues: U.S. Navy policies on Guam, 1989-1941*.

    Unpublished manuscript, copy in possession of author.

Hattori, A. P. (1996). Righting civil wrongs: Guam congress walkout of 1949. In Political

    Status Education Coordinating Commission (Ed.), *Kinalamten pulikåt: Siñenten I*

    Chamorro: Issues in Guam's political development: The Chamorro perspective

    (pp. 57-69). Agana, GU: Editor.

Hattori, A. P. (1999, December). *Colonial dis-eas: U.S. Naval health policies and the*

    Chamorro of Guam, 1989-1941 (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest

    Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9951190)

Hau'ofa, E. (1994, Spring). Our sea of islands. *The Contemporary Pacific: A Journal of*

    Island Affairs, 6(1), 147-161.

Henriksen, J. B. (2001). Implementation of the right of self-determination of indigenous

    peoples. *Indigenous Affairs: Self-Determination, 3*, 6-21.

Howard, C. P. (1987). Thoughts and confession of a Chamorro advocate. In *Hale'-ta,*

    hinasso': Tinige' put Chamorro [Insights: The Chamorro Identity] (Vol 1) (pp.

    154-161). Agana, GU: Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.

Howard, A. (1990). Cultural paradigms, history, and the search for identity in Oceania. In
J. Linnekin & L. Poyer (Eds.) *Cultural identity and ethnicity in the Pacific* (pp.
259-279). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Indoctrination. (2010). *Oxford dictionaries*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved
September 28, 2010 from
http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/indoctrinate#m_en_gb0408030.006

Ivison, D., Patton, P. & Sanders, W. (2000). Introduction. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W.
Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples* (pp. 1-21).
UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kauanui, J. K. (2005, Spring). Precarious Positions: Native Hawaiians and US Federal
Recognition. *The Contemporary Pacific: A Journal of Island Affairs, 17*(1), 1-27.

Kauanui, J. K. (2008, Fall). Colonialism in Equality: Hawaiian Sovereignty and the
Question of U.S. Civil Rights. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 107*(4), 635-650.

Kauanui, J. K. (2008). *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and
Indigeneity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Leibowitz, A. H. (1989). *Defining status: A comprehensive analysis of United States
territorial relations*. Netherlands: Kluwer Law International.

Limtiaco, S. (2000, October 25). Plebiscite pushed to 2002. *Pacific Daily News,* pp. 1, 4.

Linnekin, J. & Poyer,L. (1990). Introduction. In J. Linnekin & L. Poyer (Eds.) *Cultural
identity and ethnicity in the Pacific* (pp. 1-16). Honolulu, HI: University of
Hawai'i Press.

Linnekin, J. (1990). The politics of culture in the Pacific. In J. Linnekin & L. Poyer (Eds.), *Cultural identity and ethnicity in the Pacific* (pp. 149-173). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Loerzel, A. (2000, July 13). Guam appeals to U.N. on decolonization. *Pacific Daily News,* p. 3.

Lowenthal, D. (1985, April). Mobility and identity in the island Pacific: A critique. In M. Chapman & P. Morrison (Eds.), Mobility and identity in the island Pacific [Special issue]. *Pacific Viewpoint,26*(1), 316-326.

Maaka, R. & Fleras, A. (2000). Engaging with indegeneity: Tino rangatiratanga in aoteara. In D. Ivinson, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples* (pp. 89-109). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Malay, K. [1998, August]. Hawaii vote tested. [Clipping from *Pacific Daily News*]. Copy in possession of author.

Malay, K. & The Associated Press (1998, August 12). Sovereignty similar for Guam, Hawaii. *Pacific Daily News,* p. 5.

Marx, A. W. (1995). Identity and social movements. In C. Tilly (Ed.), *Citizenship, identity, and social history, international review of social history* (Suppl. 3) (pp. 159-183). New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCann, M. W. (1994). *Rights at work: Pay equity reform and the politics of legal mobilization*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

McLaren, R. A. (1990). *Guam, America's one and future colony under international law.* Unpublished manuscript, School of Law, University of Hawaiʻi.

Meijl, T. V. (2004). Introduction. In T.V. Meijl & J. Miedema (Eds.), *Shifting images of identity in the Pacific* (pp. 1-20). Netherlands: KITLV Press.

Memmi, A. (1965). *Colonizer and the colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Merry, S. E. (2000). *Colonizing Hawaiʻi: The cultural power of law*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Merton, R. K. (1972, July). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Socioloy, 8*(1), 9-47.

Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, W. (2003). *The darker side of the Renaissance: Literacy, territoriality & colonization*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Minow, M. (1990). *Making all the difference: Inclusion, exclusion, and American law*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Mishler, E. G. (1992). Work, identity, and narrative: An articst-craftsman's story. In G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg. (Eds.), *Storied lives: The cultural politics of self-understanding* (pp. 21-40). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Nora, P. (1989, Spring). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Representations 26*. The Regents of the University of California.

O'Hanlon, R. (2000). Recovering the subject: Subaltern studies and histories of resistance in colonial south Asia. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and the postcolonial,* (pp. 72-115). London and New York: Verso.

O'Hanlon, R. & Washbrook, D. (2000). After orientalism: Culture, criticism and politics in the third world. In In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and the postcolonial,* (pp. 191-219). London and New York: Verso.

Organic Act of Guam , 48 U.S.C. §1421(b) (1950).

Palomo, T. (1984). *An island in agony: A haunting story of the only American territory occupied by the enemy during World War II, including search for six American sailors*. Guam: Author.

Pandey, G. (2000). Voices from the edge: The struggle to write subaltern histories. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and the postcolonial,* (pp. 281-299). London and New York: Verso.

Partido, G. (2011, February 4). Opening Pandora's box. *Marianas Variety*. Retrieved from

http://www.mvguam.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=164 86:opening-pandoras-box&catid=33:island-stri-by-gerry-partido&Itemid=109

Peattie, M. R. (1988). *Nan'yō:The rise and fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885-1945*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaiʻi.

Perez, C. T. (1994, May). *De-liberating liberation: A discussion of the expression of Chamorro identity through symbols of American patriotism.* Unpublished manuscript, copy in possession of author.

Perez, C.T. (1997). *Signs of being–A Chamorro spiritual being.* Manuscript submitted for publication, copy in possession of author.

Perez, M. P. (1997, August). *The dialectic of indigenous identity in the wake of colonialism: The case of Chamorros of Guam* (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Riverside.

Pobutsky, A. M. (2001, April). Economics and fertility: Changing family structure among Chamorros on the island of Guam. *The History of the Family, 6*(1), 95-23. doi:10.1016/S1081-602X(01)00064-1

Pocock, J. G. A. (2000). Waitangi as mystery of state: Consequences of ascription of federative capacity to the Maori. In D. Ivinson, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples* (pp. 25-35). United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Political Stauts Education Coordinating Commission. (1996). *Inafa'maolek: Chamorro tradition and values*. Guam: Author.

Prakash, G. (2000). Can the subaltern ride? A reply to O'Hanlon and Washbrook. In V. Chaturvedi (Ed.), *Mapping subaltern studies and the postcolonial,* (pp. 220-238). London and New York: Verso.

Preston, P. W. (1997). *Political/cultural identity: Citizens and nations in a global era.* London, Thousand Oaks, and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Rice v. Cayetano, 528 U.S. 495 (2000).

Rogers, R. F. (1988). *Guam's commonwealth effort 1987-1988*. Mangilao, GU: Micronesian Area Research Center.

Rogers, R. F. (1995). *Destiny's landfall: A history of Guam*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Rosenwald, G. C. (1992). Conclusion: Reflections on narrative self-understanding. In
   G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg. (Eds.), *Storied lives: The cultural politics of*
   self-understanding (pp. 265-289). New Haven and London: Yale University
   Press.

Rosenwald, G. C. & Ochberg, R. L. (1992). Introduction: Life stories, cultural politics,
   and self-understanding. In G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg. (Eds.), *Storied lives:*
   The cultural politics of self-understanding (pp. 1-18). New Haven and London:
   Yale University Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, USA: Vintage Books.

Sanchez, P. C. (1987). *Guahan Guam: The history of our island*. Agana, GU: Sanchez
   Publishing House.

Sarot, A. (2001). *When the state kills: Capital punishment in the American condition*.
   UK: Princeton University Press.

Schiengold, S. A. (1974). *The politics of rights: Lawyers, public policy, and political*
   change (2nd ed.). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Scott, S. V. (2010). *International law in world politics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Boulder
   and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers. (Originally published 2004).

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current
   textbooks. In M. W. Apple & L. K. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the*
   textbook (78-110). New York and London: Rouledge.

Smith, L. T. (2001). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.*
   London and New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Souder-Jaffery, L. (1993). A not so perfect union: Federal-territorial relations between the United States and Guam. In *Hale'-ta hinasso': Tinige' put Chamorro* [Insights: The Chamorro identity] (Vol. 1) (pp. 108-123). Agana, GU: Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.

Souder-Jaffer, L. & Underwood, R. A. (Eds.). (1987). *Chamorro self-determination.* Agana and Mangilao: Chamorro Studies Association and Micronesian Area Research Center.

Stambaugh, J. (1969). Introduction. In M. Heidegger, *Identity and difference* (pp. 7-18) (J. Stambaugh, Trans.). New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row Publishers.

Statham, Jr., R. E. (2001). U.S. territorial expansion: Extended republicanism versus hyperextended expansionism. In C. D. Burnett & B. Marshall (Eds.), *Foreign in a domestic sense: Puerto Rico, American expansion, and the Constitution* (pp. 167-181). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Statham, Jr., R. E. (2002). *Colonial constitutionalism: The tyranny of United States' offshore territorial policy and relations*. Lanham, Boulder, New York and Oxford: Lexington Books.

Strauss, A. L. (1959). *Mirrors and masks: The search for identity.* Chicago: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois.

Stychin, C. F. (1998). *A nation by rights: National cultures, sexual identity politics and the discourse of rights.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Taitano, G. (2009). Chamorro vs. Chamoru. In *Guampedia.com*. Retrieved November 28, 2011, from http://guampedia.com/chamorro-vs-chamoru/

Tatko, A. (1998, September 25). Chamorro-only vote taking shape. *Pacific Daily News,* p. 3.

Taylor, D. M. (2002). *The quest for identity: From minority groups to generation Xers.* Westport, CT and London, UK: Praegar.

Temaru, O. (2000). Independence and sovereignty for Tea o Maohi (French Polynesia). *Indigenous Affairs: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs: The Pacific, 1,* 14-18.

Thaman, K. H. (1985, April). The defining distance: Peoples, places, and worldview. In M. Chapman & P. Morrison (Eds.), Mobility and identity in the island Pacific [Special issue]. *Pacific Viewpoint,26*(1), 106-115.

Thaman, K. H. (2003, Spring). Decolonizing Pacific studies: Indigenous perspectives, knowledge and wisdom in higher education. *The Contemporary Pacific, 15*(1), pp.1-17. doi: 10.1353/cp.2003.0032

Tilly, C. (1995). Citizenship, identity, and social history. In C. Tilly (Ed.), *Citizenship, identity, and social history, international review of social history* (Suppl. 3) (pp. 1-18). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Trask, M. (2002). The use of UN human rights mechanisms by indigenous peoples: Past practices and emerging challenge. *Indigenous Affairs: International Processes: Perspectives and Challenges, 1,* 26-31.

Treaty of Paris of 1898, Art. IX

Troutman, C. H. (2002). *The Organic Act of Guam and related federal laws affecting the governmental structure of Guam (through June 11, 2001).* Guam: University of Guam and Government of Guam.

Torres, G. & Milun, K. (1995). Stories and standing: The legal meaning of identity. In D. Danielsen and K. Engle (Eds.), *After identity: A reader in law and culture* (pp. 129-142). New York and London: Routledge.

Tully, J. (1995). *Strange multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Tully, J. (2000). The struggles of indigenous peoples for and of freedom. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples*, (pp. 36-59). UK: Cambridge University Press.

U.N. Charter of the United Nations, 1945. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/

U.N. Human Rights Committee. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966. Retrieved from http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/pdf/ccpr.pdf

U.N. General Assembly, 61st Session. (2007). *Resolution 61/295. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Available: United Nations Documents and Publications/A/RES/61/295. Retrieved from: http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/512/07/PDF/N0651207.pdf?OpenElement

U.N. General Assembly, 61st Session. *General Assembly Adopts Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. No an Official Record. New York 2007. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/ga10612.doc.htm

U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 1990: Summary Population and Housing Characteristics: Guam. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1992.

U.S. Census of Population and Housing, 2000: Summary Population and Housing Characteristics: Guam. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2004.

U.S. Constitution, Art. IV, §3.

U.S. Constitution, Amendment XIV

U. S. Department of Defense. (2009). Guam Buildup Draft Environmental Impact
Statement. Retrieved from http://www.guambuildupeis.us/

Underwood, R. A. (1985, April). Excursions into inauthenticity: The Chamorros of
Guam. In M. Chapman & P. Morrison (Eds.), Mobility and identity in the island
Pacific [Special issue]. *Pacific Viewpoint,26*(1), 160-184.

Underwood, R. (1987). Immigration and Guam's future. In L. Souder-Jaffery & R. A.
Underwood (Eds.), *Chamorro self-determination: The right of a people (I
derechon i taotao)* (pp. 83-90). Agana and Mangilao: Chamorro Studies
Association and Micronesian Area Research Center.

Veyne, P. (1984). *Writing History: Essay on Epistemolgy*, trans. Mina Moore-Rinvolucri.
Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Vienna Convention, Art. 53.

Webber, J. (2000). Beyond regret: Mabo's implications for Austrailian Constitutionalism.
In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of
indigenous peoples,* (pp. 60-87). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wiersma, J. (1992). Karen: The transforming story. In G.C. Rosenwald & R.L. Ochberg.
(Eds.), *Storied lives: The cultural politics of self-understanding* (pp. 195-213).
New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Weisbrod, C. (2002). *Emblems of pluralism: Cultural differences and the state.* Princeton
and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

White, H. (1987). *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

White, H. (2010). *The Fiction of Narrative: Essays on History, Literature and Theory 1957-2007*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wong, B. (1998, July 1). Task force make first report to decolonization commission. [Clipping from *Pacific Daily News*]. Copy in possession of author.

Yaukey, J. (1998, August 14). New Puerto Rico proposal may aid Guam's quest. [Clipping from *Pacific Daily News*]. Copy in possession of author.

Young, I. M. (2000a). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young, I. M. (2000b). Hybrid democracy: Iroquois federalism and the postcolonial project. In D. Ivison, P. Patton & W. Sanders (Eds.), *Political theory and the rights of indigenous peoples,* (pp. 237-258). UK: Cambridge University Press.