Militarization and Identity on Guahan/Guam: Exploring intersections of indigeneity, gender and security

Ronni ALEXANDER*

Abstract

While the Pacific island of Guahan/Guam is best known as a vacation resort, in fact much of the island has been taken to house US military bases and other facilities. Over 400 years of military colonialism has devalorized the local CHamoru culture, making it virtually invisible not only for those outside of Guahan/Guam but also for many CHamoru people themselves. This article reflects on the implications of this history for CHamoru female and male bodies and lived lives. Using an intersectional approach, the article seeks to better understand the complexities underlying local attitudes toward the US military presence, including a proposed military build-up.

Key Words

Guam/Guahan, CHamoru, citizenship, gender, intersectionality, militarization, military colonialism, security

The Pacific island of Guam (Guahan)[1] is best known as a tourist destination, but in fact for over four hundred years, it has been subjected to the military and strategic desires of outside powers. In 1521, Magellan first claimed the island for Spain; control shifted to the United States in 1898 after Spain's defeat in the Spanish-American War. Today the island remains on the list of non-self-governing territories maintained by the United Nations Special Committee on Decolonization.

Guahan/Guam is a military colony of the United States. The people have had US citizenship, but no voice in the decisions that have put a third of their island under US military control. This military neo-colonial/colonial relationship involves not only visible manifestations of military presence but also militarization, a "step-by-step process by

* Professor, Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University.

which something becomes *controlled by, dependent on, or derives its value from* the military as an institution or militaristic criteria" (Enloe 2000:291, emphasis in the original).[2] On militarized Guahan/Guam, US strategic concerns affect virtually all aspects of life.

Colonization for strategic purposes, or 'military colonialism,' has two sides: the visible side such as military bases and hardware, and the less visible or 'soft' side comprised of food, cultural tastes, markets, and the military ideology that plays a fundamental role in the way the society is governed (Gerson 2009:50). Military colonization brings racialized and gendered beliefs of normality, citizenship, and safety, as well as militarizing social relations. The conflation of notions of citizenship as belonging to the state/national collective with military service and particular forms of masculinity, class, and heteronormativity are of particular significance here because they affect ideas, identities, and behaviors, militarizing bodies and changing the ways people understand what it means to be a woman or a man. 'Citizenship' both militarizes and normalizes people into colonial, neo-colonial, and national collectives and hierarchies.

American citizenship on Guahan/Guam exemplifies this militarizing of bodies and identities. In 1950, in a unilateral decision by the US Congress rather than a process of self-determination by the indigenous CHamorus, the Organic Act of Guam made the island an unincorporated organized territory of the United States. Administration was shifted from the Navy to the Department of the Interior and limited home rule established. All citizens residing there at the time of the enactment, as well as their children born after 11 April 1899, were granted statutory, or congressional, US citizenship,[3] giving them many of the same rights and privileges as other Americans. They cannot, however, vote in presidential elections, and their observer in the House of Representatives cannot vote. People on Guahan/Guam fought hard for, and greatly value, their American citizenship, but it is "second class citizenship" (Rogers 1995: 226). Citizens on Guahan/Guam enlist in the military and fight in US wars as Americans, but they have no say in the military strategy that has put a third of their island under US military control.

Today, a controversial military build-up seen as either a tremendous threat or potential golden goose is posing serious environmental, demographic and economic concerns. At first glance, resistance to the military presence in general and the build-

up in particular is hard to see. Where visible, it is generally in the context of CHamoru activism. Theories of bio-politics, colonization and economic deprivation/development can to some extent explain the devalorization of CHamoru culture and why at the fringes of empire, patriotism and support for the US military presence would appear to be strong.[4] They are less useful, however, for examining the contradictions lying beneath the surface of citizenship. In other words, theories of bio-politics and governmentality are insufficient to discover what it means to be CHamoru and American and the contradictions for lived lives negotiating indigeneity, nationality, class, and gender on Guahan/Guam.

Can an intersectional approach help to explain the complexities underlying local attitudes toward the US military presence? What can it tell us about the processes of marginalization that led to the devalorization of CHamoru culture and identity? Can it provide suggestions to scholars and activists about the praxis of opposing militarization? Looking along axes of gender, indigeneity, class, and distance, the paper will examine the complexities of citizenship, identity and the military on Guahan/Guam.

Intersectionality: looking within and between

Over the past twenty years, there has been a lively debate within and outside of IR about the meaning and focus of the intersectional approach.[5] Much of this work has aspired to demonstrate the complexities of marginalization by looking at the ways in which categories can at the same time empower particular groups and make other groups and/or the diversity within them invisible. Intersectionality also demonstrates how, as Collins suggests, "our own thoughts and actions uphold someone else's subordination" (Collins 2000:287). Using axes of inequality such as race, class, and gender, McCall has shown how social relations and processes impact and shape social experiences. She suggests three categories of complexity: anticategorical, intracategorical, and intercategorical, emphasizing the importance of the latter because it calls for scholars to, "provisionally adopt existing analytical categories to document relationships of inequality among social groups and changing configurations of inequality along multiple and conflicting dimensions" (McCall 2005:1773). Looking at Guahan/Guam from an intercategorical perspective along axes of gender and

nationality can reveal the ways race/indigeneity is devalorized and hidden by a racialized category of citizenship, e.g. American on the one hand and notions of the noble savage and 'pure' indigeneity on the other. It also highlights the tensions between CHamoru social relations based on interdependence, family and harmony and Western notions centering on individual merit, private property, and gendered public/private spaces. In this regard, one might question whether even critical theory is able to overcome "the notion that there is a particular individual entity which is silently presupposed when we use the concept of identity" (Papadopoulos 2008:140). Can American concepts of the self as an independent individual co-exist with CHamoru understandings of the self as part of an interconnected and interdependent web of extended family? How do they play out when they are contained within one body?

An anticategorical approach might identify ways in which efforts to create/re-create CHamoru identity serve to reproduce 'CHamoru' within colonial, gendered and militarized conceptions of self. The following excerpt from the blog of a CHamoru activist illustrates this in the context of Guahan.

> One of the weaknesses of activism on Guam is the impression that those who are involved in it all come from the same place, are all culled from the same social source. They are all people who just want land. They are all people on welfare. They are all just crazy CHamorus. As a movement which seeks to change something, you are weakened by this perception, because in terms of gaining support for whatever you are fighting for, it is easy to dismiss your movement as a mere slice of life (Bevacqua 2010.1.12).

In contrast, Yuval-Davis suggests that defining difference within a category runs the risk of reinscribing "the fragmented, additive model of oppression and essentializ(ing) specific social identities. Instead, the point is to analyse the differential ways in which different social divisions are concretely enmeshed and constructed by each other and how they relate to political and subjective constructions of identities" (Yuval-Davis 2006:205). As we will see, in Guahan/Guam, depopulation and intermarriage between the indigenous CHamoru and others created a population of so-called 'mestizos' whose legitimacy, or lack thereof, has played an important part in

the construction of identity and citizenship. In particular, racialized American notions of indigenous 'purity' have left CHamoru people having to 'prove' not only their legitimacy as Americans but also as indigenous. (Monnig 2007:58, Perez, M. 2002).

A critical understanding of history is important for defining indigeneity and identity, but many CHamoru lack an understanding of their roots and ancient culture. According to Pacific writer Albert Wendt, "we are what we remember ourselves to be" (cited in Underwood 1998:9). Activists are trying to make knowledge of CHamoru culture accessible to young people through teaching language and history to help them to 'remember' who they are. Much of the ancient culture and social ranking has been lost, but the core values, particularly those concerning family, loyalty, and respect, remain strong. In brief, ancient CHamoru society was matrilineal and hierarchal, based on caste, age, and clan (extended families).[6] Seven core values ensured that social and physical boundaries were respected. Central among these is *inafa'maolek*, interdependence within the extended family, a concept of mutuality and togetherness that rests on a complex system of reciprocal obligations forming a network of mutual responsibility and underlies all social relations. The caste system and the rank of one's clan determined ownership and use of land, sea, rivers, and streams, and *mamahlao* (respect for others) reflects understanding of the social ranking according to caste, clan, age, and status within the clan. Harmony and consensus were held to be extremely important and those with higher ranking had responsibility to protect those of lower rank. *Mamahlao* requires one to always put others before oneself (Cunningham 1998:29-31). Although the caste system is long gone, these values of interdependence and responsibility are still very important in CHamoru culture and identity. In that they put the extended family before the individual, on a very deep level they contradict American values and behaviors which center on the individual.

On militarized and Americanized Guahan/Guam today, CHamoru/Guamanian/Micronesian/Filipino/Pacific Islander identities and hierarchies are formed, and lives lived, around the category of citizenship (American).[7] Intracategorical analysis is useful because the category of 'CHamoru' is highly contested. Intracategorical analysis encourages us to note the tensions created by assumptions about the unchanging boundaries of groups (Yuval-Davis 2005:531). At the same time,

intercategorical analysis helps to show how some boundaries are made invisible by others. In the case of Guahan/Guam, citizenship, military service, indigeneity, and gender are important categories to think about in this respect. In the military, for example, "race is to be overcome through military service; participants are invited to abandon racial identification in favor of identification with the military unit" (Bartlett and Lutz 1998:132). In fact, the reality in the military often contrasts greatly with these purported homogenizing effects, disappointing the expectations of many CHamoru soldiers for finding equality.

Winker and Degele use narrative and personal experience in an intercategorical approach which treats intersectionality as a "system of interactions between inequality-creating social structures (i.e. of power relations), symbolic representations and identity constructions that are context-specific, topic-orientated and inextricably linked to social praxis" (2011:54). Similarly, Braun uses narrative and intersectional approach to look at the ways women in Lesotho describe the ways male privilege and gender inequality are reinforced by development policies and practices. She demonstrates the ways in which the global interests of the masculine development industry combine with those of the patriarchal state and society (Braun 2011:158). The military build-up on Guahan/Guam is the result of a similar combination of racialized masculine military and development interests which are being foisted on a community which, in spite of having American citizenship, has limited institutional infrastructure with which to fight back.

Using axes of time and distance to look at citizenship on Guahan/Guam can also help to highlight hidden exclusionary practices. For example, the rhetoric of 'remoteness' and 'smallness' legitimizes subordination by making Guahan/Guam and its inhabitants appear so small and unimportant as to be incapable of self-rule. Moreover, artificially created categories such as 'Guamanian' reinscribed and normalized relations of power/knowledge, denying CHamoru legitimacy and agency through focus on their 'mestizo' background. Since identity is based not only on group membership but also on feelings of belonging (Yuval-Davis 2005:521-2), an understanding of the difficulty of 'being CHamoru' along a variety of axes can help to further deepen our understanding of the complexities of living simultaneously on the margins and at the center of the American empire.

Colonized and militarized bodies: Spain

In discussing identity, Winker and Degele (2011:5) stress the importance of bodies and bodyisms. Souder (1992) focuses on bodies and seeks a way to remember the colonized rather than the colonizers, looking at the ways colonization affected gender relations. She suggests the following three phases which show changes in gender relations and the effects of patriarchy on the matrilineal CHamoru society. (1) Conquest and the aggressive introduction of Catholicism by Spain beginning in the 1670's; (2) the US administration beginning in 1898 when marriage was institutionalized[8] and a patriarchal separation of work and home which divided life into 'public' and 'private' spheres established; and (3) modernization through tourism beginning in the 1960's, and the creation of a more heterogeneous population through the relaxing of immigration laws[9] (Souder 1992:7-8). Thinking about not only gender relations but also class and citizenship during these periods underscores the ways in which CHamoru identity became subsumed first to that of the Catholic Church and then to 'America'.

In looking at early encounters with Europeans, Souder talks about Catholicism but fails to address the implications for CHamoru bodies of disease and armed resistance. As the Manila galleon trade grew, the colony of Guam became important as a provisioning station and in 1668, with the support of the Spanish crown and the Church of Rome, the Jesuit missionary Diego Luís de San Vitores arrived on Guahan determined to establish both Catholicism and Spanish rule. His job was made somewhat easier because CHamorus had no natural resistance to European diseases such as influenza, measles, smallpox and syphilis, but in spite of that they put up strong resistance. By the end of the 17th century, the combination of war and disease had decimated the population by between eighty and ninety percent and "almost all of Guam's most important resource, its labour resource, was destroyed. Estimates say that only 2,000 native inhabitants remained.... (T)hese were mostly women, children and the elderly" (Troutman 1998:332).

As there was no longer sufficient labor to support Spain's agricultural and other provisioning needs, the Spanish colonial government instead brought in workers from the Philippines and Mexico (Guerrero 2002:85). The Spaniards maintained a hierarchal society, with *peninsulares* (people born in Spain), *criollos* (those born in the colonies),

mestizos, Filipinos, and *indios* (CHamoru), in that rank order. In the 1670's, Spanish, Filipino and mestizo soldiers began to marry CHamoru women in church ceremonies and set up permanent households. In particular, there were marriages between the highest caste women and Spanish officials (the reverse was not allowed). This gave high caste CHamoru women access to colonial power, while at the same time reinforcing the traditional power of women in the home (Souder 1992:68). It also disenfranchised men, particularly high caste men, by limiting their traditional activities such as fishing, and by changing the rules for reproduction. Souder claims that since girls follow their mothers and boys tend to follow their fathers, girls were able to access traditional knowledge, including language, more easily than boys. As a result, while many of the women's skills remain, the men's skills such as canoe building have been lost (Souder 1992:58).

The Spanish created a new social hierarchy through the introduction of patriarchal ideas of private property and land ownership, consolidating their control of land through marriage. Men were forced to provide labor on this land. In the 1800s, a variety of charges were placed on everyone except CHamorus. As a result, mestizos, Filipinos and others began to list themselves and their newborn children as *indios* in order to avoid paying. Rogers, for example, claims this resulted in a new valorization of the distinctive CHamoru identity (Rogers 1995:96-97). Monnig (2007) and others, however, see this as on the one hand, the consolidation of 'otherness' by the colonizers and on the other, the beginning of the denial of CHamoru legitimacy on the basis of 'impurity.'

The implications of depopulation and intermarriage are also debated. For example, Troutman argues that depopulation led to a total collapse of traditional social relations and the destruction of CHamoru identity, which were then replaced by the Catholic Church. He claims, "The depopulation of Guam from disease, flight and, least of all, death in battle, acted to cause the CHamorus to give up their corporate structure and adopt, no - absorb into their very being the corporate identity and values of the conqueror" (Troutman 1998:333). An alternative view might suggest that depopulation helped the alliance of high caste women and Spanish men, leading to the separation of CHamoru clans from their land. Land was not a commodity but the essence of CHamoru identity, and the usurpation of land changed forever lifestyles,

livelihoods and social relations. Many of these changes were institutionalized through the spread of Catholicism, the success of which was assisted by forced baptisms and capture of CHamoru children who were then sent to live in mission schools (Rogers 1995:60-1).

The introduction of patriarchal values, individualism, and conceptions of property ownership challenged gender perceptions and performativity, severely weakening the caste and clan systems. With the introduction of Catholicism came new conceptions of 'equality' based on baptism regardless of caste or clan, undermining *mamahlao* and *inafa'maolek*. The introduction of individual merit challenged ideas of competition as a group. Living spaces, language, and education including such things as systems for counting time or numbers were changed. For example, traditionally only the highest caste men could learn navigational skills or go into the ocean beyond the reef. Young men lived together in men's houses until marriage. Under the Spanish, the men's houses were closed, women were confined to the home, and the traditional male arts of fishing, canoe making and sailing were lost (Kasperbaur 2002:34-35).

Colonized and militarized bodies: Fortress Guahan

Souder's second phase begins with the cession of Guahan/Guam to the United States in 1898. The US Navy administrators viewed themselves as 'parents' to the child-like, dependent and feminine CHamorus. This enabled them to justify the creation of a paternalistic and masculine system of government which would promote their moral and material development and "achieve a transformation in the bodies and minds of the people (and) transform the CHamoru populace into an 'American' society, a new people who would be productive, disciplined, educated, and sanitary" (Hattori 1995:1 in Viernes 2009:104). One aspect of this endeavor was the creation of new identities such as 'Guamanian,' 'Micronesian,' and 'American.'

In 1941, the Japanese captured Guahan/Guam, remaining there until 1944. The Japanese occupation was brutal and when, after thirteen consecutive days of bombing, the US regained control, people celebrated their 'liberation.' In fact, the US return was a repetition of military colonialism; control of Guahan/Guam and the other Mariana Islands was a prerequisite for mounting attacks on Okinawa and the Japanese mainland, including the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This

portrayal of the "messianic" liberation of Guahan/Guam from the Japanese encouraged in the CHamoru people a need to reciprocate. "Obligations being a sacred duty, CHamorus have since been caught in a never ending cycle of 'paying back'" (Souder in Diaz 2009:160). Part of this 'paying back' involved acquiescing (albeit often reluctantly and angrily) to the establishment of US bases on Guahan/Guam which after the war were kept, along with great deal of other land taken for strategic purposes.[10] Today, 'liberation' is the most visible and accessible trope of historical memory on Guahan/Guam, and it is conflated with patriotism and civic duty. Liberation Day is a major affair, celebrated with parades and festivities (See Diaz 2009, Viernes 2009, Perez, M. 2001, and Perez, C. 2002).

After the war, the US took the position that the people were not yet ready for self-government, and Guahan/Guam was kept under US military administration. CHamoru leaders, however, demanded both recognition of their loyalty to the US during the war and a more permanent political status.[11] These culminated in a walkout by members of the Guam Congress in 1949, and the unilateral passage of the Organic Act by the US Congress the following year. Passage of this Act presumably meant that Guahan/Guam was now ready to exercise self-determination. There was talk about future political status, and in the seventies, a political status commission was established which eventually led to the holding of a plebiscite, the results of which showed support for the establishment of a commonwealth similar to Puerto Rico and the Northern Marianas. In the eighties, a Commonwealth Act was drawn up, and finally presented to Congress in 1997. Both the Bush and Clinton administrations opposed the change in status on the basis of strategic defense interests and territorial policy (Quimby 2011:365-6), refusing to agree to three important areas of the Act: mutual consent, immigration control, and self-determination (Perez, M. 2002:462). The Commonwealth Act has faded into oblivion and Guahan/Guam's political status has remained unchanged.[12] This situation gives credence to the assertion that "the current US strategy of promoting of democracy abroad … may actually undermine the viability of (democracy) in any given (base) host (Cooley 2008:4). Guahan/Guam continues as an organized unincorporated territory, a relationship which both re-creates, and is supported by, the multiple and often contradictory identities produced by sixty years of juggling what it means to be 'American.'

Today, the issue of political status is complicated by discourses of racial 'purity.' As we have seen, as a result of war, disease, and colonial policy, virtually all CHamoru are of mixed blood. Monnig suggests that both cultural and political legitimacy have been made impossible for CHamoru by the construction of identity, particularly the US discursive connection between 'purity' and group legitimacy on the one hand and hybridity and group invalidity on the other. CHamorus are faced with the prospect of incessantly 'proving' their authenticity as a Pacific indigenous group 'worthy' of self-determination, self-rule, and/or full US citizenship" (Monnig 2007:407). This is further compounded by a sense of responsibility to the US in reciprocation for 'liberation' during World War II. The need/desire to 'be American' coupled with the demand that CHamorus 'prove their authenticity' has shaped their abilities to work through issues of importance such as language, land, immigration, and political status. As a result, not only are both Guahan and Guahan/Guam invisible to many Americans, but Guahan is also invisible to many CHamorus.

Military Colonialism Today

Souder's third phase of gendered colonization involves modernization and immigration. Her focus is on the tourism industry, but the military continues to play a huge role. Over 100 years of US military colonialism on Guahan/Guam has retarded political and economic development and caused major land alienation, immigration and environmental impacts (Quimby 2011:361). As we have seen, particularly after World War II, huge parcels of CHamoru land were taken by the Navy for military use, much of it without the consent of the landowners and without the payment of compensation. Today, nearly half of the island's 544 square kilometers is taken up by US bases and other military facilities which are inaccessible to visitors and local residents and about 35,000 military personnel and their dependents are stationed there.[13] By 2006, the U.S. military accounted for more than 40 percent of total government expenditures and about 90 percent of U.S. federal spending on Guahan/Guam (US GAO 2006). That year, a proposal was made for a new military expansion. Planned in conjunction with the 2006 US-Japan Realignment Roadmap, the build-up was described by US Defense Secretary Robert Gates in 2008 as "one of the largest movements of military assets in decades" (Kan 2010:1). The proposal included the addition of six nuclear submarines,

making a total of nine, a new Ballistic Missile Defense station, a huge Global Strike Force, a strike and intelligence surveillance reconnaissance hub, and a sixth aircraft carrier for the region (Aguon 2008:125 and Kan 2010). It also entails live-fire training, some of which is to take place on ancient CHamoru cultural sites.[14] The construction and deployment is expected to add about 55,000 people to the current population of 170,000. This was to include 8000 US Marines and their families who were scheduled to be relocated from Okinawa in 2014.[15] It will also include a labor force of about 20,000 construction workers, many of whom are said to be coming from the Philippines.

The residents of Guahan/Guam have been told that the build-up will be a blessing for the local economy. Proponents claim that "each additional submarine would bring roughly 150 sailors to Guahan/Guam and $9 million in salaries for them and their support personnel" (Erikson and Mikolay cited in Lutz 2009:24). However, most of the labor force, the skilled workers in particular, will be from other places because in Guahan/Guam there are not enough workers, particularly well-trained ones, to do skilled jobs (Interview, Kayoko Kushima 2011.9.10). In addition, with little or no local industry, almost all of the supplies will come from outside of Guahan/Guam. While the build-up might bring in money, proponents fail to mention the amount of land, water, and other resources that it will take from the local population.[16]

Both the military and tourism require land and drive up the cost of living, forcing many families to leave. So many CHamoru have left that they now number less than 40% of the total population.[17] This trend underlies the appeal of the Guahan Indigenous Collective to the UN Decolonization Committee to bring an end to the "great exodus" of "young CHamorus, doctors, teachers and future leaders leaving the island as US Marines, fighter aircraft bombers, unmanned aerial vehicles, fast-attack nuclear submarines and foreign construction workers take their place" (Guerrero 2006:10). The situation is complicated by the fact that many young people, already prepared by JROTC,[18] believe enlisting in the US military to be the only viable option for their future (Aguon 2008). Most families have someone affiliated with the military, many serving in Iraq, Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa, and casualty rates are extremely high (*Pacific Daily News* 2011.9.11:5 and Aguon 2008).[19]

Voices: military colonialism and ambiguity on Guahan/Guam

This section uses statements from interviews and secondary sources to underscore some of the contradictions of citizenship and identity on Guahan/Guam today. These voices powerfully convey the anguish of being made invisible both to oneself and to the world.

As Americans and as soldiers, as men and as women, CHamoru are told they are 'equal.' In fact, it is 'equal but unequal' status.

> What bothers me is … when we get together with … people other than our nationality, and we talk about, 'She's American and she's CHamoru … it's like 'Wait a minute, we're just as American as you are. We're doing the same thing you're doing. Defending the country.' … The other thing that bugs me is that we don't, we can't vote for president. … Here you are defending the U.S.A. and you can't even vote for the president (Taitano in Perez, C. 2002:75).

University of Guam president and former representative to the US House of Representatives, Robert Underwood describes the situation on Guahan/Guam today as an identity crisis. He writes,

> On Guam, most of us have become victims of a limited consciousness … Because of the strength of this myopia … we are pilloried as a group of people incessantly, without respite and seemingly with no hope of escape. … We view the development of the Chamorro people in a framework which denies them the right to be. We are forced to relate to each other as members of different ethnic and social groups as if we were not on Guam, but in a different world (Perez, M. 2002: 463).

Aguon speaks to the effects of the lack of perceived authenticity in terms of internalized colonization, or second tier colonialism, where the struggle is not against the colonizer so much as against oneself (Aguon 2006:17). He says,

> (A)s America's perilous push to dominate the global political stage is being forced

> to peel back its mask by thoughtful citizens the world over, we, the indigenous people of America's westernmost possession are not joining in the fight. We are kept under lock and key. Cleverly invisible in the international community so that no one sees as we slip quietly into the sea. Not marching, but being marched, to the drums of our own disempowerment. But alone, that information is insufficient to understand the quality of anguish today being loosed on the CHamoru people (Aguon 2006:13).

Aguon goes on to explain that the anguish lies not in having to fight an external power, but in the struggle to attract people's attention. "... (W)e are at home in our kitchens and living rooms engaging even our closest friends and families who have set their hearts on singing America.... The tragedy of our day, however, is that cynicism like a bad lover has come calling and many of us no longer believe this war is one we can win" (Aguon 2006:18).

Contributing to the 'anguish' is the realization that the CHamoru activists who are involved in consciousness raising are stigmatized and silenced. Described by Underwood as 'maladjusted,' these "individuals do not have to be dealt with. They are simply tolerated, occasionally recognized … and even treated well within institutions. … If they persist being maladjusted (retain critical perspectives on society), they will be tolerated as one would a fool or mentally-retarded individual. … It simply reduces them to a 'disgruntled minority,' a 'vocal few,' or 'hot-headed nationalists'" (Underwood in Perez, M. 2002:433-4).

During a visit to Guahan/Guam in 2010, I spoke with Dr. Vivian Dames about identity, the military, and the bases. She referred to Guahan/Guam's ambiguous political status as being "neither fish nor fowl" and spoke about the frustration of having no political framework for changing things. "The tragedy is that so many Guahan/Guam people are so normalized that they don't think anything is wrong. The US has managed to convince them that they have the best deal, and that dignity, identity and culture don't really matter" (Interview with Vivian Dames 2010.5.8).

This view was also expressed by Rosario, a high school student who submitted a video she had made by interviewing three CHamoru women about history and identity as an American History Week project. She was at a loss to understand why

the CHamoru judges did not care about CHamoru history (Interview with Rosario 2010.5.8).

Rosario had chosen women because she wanted to explore the meaning of matrilineal CHamoru culture, and her subjects were women of three different generations, so that she could explore how understandings and performativity have changed. Rosario, like some other young women I met on Guahan/Guam, was hoping to discover in her heritage a way to live as a powerful, CHamoru woman. In so doing, she is competing with idealized and Americanized versions of the past which change the way women view themselves and gender relations. For example, according to Lisa, one of the women interviewed and a CHamoru activist, in a confused conflation of matrilineality with matriarchy, young CHamoru women on Guahan/Guam justify enlisting in the US military with the argument that CHamoru women have always been strong.[20] This confusion speaks to how racialized categories of gender that treat women as subordinate tend to ignore aspects of non-Western culture that give women power in ways not available to, or existing in, Western social relations. Nowhere perhaps are the contradictions of gender, indigeneity, and citizenship so strong as in the military.

Observations by Hope Cristobal, an expert on CHamoru culture and history who taught a course called History of Guam at the University of Guam are also pertinent. She told me that the CHamoru students do not seem to care about their heritage, and 'ancient CHamoru' is not something that seems to be directly related to their lives (Interview with Hope Cristobal 2010.5.8). She went on to say that in fact most of the students were Filipino,[21] hoping to use Guahan/Guam as a stepping stone to attaining US citizenship and going to the mainland US. Most of what she taught, she told me, was the American history necessary for the citizenship exam. Of course, enlisting in the US Army also helps their cause.

Today, the denial and/or low esteem for CHamoru culture and valorization of the military are processes that come from outside, but also from within. For most CHamoru, being as *American* may well reflect Preston King's assertion that national identity is not "the identity of the *state*, but … that of the individual, as it intersects culture (nation) and politics (state)" (King 2007:623-4). King looks to constitutionalism as a clear indication of the meaning of identity, but concludes that

"no constitution is ever quite as concrete and delimited as it may appear" (King 2007: 625). As a territory of the United States, Guahan/Guam has no constitution and the CHamoru people have not engaged in a process of self-determination to create one. As we have seen, while American citizenship is seen as all-inclusive, in fact the concept itself is hierarchal and exclusionary. Moreover, the racialized American view of indigenous 'purity' denies legitimacy to CHamoru realities of *mistizu*. If we were add to this axes of difference rooted in notions of distance, size, and remoteness, the strands that comprise being "neither fish nor fowl" become even more clear. It is hardly a surprise that today 'being CHamoru' is much more a cultural act than a way of life (Interview with LisaLinda Natividad 2010.5).

CONCLUSION

This paper began by asking whether an intersectional approach might provide answers to why opposition to the US military presence on Guahan/Guam seems to be so difficult. On one level, this analysis has shown the difficulty to be structural. Guahan/Guam is both part of, and separate from, the United States, and its citizens are American, but are 'second class Americans' and therefore different from other Americans. Guahan/Guam is both "Where America's Day Begins" and where America's NIMBY (not in my backyard) ends. The mainland US (and even Hawai'i) have at least the formal structures for demanding that the actual tools for forceful discipline and sovereign repression get located someplace else, but American citizens of Guahan/Guam have no choice in those decisions and no formal mechanisms for refusal.

The contradictions of citizenship on Guahan/Guam become more visible when viewed along, or between, various axes of identity. Having American citizenship helps to disguise the fact that relations between the US and Guahan/Guam are those of military colonialism; not only is Guahan/Guam subjected to political and social control by a colonial power, but governance on the island has become militarized and racialized. As an unincorporated organized territory, Guahan/Guam is both a part of, and different from, the United States, and the military, an organization which purports to provide opportunities for equality independent of race, serves to make things even more confusing.

The voices expressed in the previous section reflect the complexities of citizenship, highlighting multi-dimensional identities and differences along lines of gender, class, and race/indigeneity. They illustrate how racialized hierarchies from the Spanish time have been reproduced in citizenship hierarchies under American rule. Moreover, the gendered and militarized notions of production/reproduction and class introduced by the Spanish and reinforced by the United States meant that for high ranking men in particular, masculinity, identity, and military service have become inextricably linked.

On Guahan/Guam, it is very difficult to 'be CHamoru.' Being simultaneously CHamoru and American through citizenship and 'equal belonging' is close to impossible. Becoming a soldier is offered as a way to overcome, or perhaps negate, invisibility through the attainment of first-class citizenship, something that is denied to other, non-militarized bodies. Yet the high death rates of CHamoru soldiers and their devalorised CHamoru identities within the military speak to ways in which the military fails to meet these expectations. Thus, on many different levels, the military is conflated with what it means to be American. And being American is both gendered and militarized.

Opposing the proposed military build-up entails serious questioning about the meaning of citizenship on, and for, Guahan/Guam. Being CHamoru means rethinking one's identity as a woman or as a man. Opposing militarization and the build-up thus requires people to question who they are, what their life choices have meant, and 'how they remember themselves to be.' It is a difficult task, but one which in the end might enable CHamoru to assert their authenticity and relieve their anguish.

There are perhaps three lessons from this analysis that can be applied to the praxis of opposing the military build-up on Guahan/Guam. The first is that this is not a single issue, not something that can be promoted successfully only as an anti-base/anti-military campaign. Therefore, praxis needs to address the underlying issues of identity, not as identity politics but through an understanding of how certain identities serve to negate others. Gendered identities are made more complex by militarization which further de-legitimizes non-Western gender identities. Being a tough CHamoru woman should not have to be the same as being a macho American soldier.

The second is the power of distance, language, and racialized, colonial notions of

identity to make some things visible, and disguise and/or deny others. Military colonialism is possible on Guahan/Guam because in the world of terrorism and globalization, military bases have become normalized and the outside world remains conveniently uncurious as to what takes place on small and distant islands. Praxis therefore needs to focus on Guahan/Guam, but also on educating the rest of the world. The third is that educating the world should not be the sole responsibility of the CHamoru. Regardless of where we were raised or currently reside, those of us on the 'outside' have internalized many of the beliefs about security/safety/risk/threat and growth/development that underlie the military build-up. Praxis needs to take into account and address the ways in which we, in disciplining ourselves, support the power relations that call for military build-ups in places like Guahan/Guam.

Notes

1 Guahan is the CHamoru name for Guam. Here, Guahan/Guam will be used except when referring specifically to the island as a subject of military colonialism. 'CHamoru' (Chamorro, Chamoru) refers to the indigenous people of Guam and their language. Although the spelling used by the government is 'Chamorro,' this spelling is closer to the actual pronunciation and reflects the desire for decolonization.

2 Here 'neo-colonialism' is used to "refer to contemporary manifestations of older colonial relations (i.e. political domination, cultural alteration and ideological justifications) under new guises. For instance, persistent U.S. neocolonial conditions involve political status and subordination, second-class citizenship, lack of control of in-migration, land acquisition, cultural erosion and Americanization." (Perez M. 2001:100). For further discussion of militarization, see for example chapters by Alexander and Reardon in Reardon and Hans (2010).

3 The most important difference between Guahan/Guam's status of Congressional citizenship and constitutional citizenship is that since Congressional citizenship is granted by Congress, presumably it could also be revoked by Congress. See Rogers (1995) and Perez, M. (2002: 458). In 1985, the Ninth Circuit Court made the nature of the relationship with the US clear in its decision on *Sakamoto v. Duty Free Shoppers*, "The Government of Guam is in essence an instrumentality of the federal government" (Rogers 1995:226).

4 Study of bio-politics sheds light on the ways states govern life and death and enhance our understanding of why, in disciplining themselves, people conform to the unwritten rules of the particular group to which they are claiming affiliation. States engage in bio-politics through "nationalization and extension of the racialized practices internal to the state aimed at pacification and normalization" (Nadesan 2008:185). However, bio-politics fails to investigate how lives are actually lived within and among various categories of identity.

5 See for example Crenshaw (1991), Collins (2000), McCall (2005), Yuval-Davis (2005), Squires (2009), Knudsen (2003), and Valentine (2008).

6 Descent was determined through the female line and women were central in the conferring of power and prestige (Souder 1992:44).

7 Terms such as 'Guamanian' and 'Micronesian' are artificial terms that are legacies of US rule. The term 'Guamanian' was used to distinguish CHamorus from Guam and those from the other Mariana Islands, and frequently included long time residents of Guam, regardless of

ethnicity (Perez, C. 2002:70). 'Micronesian' is a pejorative term used to refer to people who have come to Guam from other Micronesian islands (Interview with Helen Thompson on Guahan/Guam, 2011.9.10).

8 Marriage was introduced under the Spanish Catholics, but it was not until the US Executive Order No.308 of 1919 that women were required to take the surname and nationality of their husbands, and children that of their fathers. The Civil Code of 1953 named men as the head of the household and ensured that wives would take their husband's names and decisions about where to live would be made by husbands (Souder 1992:45-53).

9 In 1963, the requirement that those entering Guam have a Naval Security Clearance was lifted, allowing for migrant workers to enter. These workers supported the development of a non-military, non-government population seeking economic growth through development of the tourism industry. Devastation by typhoons in 1962 and 1976 brought major redevelopment funds, further supporting the growing tourism industry. At the same time, the rebuilding disrupted traditional neighborhood patterns and ways of life (Souder 1992:35-36).

10 For example, P.L.594, the Land Acquisition Act of 1946, authorized the US Navy Department to acquire private land needed for permanent military installations. Compensation was at best inadequate, and the largest amounts of what was paid went to the biggest landowners. In addition to land for bases, 1500 acres of the best farmland was taken for food production for the military, and US objectives at the end of WWII were to acquire 55% of the total land area of the island. Even when land was no longer necessary for military use, it was not returned to the CHamoru owners (Rogers 1995:214-17).

11 The first petition to the US Congress asking for civilian government was submitted in 1901, and a series of similar petitions asking for US citizenship and self-determination were filed beginning in 1933 (Hattori 1996:57-69). Also see Diaz 2009 and Viernes 2009. The US victory was a celebrated as "'glorious event' whose price in lives lost had purchased freedom and later American claims of exclusive rights to the region" (Diaz 2009:159).

12 Quimby (2011) claims that the defeat of the Commonwealth attempt was due in part to poor strategic planning by CHamorus in favor of self-determination. While CHamorus admit there was disunity, a much more convincing argument is that the defeat was brought on by pressure from the United States for strategic reasons, coupled with the normalization of the acceptance of the status quo.

13 According to the 2010 "Base Structure Report," the US 'owns' 254 square kilometers of the 256.45 square kilometers housing military installations on Guahan/Guam (US Department of Defense 2010:52-53). Natividad and Kirk (2010) say that the US controls about 39% of the island, an indication of the size of the build-up.

14 A lawsuit filed against the US Navy to prevent the building of a firing range at Pagat has been approved by a Hawaii district court, although the Navy is calling for a dismissal (Ridgell 2011).

15 On 12 December 2011, the US Congress voted against allocating funds for the relocation of the US Marines from Okinawa to Guahan/Guam. It is unclear when, or whether, the relocation will take place (Kurashige 2011). The number of Marines scheduled to go to Guahan/Guam has been cut in half, and there is discussion in progress about whether or not the remainder will stay in Japan.

16 The Environmental Impact Statement for the build-up is available at the Navy's site: http://www.guambuildupeis.us/ Some of the more successful opposition to the build-up in Guahan/Guam and Japan has centered on environmental threats.

17 The population is about 180,000 people of whom about 37% are CHamoru, 26% Filipino and and 11% other Pacific Islander. About 85% of the population is Roman Catholic. Spoken languages include English (38%), CHamoru (22%), Filipino languages (22%) and others. (July 2010 census in CIA World Factbook).

18 There are three JROTC programs in the public high schools and also an ROTC program at the University of Guam. See Natividad and Kirk (2010:5) and Aguon (2008).
19 Guahan/Guam is said to have the highest per capita enlistment rate and casualty rate in the US army (*Pacific Sunday News*, 2011.9.11).
20 Observation by LisaLinda Natividad in a conversation at University of Guam, 2011.9.12.
21 The political status of Guahan/Guam, coupled with possibilities for service in the US military, makes Guahan/Guam attractive to Filipinos and Pacific Islanders who ultimately want to go to the mainland US. Citizens of Guahan/Guam generally migrate to Hawaii and the mainland US. (Quimby 2011:361).

References

Aguon, Julian. *What We Bury At Night: Disposable Humanity.* Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2008.

.... *Just Left of the Setting Sun.* Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2006.

Bartlett, Lesley and Catherine Lutz. "Disciplining Social Difference: Some Cultural Politics of Military Training in Public High Schools." *The Urban Review,* 30:2 (1998), pp.119-136.

Bevacqua, Michael Lujan. "No Rest for the Awake: CHamoru Thoughts on Race, Decolonization, Peace and Art" (last accessed on 2012.1.20) Available at: http://minagahet.blogspot.com/2010/01/buildupbreakdown-3-boonie-stompers.html

Braun, Yvonne A. "Left High and Dry." *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 13:2 (2011), pp.141-162.

Carter, L., W. Wuerch, R. Carter, eds. *Guam History: Perspectives.* Volume 1. Mangilao: University of Guam, 1998.

CIA World Factbook (last accessed on 2011.2.3). Available at: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/gq.html.

Collins, P.H. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (2nd edition). NY: Routledge, 2000.

Cooley, Alexander. Base Politics: *Democratic Change and the U.S. Military Overseas.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review,* 43:6 (1991) pp.1241-1299.

Cunningham, Lawrence. "The Ancient CHamorus of Guam," pp.11-36 in Carter, et. al. *Guam History: Perspectives,* University of Guam 1998.

Diaz, Vicente M. "Deliberating 'Liberation Day': Identity, History, Memory, and War in Guam," in Fujitani, T., Geoffrey M. White, Lisa Yoneyama. (2001) P*erilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s).* Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2009, pp.155-180

Enloe, Cynthia. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Gerson, Joseph "US Foreign Military Bases and Military Colonialism: Personal and Analytical Perspectives" in Lutz, Catherine, ed. *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts.* Amsterdam: Pluto Press, 2009, pp.47-70.

Guerrero, Anthony Leon. "The Economic Development of Guam," pp. 83-101 in PSSEC, eds. *Issues in Guam's Political Development: The CHamoru Perspective.* Agana, Guam: PSECC, 2002.

Guerrero, Victoria-Lola Montecalvo Leon. "The Legacies of War" in "Hita Guåhan! Chamoru Testimonies to the United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee – 2006." Available at: http://www.minagahetzine.com/hita2006.pdf (Last accessed 2013.6).

Kan, Shirley A. "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments." 2010.7.30. Congressional Research Service (CRS) Report for Congress. CRS 7-5700, www.crs.gov RS22570 (2010), (downloaded 2011.1.21).

Kasperbauer, Carmen Artero. "The CHamoru Culture," pp.26-39 in PSSEC, *Issues in Guam's Political Development: The CHamoru Perspective.* Agana, Guam: PSECC, 2002.

King, Preston. "Being American." *Government and Opposition* 42:4 (2007) pp.593-625.

Knudsen, Susanne V. "Intersectionality – A Theoretical Inspiration in the Analysis of Minority Cultures and Identities in Textbooks." *Consortium on Race, Gender, and Ethnicity.* (2003). Available at www.crge.umd.edu/publications/ news.pdf. (accessed 2011.12.10).

Kurashige, Nae. "*Futenma Beizaise mo ashikase*" *(US Financial Situation affecting Futenma Base) Asahi Shimbun*

2011.12.14.
Lutz, Catherine, ed. *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts.* Amsterdam: Pluto Press, 2009.
McCall, Leslie. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs,* 30:3 (2005), pp.1771-1800.
Monnig, Laurel Ann. " 'Proving CHamoru': Indigenous narratives of race, identity and Decolonization on Guam." (2007). Unpublished doctoral dissertation available at http://books.google.co.jp/books?id=CVkleycAB04C&printsec=frontcover&hl=ja&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=snippet&q=contents&f=false (accessed 2012.1.19).
Nadesan, Majia Holmer. *Governmentality, Biopower, and Everyday Life.* New York: Routledge, 2008.
Natividad, LisaLinda and Gwyn Kirk. "Fortress Guam: Resistance to US Military Mega-Buildup," *The Asia-Pacific Journal, 19-1-10, May 10, 2010.* http://japanfocus.org/articles/print_article/3356 (accessed on *2011.2.14*)
Pacific Daily News. (*Pacific Sunday News,* 2011.9.11 Vol.43, No.222) Hagatna: Guam, available at guampdn.com.
Papadoupoulos, Dimitris. "In the Ruins of Representation: Identity, Individuality, Subjectification." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 47 (2008), pp.139-165.
Perez, C.T. "A CHamoru Re-Telling of Liberation," pp. 70-77 in PSSEC, *Issues in Guam's Political Development: The CHamoru Perspective.* Agana, Guam: PSSEC, 2002.
Perez, Michael. "Pacific Identities beyond US Racial Formations: The Case of Chamorro Ambivalence and Flux." *Social Identities* 8:3 (2002), pp.457-479.
.... "Contested Sites: Pacific Resistance in Guam to U.S. Empire." *Amerasia Journal* 27:1 (2001), pp.97-114.
Political Status Education Coordinating Commission (PSECC). *Issues in Guam's Political Development: The CHamoru Perspective (Kinalamtn Pulitikat: Sinenten I CHamoru).* Agana, Guam (2002). PSECC as mandated by Public Law 20-99.
Quimby, Frank. "Fortress Guåhån." *Journal of Pacific History* 46:3 (2011), pp.357-380.
Reardon, Betty A. and Asha Hans, eds. *The Gender Imperative: Human Security vs. State Security.* New Delhi: Routledge, 2010.
Ridgell, Clynt. "We Are Guahan Want Courts to Stay Involved in Pagat Case." Pacific News Center, 2011.12.05. Available at: http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=19152:we-are-guahan-want-courts-to-stay-involved-in-pagat-case&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156 (Accessed on 2011.12.20).
Rogers, Robert F. *Destiny's Landfall.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1995.
Squires, Judith. "Intersecting Inequalities." *International Feminist Journal of Politics,* 11:4 (2009), pp.496-512.
Souder, Laura. *Daughters of the Island: Contemporary CHamoru Women Organizers on Guam,* (1992). 2nd edition. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
Troutman, Charles H. "Does Guam have a Political Identity?" pp.329-344 in Carter, et. al. *Guam History: Perspectives,* University of Guam, 1998.
Underwood, Robert. "Teaching Guam History in Guam High Schools." pp.1-10 in Carter, et. al. *Guam History: Perspectives,* University of Guam, 1998.
United States Department of Defense. "Base Structure Report for Fiscal Year 2010 Baseline (A Summary of DoD's Real Property Inventory)." Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), 2010.
United States General Accounting Office (US GAO). "U.S. Insular Areas: Economic, Fiscal, and Financial Accountability Challenges." GAO-07-119 (2006).
Valentine, Gill. "Theorizing and Researching Intersectionality: A Challenge for Feminist Geography." *The Professional Geographer.* 59:1 (2008), 10-21.
Viernes, J. P. "Won't You Please Come Back to Guam? Media Discourse, Military Buildup, and CHamoru in the Space Between" in *The Space Between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific,* edited by A. Marata Tamaira, 103-118. Occasional Paper Series 44. Honolulu, Hawai 'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai 'i at Mānoa, 2009.
Winker, Gabriele and Nina Degele. "Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: Dealing with social inequality." *European Journal of Women's Studies.* 18:1 (2011), pp. 51–66.
Yuval-Davis, Nira. "Intersectionality and Feminist Politics." *European Journal of Women's Studies.* 13:3 (2006), pp.193–209.

Yuval-Davis, Nira, Floya Anthias & Eleonore Kofman. “Secure Borders and Safe Haven and the Gendered Politics of Belonging: Beyond Social Cohesion.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 28:3 (2005), pp.513-535.