

Copyright
by
Tiara Rose Naputi
2013

**The Dissertation Committee for Tiara Rose Naputi Certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:**

**Charting Contemporary Chamoru Activism: Anti-Militarization &
Social Movements in Guåhan**

Committee:

Dana L. Cloud Supervisor

Barry Brummett

Joshua Gunn

Circe Sturm

Michael Lujan Bevacqua

**Charting Contemporary Chamoru Activism: Anti-Militarization &
Social Movements in Guåhan**

by

Tiara Rose Naputi, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2013

Dedication

To Chamorus and to those who endure the ongoing legacy of colonization around the world; may we continue to persevere in a movement to protect and defend our people, our land, our language, and our future.

Acknowledgements

My time in higher education has been paved by a long procession of extended “family” members. It has been filled with people whom have shared advice, wisdom, and encouragement; people whom have taken the time to care, to listen, and to nurture my ideas. They have shared their homes, their food, and their unwavering support. They have profoundly influenced my ideas, arguments, critical consciousness, and growth as a person, especially during these last four years. I am so very grateful for these people and these relationships.

To my dissertation committee: Dana Cloud, thank you for being such a dedicated advisor and a wonderful mentor, for advocating for me and supporting me through both the M.A. and Ph.D. programs, for leading by your example and demonstrating how to be an activist and a scholar committed to social justice. Barry Brummett, thank you for teaching me about method, an understanding of how to get into a text, and an appreciation for the little secrets of academia. Josh Gunn, thank you for guiding me through this discipline, creating a strong sense of appreciation for being a good citizen and scholar, and being a rock star example and for the kind support. For Circe Sturm, thank you for leading me to Indigenous Studies and NAISA, for teaching me about applied scholarship with my cultural community, and encouraging me as I sought deeper connections with my homeland. Thank you for supporting my goals of working for the political advancement of indigenous peoples and giving me a supportive community home. Michael Lujan Bevacqua, *Saina Ma’åse* for being such a strong Chamoru advocate for helping me navigate the complexities of decolonization, language, and militarization, for letting me join in on your classes, and for sharing your sharp wit and sense of humor along the way.

For those back home in Guåhan: Thank you to everyone who took the time to participate in my interviews for this project, who gave me advice, who took me around the island, and taught me about our land, who shared their stories, who helped me strategize and think more deeply about the issues facing our people.

Thank you to the Communication Studies Department for giving me so much assistance, encouragement, and support over the years. I am particularly grateful for everyone on the administrative staff, the excellent coaching from Susan Corbin, and the UT Debate Team.

For my dear friends who have been a great source of encouragement and always live by example as strong, brilliant, caring women: Zazil Reyes García, Rachel Kraft, Ashley Mack, Danee Pye, Caroline Simpson, Valerie Thatcher, Amber Turner, and Katelyn Wood. Thank you all for being the kind of people that make friendship come easy and laughter come often.

A good deal of this project was brainstormed, worked out, written, and edited around my family. From my grandparents, parents, siblings, and extended family members I have received love, encouragement, laughter, hugs, a constant supply of coffee, and home cooked meals. *Saina Ma'åse* to my family, wherever you are in the world—you are the best. I thank my Tatan Bihu, Vicente Benavente Naputi, who passed away on January 30, 2011 while I was starting the initial work on this project. He always believed in me, and encouraged me to get my Ph.D. or, as he called it, the “**P**erhaps Degree.” For my dad, thank you for helping me translate, for always joking around, and for sharing such great stories about life back home. For my mom, thank you for encouraging me to always have a zest for life and learning and for being a colossal help during the final push of this project. For my sisters (Francine, Marissa, Sara, and

Lindsey), thank you for being four of the best women I know and for pushing me in your own ways to be a better person.

For my Guerrero family (*Familian Robat*), thank you for teaching me the Guerrero ways, talking story, going on hikes, and encouraging me to follow the tradition of educators in our clan. For my Naputi family (*Familian Kaderon*), thank you for instilling in me a respect for strong voices and minds, for giving me a sense of humor and a constant supply of jokes and laughter, for encouraging me, for opening my eyes to the tradition of activists and advocates in our clan. A very special Saina Ma'åse goes to my Auntie Dora Santos Blas and Uncle Ray Blas. I cannot express enough gratitude for everything you did for me, and have done for our family. Thank you for chauffeuring me around our island, for introducing me to your (seemingly endless) social network, for helping me begin my project, and for helping me reunite with our family in Guåhan when I returned home in 2011.

Finally, thank you to my best friend and partner, Chris Crowe. Words fail to express how grateful I am for you, for how you work to make this world a better place, for your love and support, and for being a person who brings out the best in me. *Hu guaiya hao*.

Charting Contemporary Chamoru Activism: Anti-Militarization & Social Movements in Guåhan

Tiara Rose Naputi, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2013

Supervisor: Dana L. Cloud

This project examines social movements in Guåhan (Guam) and activism within this unincorporated territory of U.S. Two assumptions guide this work. First, Guåhan is the site of rhetorical struggle over identity, indigeneity, and Americanness. Second, indigenous Chamoru (Chamorro) struggles must be examined within the historical context of colonial projects, which have established a political economy of stratification. Thus, the complexities of social movement organizing might be better understood when historicized with political and economic realities. To get a more complete understanding of how indigenous social movements and activism in contemporary Guåhan are shaped by understandings of national identity, colonization, and military buildup, I analyze three sets of artifacts: (1) testimonies at United Nations from 2005-2012; (2) the texts and activities of the group We Are Guåhan and its legal action against the Department of Defense (DOD) regarding the U.S. military buildup; and (3) interviews with social movement members and organizers regarding activism in Guåhan and contending with American influence. The project argues that resistance takes place through social movement efforts centered on the issues of ancestral land, language and cultural revitalization, and self-determination for Chamorus; and these moments occur primarily

through actions that both depend upon and reinforce communicative channels directed against the U.S. nation-state. This phenomenon is articulated through the rhetoric of both/neither that demonstrates complex and contradictory identities positioned as both part of the U.S. while simultaneously remaining exterior to it.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Reading Indigeneity, Social Movements, and Activism Rhetorically ...	1
Situating Guåhan.....	3
Indigenous Social Movements & Communication Studies	7
The Texts Of Guåhan.....	10
Literature Review.....	13
Chapter Preview.....	51
Chapter 2: Decolonizing Methodology & the Construction of Both/Neither Identities	55
Decolonizing Methodology	56
Rhetoric of Both/Neither.....	66
Both/Neither Constructions	69
Ideological Criticism.....	71
Chapter 3: Chamoru Testimonies Before the United Nations	76
Charting the Cycle: UN Histories of Decolonization & Guåhan.....	79
In Our Own Words: Rhetorical Analysis of United Nations Testimonies....	84
Physical Dislocations: Pushing Chamorus to the Periphery	97
Cultural Dislocations: Striving for <i>Inafa' Maolek</i> Among Decentered Chamorus	110
My Four Minutes at the UN.....	119
Assessing the Limits of the UN	124
The Ambivalent Promises of the United Nations	128
Chapter 4: We Are Guåhan & <i>The Grey Papers</i>	131
Local Activism: 2005-2009	136
The DEIS: 11,000 pages in 90 days.....	139
In Their Own Words: Rhetorical Analysis of <i>The Grey Papers</i>	143
Assessing the Rhetorical Power of “Grey”	163

Chapter 5: Protecting & Defending Pãgat	165
<i>Inafa' Maolek</i> : Restoring the Cultural, Environmental, & Historical Balance	168
Heritage Hikes: Connecting to Our Lands	178
The Supplemental EIS: Engaging the DOD Again.....	185
<i>We Are Pãgat</i> : Documenting the DOD.....	189
Media Framing: Silence From The “Mainland”	196
Chapter 6: Articulating Activism Through Both/Neither Identities	204
From Our Local Words: Rhetorical Analysis of Interviews in Guåhan	205
Embedded Externalization of Politics.....	215
Embedded Externalization of Decolonization	220
Embedded Externalization of the Buildup	224
Conclusion: Restoring the Balance	244
Rhetorical Practices: A Politics of <i>Inafa' Maolek</i>	245
Both/Neither Identities In a Terrain of Settler Colonialism.....	247
Moving Beyond the “Grey”: Implications for Guåhan	250
Mobilizing Decolonizing Methodologies: Implications for Social Movements	253
Indigenous Identity Framing.....	255
Implications for the U.S. Military	257
Imagining the Politics Beyond Both/Neither: Subjects in Sovereign Space	259
Bibliography	263

Chapter 1: Reading Indigeneity, Social Movements, and Activism Rhetorically

During a U.S. House Armed Service Committee hearing in 2010, Representative Hank Johnson (D-GA) expressed concern about the U.S. military buildup plans for Guåhan (Guam)¹ by saying that the island “will tip over and capsize.”² This statement was one of the few moments of media circulated discourse from a U.S. politician about the Department of Defense (DOD) plans to relocate the Futenma military base from Okinawa to Guåhan. After his remarks went viral and met with criticism, the Democrat released a statement saying that he was “obviously” joking by explaining: “The subtle humor of this obviously metaphorical reference to a ship capsizing illustrated my concern about the impact of the planned military buildup on this small tropical island.”³ Guåhan rarely makes news coverage in U.S. mainstream media outlets, yet the controversy over the U.S. representative’s statement reflects that when it is discussed in the news it is often accompanied by dismissive and trivializing discourse toward the island and its inhabitants. While Johnson’s remarks were arguably meant to express opposition to the buildup, his characterization of the island as small and vulnerable to capsizing under the weight of a new wave of U.S. military expansion made a mockery of him, but detracted from drawing critical public attention to the U.S. military plans for the Pacific.

1 As a member of the Chamoru diaspora, I have made a conscious political decision to follow other Chamoru and Pacific scholars and take ownership of otherwise borrowed names for the indigenous population (Aguon, *Just Left* 12-15; Dames, “Rethinking the Circle,” 379; Monnig, “Proving Chamorro,” 27-31). Throughout this essay I refer to the island Guåhan (Guam) and its peoples Chamorus (Chamorros) to signify its indigenous history, avoid the Spanish and U.S. colonial terminology and spellings imposed by external authorities, and stand in solidarity with contemporary indigenous struggles.

2 Representative Johnson stated: “My fear is that the whole island will become so overly populated that it will tip over and capsize.” See Stephanie Condon, “Hank Johnson Worries Guam Could ‘Capsize’ after Marine Buildup,” CBS News, April 1, 2010, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20001567-503544.html.

3 Charles Ray, “Congressman Clarifies Island Tipping Comment,” CNN, April 1, 2010, <http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2010/04/01/congressman-clarifies-island-tipping-comment/?fbid=YUADj-tX3LK>

What led up to Johnson's remarks at the U.S. Armed Services Committee Hearing was a 2006 agreement between the U.S. and Japan that proposed a \$10.3 billion military buildup project on Guåhan. Called the United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation (Roadmap), this agreement offered a plan for strengthening the U.S.-Japan alliance, which included the relocation of roughly 8,000 Marines and their 9,000 dependents from Okinawa to Guåhan by 2014.⁴ The Roadmap establishes a sweeping reorganization of U.S. troops and bases in Japan, and supports the development of new facilities and infrastructure on Guåhan in order to facilitate the relocation.⁵ At its inception, the 2006 agreement also proposed to add a range of military infrastructure developments to the region including nuclear submarines, a Ballistic Missile Defense station, a massive Global Strike Force, a sixth aircraft carrier, and live-fire training.⁶ During a visit to the island in 2008, U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates declared that the buildup would be "one of the largest movements of military assets in decades," and would help "maintain a robust military presence in a critical part of the world."⁷ In February 2009 the bilateral agreement confirmed the relocation of approximately 8,000 Marines and 9,000 dependents with complete relocation to be finished by 2014.⁸ These plans became commonly known on Guåhan as the U.S. military buildup (or buildup), stirring up polarizing views among the local residents and throughout the region.

4 Condoleeza Rice, Donald Rumsfeld, Taro Aso, and Fukushima Nukaga, "United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation," United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee Document. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/doc0605.html> (accessed April 29, 2010). See part 1(b).

5 Shirley A. Kan and Larry A. Niksch, "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments," Congressional Research Service, CRS Report for Congress, 7-5700. January 7 2010, <http://openocrs.com/document/RS22570/>.

6 Julian Aguon, *What We Bury at Night: Disposable Humanity* (Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2008), 125. See also Kan 2010, 2-6; Natividad and Kirk n. pag

7 Donna Miles, "Gates Views Growth Under Way in Guam," American Forces Press Service, May 30, 2008, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=50042>.

8 Shirley A. Kan, "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments," Congressional Research Service (CRS), 2012. Vol. 7-5700, March 29, 2012, <http://openocrs.com/document/RS22570/>

In this dissertation I argue that Guåhan represents an important site for rhetorical inquiry that demands international attention, especially by those conducting critical inquiry about policymaking in the Pacific. The island is often overlooked due to its small size, and is rarely covered by mainstream U.S. media—however, it is in this space that the dynamic and complex issues of national belonging, indigenous identity, and U.S. security and military policy converge. The intersection of these issues also reveals the complexity of “both/neither” rhetoric. I argue this rhetorical phenomenon simultaneously positions Guåhan identities between *belonging to* the U.S. while remaining neither a part of *nor completely separate from* the U.S. Thus, both/neither rhetoric is vexed by its mixture of strategies that depend upon the U.S. nation-state institutions while concurrently articulating a distinct indigenous identity as a challenge to the U.S. This chapter argues that a rhetorical perspective is needed toward the movement in Guåhan. It frames the relevant literature while offering rhetorical studies as a framework for understanding issues of nationalism, colonialism, and resistance in the Pacific. To understand the complexity of this case, it is important to first retrace the historical context that influences how the U.S. positions and perpetuates its policies toward Guåhan. Understanding the political, social, and economic context of the movement allows the contemporary struggles to be viewed as a continuation of past conflicts.

SITUATING GUÅHAN

In 2013, Guåhan continues to be labeled as an unincorporated territory by the United States, and is one of the “oldest colonial dependencies in the world.”⁹ According to the United Nations, it is one of the sixteen non-self-governing territories (NSGT) in the

9 Van Dyke 1996, 625. Arnold H. Leibowitz, *Defining Status: A Comprehensive Analysis of United States Territorial Relations* (London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1989), 165-169. It is important to note that the colonial relationship between Guåhan and the U.S. began in 1898, however the island had been colonized previously for centuries by Spain and has a centuries long history of colonization.

world. This territorial designation perpetuates the colonial relationship that began in 1521 when Ferdinand Magellan docked on the island's shores, and it was later more formally established in 1668 when Spanish Jesuit missionaries embarked on religious conversion of the island.¹⁰ Centuries later, Spanish control was transferred to the United States in 1898. An imperial war of U.S. expansion, the Spanish-American War ended with the signing of the Treaty of Paris where the U.S. claimed ownership of Cuba, Guåhan, Philippines, Puerto Rico, and parts of the West Indies. This war set "the regional grounds of what would constitute U.S. global hegemony in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."¹¹

Following the war, the U.S. Congress granted the Department of Navy administrative authority to establish a military government in Guåhan.¹² The U.S. Naval government ran the island until World War II when it was seized by Japan in 1941. Guåhan endured a short but brutal period of military rule before being re-captured by the U.S. in 1944.¹³ Guåhan quickly returned to U.S. and Naval government control, and maintains its designation as an unincorporated territory of the U.S. It is difficult to navigate through these waves of conquest, capture, and control of the island by three different countries for a period of time that spanned from 1521 to 1944. It is even more difficult to realize that these troubled waters came to the shores of Guåhan without any formal political rights afforded to the native inhabitants. It is unfathomable that the forces of U.S. hegemony that sprouted in 1898, continue to characterize the relationship

10 Tony Palomo, *An Island in Agony* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1984), 59-63.; Robert F. Rogers, *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1995), 45.

11 Ramón Grosfoguel, and Ana Margarita Cervantes-Rodriguez, *The Modern/Colonial/Capitalist World-System in the Twentieth Century: Global Processes, Antisystemic Movements and the Geopolitics of Knowledge* (Westport: Praeger, 2002), xiii

12 Penelope Bordallo Hofschneider, *A Campaign for Political Rights on the Island of Guam 1899-1950* (CNMI Division of Historical Preservation, 2001), 18.

13 Harry Gailey, *The Liberation of Guam: 21 July – 10 August 1944* (Novato: Presidio Press, 1988), 1-7

between the U.S. and Guåhan in the twenty-first century. These waves of conquest have left an enduring legacy of colonization and militarization that has a significant impact on the inherent collective rights of the Chamoru (Chamorro) indigenous people. Navigating through the history of colonization demonstrates how U.S. military, political, and economic considerations have converged to hold Guåhan in a state of political limbo for over a century. It was not until six years after the U.S. recaptured Guåhan that any semblance of political rights were given.

In 1950, the Organic Act of Guam was passed which designated the island as an unincorporated territory of the U.S., ended Naval control, and afforded civil and political rights and protection to the inhabitants; this act continues to govern the island.¹⁴ However, those who received citizenship through the Act do not enjoy full protections under the U.S. Constitution.¹⁵ By only recognizing “states,” the legal umbrella of the Constitution excludes Guåhan. Consequently the island remains exterior to the American nation while simultaneously being held in proximity to the U.S. for over a century as U.S. military, economic, and political considerations place Guåhan in political limbo. The territory designation affords an ambiguous political status, even as the issue of sovereignty for Guåhan remains a contentious one.¹⁶ This ambiguity positions the island in a tenuous relationship with the U.S.,¹⁷ where the basis of U.S.-Guåhan relations are characterized by the primacy of U.S. colonialism and framed in overtly militaristic

14 Hofschneider, *A Campaign*, 155.

15 Hannah M.T. Gutierrez, “Guam’s Future Political Status: An Argument for Free Association with U.S. Citizenship,” *Asian-Pacific Law & Policy Journal* 4 (2003): 123.

16 Michael P. Perez, “Chamorro Resistance and the Prospects for Sovereignty in Guam,” in *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, ed. Joanne Barker. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 172.

17 Ronald Stæde, *Pacific Passages: World Culture and Local Politics in Guam* (Sweden: Stockholm Studies in Anthropology, 1998), 47.

terms.¹⁸ Since September 11, 2001 the island has increasingly become a site of military activities and buildup.¹⁹ In the push to prepare for the global War on Terror, former President George W. Bush's administration designated "hot spots" for redistribution in the Asia-Pacific region. The military value of the island increased exponentially due to its geographic proximity to Asia, and its status as a U.S. territory and military outpost.²⁰ It is now considered one of the most strategic military locales in the Pacific Rim.²¹ These developments take place in the context of an extensive history of U.S. militarization policies on Guåhan. Against this backdrop, Chamorus have formed a small, yet determined movement to challenge the forces of U.S. military dominance.²²

There are many facets of contemporary Chamoru activism and social movement organizing that have emerged in response to the proposed military buildup, some of which build upon the foundation of activism established in the mid to late twentieth century in Guåhan.²³ Here, I have only mentioned a few moments within the timeline of the "Roadmap" agreement to highlight the evolution of the the buildup plans and some of the locally organized responses presented against it. Unfortunately, within U.S. media and news coverage, there is a complete lack of regard for Guåhan and no significant

18 Keith L. Camacho and Laurel A. Monnig, "Uncomfortable Fatigues: Chamorro Soldiers, Gendered Identities, and the Question of Decolonization in Guam," in *Militarized Currents: Toward A Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, ed. Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 150

19 Catherine Lutz, "US Military Bases on Guam in Global Perspective," *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 30-3-10, July 26, 2010. n. pag. <http://www.japanfocus.org/-catherine-lutz/3389>.

20 Michael Lujan Bevacqua, "The Exceptional Life and Death of a Chamorro Soldier: Tracing the Militarization of Desire in Guam, USA," in *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, ed. Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 33.

21 Michael P. Perez, "Contested Sites: Pacific Resistance in Guam to U.S. Empire," *Amerasia Journal* 27 (2001):97; LisaLindaNatividad and Gwyn Kirk, "Fortress Guam: Resistance to U.S. Military Mega-Buildup," *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, May 10, 2010, n.pag. <http://www.japanfocus.org/-LisaLinda-Natividad/3356>.

22 Bevacqua, "The Exceptional Life," 35. This work focuses on the self-determination movement which poses challenges to military buildup.

23 Natividad and Kirk, "Fortress Guam," n. pag.

media attention directed toward island affairs. Despite Guåhan's "status as one of the world's last official colonies, this increased militarization of the island has registered little to no protest on an international or national level."²⁴ Thus, Guåhan activists face a challenging rhetorical situation. With these problems in mind, I seek in this project to address the following central questions: What are the rhetorical and discursive practices of contemporary indigenous social movement efforts against U.S. militarization in Guåhan? How do indigenous activists negotiate multiple levels of identification through communication in challenging common sense about militarization? A rhetorical perspective can help to answer these questions.

INDIGENOUS SOCIAL MOVEMENTS & COMMUNICATION STUDIES

A rhetorical perspective brought to this phenomenon uncover the particular messages, language, and discourses surrounding the military buildup as well as the specific nature of responses that have been raised in opposition to these plans. Although the dominant discourse in the U.S. national context overlooks these issues, a communication perspective can draw direct attention to these matters that have been ignored in public discourse, assess the rhetorical strategies of activists, and foster further conversation about how these activists might intervene rhetorically with grater success in the future.

One major rhetorical focus is on how people negotiate bivalent identities in self-determination and to inform the role of discourse within social movements that operate from such complex national/international positions. Communication offers a beneficial angle and approach to this project because it allows for examination of the rhetorical devices that constitute resistance, and it expresses a point of view which enriches our

²⁴ Bevacqua, "The Exceptional Life," 33.

understanding about the way we live and respond to militarization in contemporary society. Through an explicit focus on rhetoric, this project illuminates the rhetorical expression and manifestations of culture and identity within indigenous social movements.

The particular case of Guåhan can be used to address significant questions about the rhetoric of social movements. Placing emphasis on a territorial space that is dependent upon the U.S. provides a rich case for analyzing the complexities of social movement rhetoric and communication for social change. By emphasizing the role of rhetoric and language in the struggle for social and political change in Guåhan, I offer a unique approach that informs broader inquiries of U.S. military policy toward unincorporated territories that provides a significant contribution to interdisciplinary work in the field of communication studies. Specifically, this project seeks to challenge and contribute to communication studies scholarship by first by recognizing the rhetorical and discursive dimensions of cultural and political struggles in relation to the U.S. nation-state, and second, by addressing the pressing need for focused attention on indigenous resistance within U.S. territorial islands in the era of hyper-militarization throughout the world.

Since the turn of the twenty-first century there has been an increase in organized peaceful protest around the globe. In 2007, the United Nations adopted the Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which signaled the importance of indigenous rights in the international arena. These events warrant the close investigation of indigenous movements. Focusing on U.S. territories is of particular importance given the propensity for this “small” area to be overlooked and trivialized given its geographic size and physical distance from the U.S. Paradoxically, this small island holds enormous strategic importance for the U.S. military and security planning in the Pacific/Asia rim—although

its small size is often one of the reasons that it is overlooked as an area for deeper investigation or inquiry. While the island is often ignored by mainstream media and discourse and considered unimportant for discussion, it is valued as strategically significant for the U.S. forward deployments in the Western Pacific and considered to be the crucial piece of U.S. defense posture in Asia.²⁵

These problems are of profound importance to communication scholars, and particularly rhetorical scholars, because they demonstrate the convergence of dynamic areas of discourse that influences politics in the contemporary world. Militarization, identity, and social movement discourse all rely on persuading and/or motivating audiences in particular situations with life-or-death consequences, and these discursive phenomena operate in complex layers from within spaces under colonial control. Furthermore, rhetoricians should be interested in U.S. geopolitical strategy because it is an area where logic and politics intersect to construct arguments and persuasive appeals in the service of military and security. Finally, understanding the construction of political identities is of increasing importance in the field.

Two assumptions guide this work. First, Guåhan is the site of rhetorical struggle over identity, indigeneity, and Americanness in a neoliberal society. Second, Chamoru struggles must be examined within the historical context of colonial projects that have established a political economy of stratification. Thus, the complexities of social movement organizing might be better understood when historicized with political and economic realities. This project attempts to get a more complete understanding of the ways in which indigenous social movements and activism in contemporary Guåhan are shaped by understandings of national identity, colonization, and military buildup,

25 Kan, "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments," 1-2.

THE TEXTS OF GUÅHAN

Through answering the primary research questions surrounding indigenous social movements and U.S. militarization, my project seeks to reconcile the ways in which U.S.-Guåhan relations are ultimately influenced by our understandings of national identity and military buildup. This task requires an examination of facets of American colonial politics that often lack U.S. media and news coverage—namely colonization and militarization within U.S. territories. In this dissertation, I focus on several case studies exploring discourses of indigenous social movement culture because they offer a rich landscape of rhetorical artifacts. I analyze several sets of texts: (1) Testimonies presented at the United Nations; (2) social movement organization We Are Guåhan and their actions taken during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and subsequent legal action against the Department of Defense (DOD) for the military buildup; (3) Interviews with social movement members and organizers regarding activism in Guåhan and contending with American influence.

My first case study chapter will consider how Chamoru both/neither identities are visible at the international level. The concept of “both/neither” is a rhetorical manifestation within indigenous resistance and identity. The concept of both/neither provides the opportunity to name the oscillating identity and voice of those active against militarization. The both/neither concept encompasses the rhetoric surrounding Guåhan’s situation as an island that is simultaneously exterior to the American nation while also falling partially under the legal umbrella of the U.S. Constitution. I analyze the testimonies at the United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) meeting, the Special Committee on Decolonization and the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues meetings from 2005-2012. While brief, this timeline represents the bulk of the international level of movement organizing in relation

to the U.S. military buildup. It also represents the resurgence of UN testimonies from Guåhan (after a lag in visits to the UN before 2005), and demonstrates a renewed effort of public activities from the decolonization and self-determination areas of the movement. I examine the ways in which these testimonies frame the issue of militarization and resistance, as well as the impact the testimonies had on the localized efforts of the movement. Additionally, these texts will enable me to explore the rhetorical practices of the movement as people respond to a changing political process and make demands to governing bodies that continue to deny them recognition.

My second case study chapter turns to the “national” level of resistance, by examining texts from We Are Guåhan, a social movement organization that emerged in 2009 around the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that outlined the Department of Defense’s plans for the U.S. military buildup. The organization’s goals are to: “educate the public on the impact of the proposed military buildup, provide the people of Guam with a voice in the buildup process; and promote a sustainable future for Guam.”²⁶ The organization presented a series of “Grey Papers” that summarized the concerns of Guam leaders, Government of Guam (GovGuam) agencies, and other entities, over the contents of, the Final EIS, GovGuam agencies, and other Guam leaders and entities. These “Grey Papers” provide an indispensable set of texts on the core responses of the local community with regard to the buildup. Additionally, when the DOD announced plans to build a firing range at Pãgat Village, We Are Guåhan galvanized strong public opposition to the buildup. This culminated in the organization’s joint efforts with Guam Preservation Trust and the National Trust for Historic

²⁶“About,” *We Are Guåhan*, accessed October 9, 2012, <http://weareguahan.com/about-weareguahan/>.

Preservation to file a lawsuit against the DOD in November 2010.²⁷ In 2011, one year after the lawsuit was filed against the DOD for breaking the law in its selection of Pāgat Village, the DOD admitted it must prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and give the public an opportunity to comment on its plans during scoping meetings.²⁸ While I will not analyze the specific legal documents associated with We Are Guåhan's lawsuit over Pāgat, the case presents a key artifact for understanding another layer of the movement's strategies against the military buildup. For this reason, it is critical to analyze discourse surrounding Pāgat and the activities organized within the communities to educate about, and take action against the proposed firing range complex. Since the artifacts from We Are Guåhan are diverse and encompass a variety of problems, I consider these texts within the broader scope of the movement to oppose the buildup. Specifically, I chart the organization's history and how it fits into the puzzle of contemporary Chamoru activism on Guåhan. I look at the rhetorical devices used to mobilize support for its Pāgat campaign and subsequent lawsuit; and I analyze the strategies and tactics that dictate the form of opposition and actions taken from 2009-2012.

My final case study examines how resistance is crafted to U.S. militarization. To supplement textual and social movement analysis, I will examine how members of the Chamoru community situate, explain, and justify their involvement in opposing the military buildup on Guåhan. Though primarily conducted with Chamorus living on the island, these interviews also include several Guåhan residents who are not of Chamoru

27 Mindy Aguon, "Lawsuit Filed Over Pagat-as-firing Ranges," *KUAM News*, November 18, 2010. <http://www.kuam.com/Global/story.asp?S=13522721>.

28 Clint Ridgell, "Video: Trust Attorneys Now Expect Hawaii Judge to Throw Out Navy's Motion to Dismiss Pagat Lawsuit," *Pacific News Center*. November 18, 2011. http://ns1.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=18777:plaintiffs-proclaim-victory-in-pagat-lawsuit&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156

descent. I examine transcripts of interviews taken from local inhabitants in Guåhan during the summer of 2011 and 2012. Analysis of the transcripts considers the rhetorical modalities of activism and resistance among indigenous peoples who have a unique culture of oral traditions and little written in the native Chamoru tongue. It also examines the issues of national belonging, American identity, and recognition within these discourses. The project hypothesizes that resistance takes place through social movement efforts centered on the topics of ancestral land, language and cultural revitalization, and self-determination for Chamorus. These moments occur primarily through actions that both depend upon and reinforce communicative channels directed against the U.S. nation-state and beyond. This examination informs broader efforts at independence and decolonization, and contributes to an understanding of the rhetorical tactics and strategies of counterpublics to engage in struggles over freedom from colonial rule.

In the sections that follow, I review the literature on imperialism, militarization, colonialism, indigenous social movements, the rhetoric of social movements, and nationalism. These areas in the literature enable me to define key concepts and further situate the convergent injustices surrounding this project. In addressing the literature, I also support the need for a rhetorical analysis of contemporary indigenous social movements in the Pacific with a specific focus on the movement in Guåhan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Imperialism

In order to conduct a rhetorical analysis of contemporary organizing and resistance efforts of movement organizations such as We Are Guåhan, the case must be situated within the historical context of imperialism and the U.S. Imperialism is about extending control or sovereignty through economic or political means, by one nation or

society over another.²⁹ This process is one of domination and is often conveyed in terms of control and conquest over space. It is about political and territorial claims to power beyond the boundaries of an imperial nation, and it entails territorial expansion.³⁰ Territorial control is expressed through authority, both symbolic and material, often involving the use of military power.³¹ Historically, the belief of an inherent moral and material superiority over an “inferior” indigenous society has provided the impetus for colonial praxis and justified oppression.³² Rhetoric offers a way of understanding how imperialism functions symbolically as a mechanism of control, colonization, and oppression. By attending to persuasive discourses, rhetoric also provides a means of analyzing the contemporary manifestations of U.S. imperialism that affect attitudes and actions around the world.

American Imperialism

Understanding the historical baggage of imperial claims to power and territorial expansion through military control, it should come as no surprise that the U.S. does not consider itself to be an imperial nation. In fact, the U.S. is often assumed to be inherently anti-imperialist.³³ In spite of its history of conquest of the North American continent, “its conversion of native groups into ‘dependent sovereigns,’ its acquisition of colonies and

29 George H. Nadel and Perry Curtis, *Imperialism and Colonialism* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 1.

30 Raymond Aron, *Imperialism and Colonialism*, vol. 17, Montague Burton Lecture on International Relations, (Leeds: University of Leeds Press, 1959): 3.

31 Elleke Boehmer, *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 2.

32 Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *Anti-Indianism in Modern America: A Voice from Tatekeya's Earth* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001), 6; Nadel and Curtis, *Imperialism and Colonialism*, 1; Tony Smith, *Pattern of Imperialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 6. Imperialism is entangled with colonialism and they are often considered to be twin concepts since both equally denote domination of one nation by another.

33 Amy E. Kaplan, “Left Alone with America,” in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, eds. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 12. United States’ culture is frequently seen as a unique case when compared to Nazi or Soviet imperialism such that the global power of the U.S. is constructed as essentially non-imperial.

other island possessions in the Spanish-American and later wars” the U.S. nation-state typically refuses to consider its exercise of power as that of an empire.³⁴ The denial of American imperialism demonstrates the importance of rhetorical analysis to grapple with dominant discourse that disregards the role of imperialism both historically and contemporarily. Rhetoric can address the problem of American denial of its own imperialism; rhetoric can also contribute to the critical work that scholars in other disciplines have accomplished against American imperialism.

The view that America is inherently anti-imperialist has been challenged by scholarly inquiry on cultural perspectives and the role of culture in imperial politics.³⁵ Recognizing the nexus of imperialism, U.S. empire, and nation, Amy Kaplan’s analysis of the nature of American imperial culture bears repeating:

to understand the multiple ways in which empire becomes a way of life means to focus on those areas of culture traditionally ignored as long as imperialism was treated as a matter of foreign diplomacy conducted by diplomatic elites or as a matter of economic necessity driven by market forces. Not only about foreign diplomacy or international relations, imperialism is also about consolidating domestic cultures and negotiating intranational relations. To foreground cultures is not only to understand how they abet the subjugation of others or foster their resistance but also to ask how international relations reciprocally shape a dominant imperial culture at home, and how imperial relations are enacted and contested within the nation.³⁶

Thus, empire is a constitutive measure of U.S. culture; this perspective highlights that nationalism, imperialism, and colonialism must be understood as interconnected phases

34 Nancy F. Cott, “Afterword,” in *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History*, ed. Ann Laura Stoler (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 469. As Cott explains, since the 1960s some scholars have taken the critical approach of applying empire terminology to U.S. history; but these works tend to depart from the conventional approaches that dominate scholarly inquiries.

35 As Amy Kaplan has argued, focusing primarily on the economic sources of imperial expansion has a tendency to disregard the role of culture in imperial policies (“Left Alone,” 13).

36 Kaplan, “Left Alone,” 14.

in an encompassing system.³⁷ Following Kaplan's work, this dissertation project further addresses the need for rhetorical inquiries of U.S. imperialism and colonialism by attending to the particular case of Guåhan, one of America's oldest colonies. Given that much of the literature on imperialism does not address the complexity of the relationship between the U.S. and its territories, my project addresses the certain aspect of imperial and colonial relations that all too often get overlooked due to broader considerations of nation-states. This focus is also crucial to the social movement in Guåhan, where the far reaching effects of imperialism play a strong role in the everyday lived experiences of those on the island, even as this phenomena remains on the periphery of academic scholarship and mainstream media coverage.³⁸ One member of the movement explains this insidious silence about imperialism on Guåhan:

U.S. imperialism has such a heavy hand in the way things get decided here, the way things happen here for the rest of the public to see. But so many things happen behind the scenes that don't get acknowledged.³⁹

Through a rhetorical analysis that turns understandings of U.S. imperialism inward and attends to the discourses surrounding silence, this project moves toward a deeper understanding of the U.S.-Guåhan relationship. A rhetorical perspective facilitates

37 Donald E. Pease, "New Perspectives on U.S. Culture and Imperialism," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, eds. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 26. Global-localism discourse posits this interconnected perspective and should be combined with anti-imperialism since both offer modes of understanding U.S. imperialism. For a discussion of the neglect of American domestic imperialism within the overlapping framework of U.S. history, colonialism, and imperialism see: Cook-Lynn, *Anti-Indianism in Modern America*.

38 Attention is often only directed toward Guam during natural disasters, controversial remarks from elected officials, or investigations over political corruption on the island. Examples include: Representative Hank Johnson (D-GA) stating that Guam could "could tip over and capsize" during a House Armed Service Committee hearing in 2010; popular culture artifacts such as the skit "Getting to Know Guam" on the David Letterman Show in 2009; and the U.S. news media reporting on Guam corruption investigations in 2007 and 2005.

39 Interview 3, personal interview, Summer 2011. To protect the anonymity of interviewees, I randomly assigned each interviewee a number and use that numerical system when quoting from the transcripts and other communication with these individuals.

considerations for how the dynamics of silence relate to the question of power, and recognizes that silence is also a critical part of meaning-making that serves a strategic function within a given context.⁴⁰ Analyzing the rhetorical dimensions of U.S. imperialism is also necessary to understand and evaluate the persuasive uses of language that surround the complex case of Guåhan, which is afforded a foreign/domestic status and is maintained by U.S. military power.

Militarization

The U.S.-Guåhan relationship is characterized by the primacy of U.S. federalism and militarism and is framed in overtly militarist terms.⁴¹ Discussions of U.S. militarization often note the implications of American exceptionalism, power projection, and base politics.⁴² In the contemporary era, the U.S. demonstrates the supremacy of military power to maintain geopolitical control and world order.⁴³ As a result, this dissertation addresses the way in which militarization is justified and naturalized through discourse and its surrounding context. By focusing on a historical-contextual analysis of rhetoric, the relationships between militarization and resistance can be examined. Though the connections between militarization and social phenomena embrace a wide variety of dimensions, I attend to the most typical views and understandings of these phenomena that are expressed in the literature. There are a variety of interpretations and definitions offered for the incidents of militarization and militarism, but many consider them to be a strong characteristic of Western countries that is predominately institutionalized in the

40 See Brummett 1980; Burke 1936; Clair 1997; Cloud 1999; Jaworski 1997; Johannesen 1974; McKerrow 1989; Scott 1972; Wander 1983.

41 Camacho and Monnig, "Uncomfortable Fatigues," 150.

42 Catherine Lutz, *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 7-10.

43 Stanley Hoffmann, "Clash of Globalizations," *Foreign Affairs* 81(2002):107.

United States.⁴⁴ Militarism is considered to be a complex of relations among society, politics, and the military.⁴⁵ Militarization has been broadly defined in a multitude of different ways ranging from military pacts, trade, international legal justification for war, militaristic behavior in culture, economy, government, and society, and the domination of military elites.⁴⁶ Militarism often refers to military value and ideologies, while militarization “draws attention to the simultaneously material and discursive nature of military dominance.”⁴⁷ This understanding of terms highlights the importance of a rhetorical perspective when attending to the topic of U.S. militarization; because of its discursive nature militarization must be considered through the process of rhetorical criticism.

Militarization results in a society that is always oriented toward war, which “obfuscates any presumed distinction between being at war and not at war.”⁴⁸ This phenomenon is exacerbated by American exceptionalism that directly influences contemporary politics and uses militarization as a primary means of establishing the geopolitics of permanent war.⁴⁹ This blurred distinction between war and peace is also what the Pentagon often relies upon when characterizing the importance of Guāhan for security and peace around the world. The areas established for militarization projects are predominately in the Asia-Pacific region, which contributes to individuals from these

44 Anton Grizold, “Contemporary National Security in the Light of Militarization and Militarism,” *Croatian Political Science Review* 37 (2001), 130.

45 Madelaine Adelman, “The Military, Militarism, and the Militarization of Domestic Violence,” *Violence Against Women* 9 (2003): 1122. Also, see Uri Ben-Eliezer, *The Making of Israeli Militarism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 25. The term can refer to the expression of institutionalized military values (such as courage or self-sacrifice) or traits (such as discipline) that influence political decision-making or lead to the establishment of a military regime.

46 Francis Beer, *Militarization: Peace Against War* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1981), 12.

47 Catherine Lutz, “Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis,” *American Anthropologist* 104 (2002): 725.

48 Adelman, “The Military,” 1123.

49 Jan Nederveen Pieterse, *Globalization or Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 131-133.

areas being subjected to much higher rates of representation in the U.S. Armed Forces.⁵⁰ The discourse surrounding the U.S. military buildup situates Guåhan as a vital part of efforts to reposition and strengthen military forces in the Pacific in order to achieve the Obama administration's confrontational "pivot" to Asia that prepares for a catastrophic war against China.⁵¹

With the U.S. plans for Guåhan orienting toward war in the Asia-Pacific region, the justification for militarization on the island has become a more predominate part of the everyday discourse. Here, militarization is considered as *military buildup*, which is the structural form characterized by increases in military forces, arms imports and production, as well as the increase in military's political role and influence in state apparatuses.⁵² Focusing on military buildup is particularly salient since U.S. security policy in a post-9/11 world has directly contributed to the increase in military power and expenditures.⁵³ Militarization also tends to demonstrate a reciprocal relationship between military buildup and militarism.⁵⁴ Often understood as contemporary colonialism in a globalized world, militarization operates hegemonically and deploys rationalized violence. For the case of Guåhan, I use military buildup to refer to an increase in military expenditures and armed forces in the context of military base politics. There is a pressing

50 Camacho and Monnig, "Uncomfortable Fatigues," 147-149.

51 See also Peter Symonds, "US Think Tank Plans Military Build-up against China," August 13, 2012, <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2012/08/csis-a13.html>.

52 Andrew L. Ross, "Dimensions of Militarization in the Third World," *Armed Forces & Society* 14 (1987): 563-566. The two main forms of militarization are process and structural.

53 Stanley Hoffmann, "Clash of Globalizations," *Foreign Affairs* 81 (2002): 105-106. The threat of terrorism has also served as justification for expanding the degrees of American militarization in order to protect state security and society. See also: Matthew J. Morgan, *The American Military after 9/11: Society, State, and Empire* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 99-100.

54 Ross, "Dimensions," 564. Military buildup points to operational dimensions that can be classified in six categories: military expenditures, armed forces, arms imports, arms production, wars, and military regimes. Adopting an empirical stance, these six indicators were used to gauge the extent of militarization in the world. The categories are useful for empirical analysis and conceptualizing the dimensions of military buildup as a structural form of militarization. It is the structural form of militarization that the reciprocal relationship is observed.

need to analyze rhetorical aspects of Guåhan's military buildup, especially as militarization is increasing throughout the Pacific region and the world. To get at the rhetorical components of militarization, this project attends to the symbolic and material dimensions of the phenomenon.

Material & Symbolic Dimensions of Militarization

The structural form of militarization is manifested as military buildup, yet militarization also encompasses material and symbolic dimensions. As a material process, militarization produces “violence and violent forms via technological, electronic, or nuclear means.”⁵⁵ The material dimension often entails the physical acquisition of weapons, bases, troops, ports, land, etc. In contrast, the symbolic dimension of militarization tends to refer to the application of military principles and concepts to a process or social phenomena. Cynthia Enloe argues that whole cultures can be militarized, which can have the effect of garnering support for war waging on the basis of collective identity, security, and pride.⁵⁶ Enloe also suggests that scholars should consider the ways in which societies become militarized, arguing that it is a step-by-step process whereby a thing or individual “comes to be controlled by the military or comes to depend for its well-being on militaristic ideas. The more militarization transforms an individual or a society, the more that individual or society comes to imagine military needs and militaristic presumptions to be not only valuable but also normal.”⁵⁷ Echoing this sentiment, Catherine Lutz explains militarization is a *discursive* process that shifts the general values and beliefs of a society in order to “legitimate the use of force, the

55 Camacho and Monnig, “Uncomfortable Fatigues,” 153.

56 Cynthia Enloe, “Sneak Attack: The Militarization of U.S. Culture,” in *Reconstructing Gender: A Multicultural Anthology*, Eds. Estelle Disch (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2002), 525. Thus, the symbolic dimension of militarization encompasses non-physical aspects of the process.

57 Cynthia Enloe, *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 3.

organization of large armies and their leaders, and the higher taxes or tribute used to pay for them.”⁵⁸ The discursive process of militarization is formed by representation and exchange of ideas, images, and values.⁵⁹ Given the rhetorical framework for this dissertation, I focus predominately on the discursive features of U.S. militarization while recognizing the importance of the material conditions involved in the buildup. Narrowing in on the case of U.S. militarization enables a critical examination of its influence on issues such as culture and indigeneity.

Culture, Indigeneity, & Militarization

Militarization, with its long history as a tool of colonialism, plays a key role in streamlining the corporate economy and political power dimensions as a global system.⁶⁰ These forces of militarization continue to have profound implications for the surrounding cultures and peoples subjected to projections of U.S. military power. With militarization functioning as a mechanism of colonial control, it entangles minorities and colonized peoples. Specifically, indigenous peoples have an extensive history of service in the U.S. military.⁶¹ Indigenous men and women frequently serve in the U.S. armed forces in

58 Lutz, “Making War,” 723.

59 Some have argued that sectors of U.S. culture such as education, cars, and even domestic life have been militarized. Primary examples of symbolic militarization include Henry Giroux’s well-reasoned argument about higher education systems in the U.S. becoming increasingly militarized after September 11, 2001. See: Henry Giroux, “The Militarization of U.S. Higher Education After 9/11,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 25 (2008): 56-82.

60 Gwyn Kirk, “Environmental Effects of U.S. Military Security: Gendered Experiences from the Philippines, South Korea, and Japan,” in *Gender and Globalization in Asia and the Pacific: Method, Practice, Theory*. Eds. Kathy E. Ferguson and Monique Mironesco (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008), 296.

61 American Indians have served in a variety of roles since the Revolutionary War, this trend of service has continued with all the major U.S. military conflicts up through the twentieth century with thousands serving in World War I, the Korean War, Vietnam War, and numerous other conflicts. See: Alison R. Bernstein, *American Indians and World War II: Toward a New Era in Indian Affairs* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999); Robert Wooster, *The Military and United States Indian Policy, 1865-1903* (Omaha: University of Nebraska Press, 1995).

higher percentages than the overall U.S. population.⁶² This phenomenon of high enlistment rates among indigenous people is a trend that carries through for other minorities as well. The representation of racial groups is quite high, with minorities among the more proportionally represented groups in the military.⁶³ For example, in the U.S. Army the most overrepresented group is Native Hawai'ian/ Other Pacific Islanders who are overrepresented by 649 percent.⁶⁴

With these enlistment figures for minorities, indigenous peoples, and Pacific Islanders, it is not surprising that U.S. military recruitment throughout the region is extremely high and Chamorus are also among the largest group of enlistees per capita.⁶⁵ Military recruiters have often praised the Marianas Islands for the successful recruitment rates and the ease of enlisting members. As one military recruiter stated, "you can't beat recruiting here in the Marianas, in Micronesia...in the states, they are really hurting but over here, I can afford to go play golf every other day."⁶⁶ Guahan is considered among the top "producers" for the U.S. Army. As David B. Cohen, deputy assistant secretary of the Interior for Insular Affairs, once stated: "There is a very strong sense of patriotism throughout the U.S. territories."⁶⁷ The tradition of American military service in the Marianas dates back for generations. There is a persistent imperative for loyalty amongst Chamorus to serve in the U.S. armed forces. Given the history of the U.S. recapture of

62 Stephen W. Silliman, "The 'Old West' in the Middle East: U.S. Military Metaphors in Real and Imagined Indian Country," *American Anthropologist* 110 (2008): 243.

63 U.S. Department of Defense, "Population Representation in the Military Services: Fiscal Year 2010 Summary Report," 18-27. The U.S. armed forces has seen a boost in enlistment rates among Hispanics and blacks in 2010

64 Tim Kane, "Who Are the Recruits? The Demographic Characteristics of U.S. Military Enlistment, 2003-2005," *Center for Data Analysis Report # 06-09* (2006): 7. The statistics about Pacific Islander representation is taken from 2004 and 2005 data, indicating that they comprise a recruit-to-population ratio of 7.49%, or an overrepresentation of 649 percent.

65 Julian Aguon, *What We Bury at Night: Disposable Humanity* (Blue Ocean Press, 2008).

66 James Brooke, "On Farthest U.S. Shores, Iraq is a way to a dream," *The New York Times*, July 31, 2005, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/31/national/31recruit.html?_r=0.

67 Ibid.

Guåhan in World War II, the U.S. victory was a “‘glorious event’ whose price in lives lost had purchased freedom and later American claims of exclusive rights to the region.”⁶⁸ The fight for Guåhan was a bloody one in which many lives were lost in the U.S. struggle to liberate Chamorus from Japanese control. Many Chamorus viewed the return of the Americans as Messianic, which has influenced the culture of Chamorus need to reciprocate; Chamorus are caught in a continuous cycle of “paying back” the Americans and fulfilling an obligation of sacred duty to the U.S.⁶⁹ Additionally, the dominant narratives of World War II are wrapped up in ideas of “liberation” that influence the overarching idea that Chamorus are forever indebted to the U.S. for its actions to reclaim the island in 1944.⁷⁰ The discourses of loyalty and indebtedness to the U.S. for liberating Guåhan are a major focal point for the rhetorical analysis of this project. As I have noted above, imperialism also often involves military control, demonstrating that militarization plays a strong role in extending imperial and colonial ideology. This reflects the influence that ideology and rhetoric hold on one another, such that rhetoric in the service of a particular ideology is “a system of persuasion to be effective on the whole community” and operates as a means of social control.⁷¹ The intersection of ideology and rhetoric also has considerable implications for our understanding of colonialism in the twenty-first century, and on its influence upon contemporary resistance efforts waged against militarization and colonization.

68 Vicente M. Diaz, “Deliberating ‘Liberation Day’: Identity, History, Memory, and War in Guam,” In *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, eds. T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, Lisa Yoneyama (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001), 158.

69 Laura M. T. Souder, “Psyche Under Siege: Uncle Sam, Look What You’ve Done to Us” (presentation, Annual Conference of the Guam Association of Social Workers, Guam, March 30, 1989). See Also: Diaz “Deliberating ‘Liberation Day,’” 160-161.

70 Diaz, “Deliberating ‘Liberation Day,’” 161-162.

71 Michael Calvin McGee, “The ‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 6.

Colonialism

My discussion of colonialism applies to the U. S. context, which is a position that has been challenged by those who consider American culture to sharply contrast with the tenets of colonialism and imperialism. The U.S. is left out of studies of colonialism, however, the colonial connection is ever-present when it comes to Guåhan. Colonialism generally entails more formal methods of political control, and it has strong connections to empire building, which influences the geographical scope of the contemporary world.⁷² Colonialism refers to “the consolidation of imperial power, and is manifested in the settlement of territory, the exploitation or development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands.”⁷³ As Frantz Fanon has argued, colonialism is sustained by claims of preemptive and superior rights over indigenous people and lands having the totalizing effect of subjugation.⁷⁴ Colonization brutally disrupts the lives of indigenous peoples while elevating the colonizers to a privileged status; in doing so, it causes indigenous peoples to be disconnected from their lands, languages, histories, and modes of thinking and interacting in the world.⁷⁵ In the case of Guåhan, these disconnections and the profound impacts of colonialism on indigenous culture continue to manifest in the form of settler colonialism.

Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism is a specific colonial formation, set apart in the annals of Western colonial ventures. It is as much a phenomena of the past as it is of the present.

72 Andrew Herod, *Geographies of Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 116-129; Kaplan, “Left Alone, 17.

73 Boehmer, *Colonial and Postcolonial*, 2. See also: Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *New Indians, Old Wars* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 73; 209-210; David K. Fieldhouse, *Colonialism 1870-1945* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981). These authors argue that colonialism refers to the rule of a group of people by a foreign power and consists of keeping colonies (often abroad).

74 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1963).

75 James R. In, “Editor’s Commentary,” *Wicazo Sa Review* 19(2004): 5.

Thus, understanding settler colonialism entails recognition of the history of the nation-state's engagement in land dispossession and assimilation within a post-empire and post-imperial context.⁷⁶ Patrick Wolfe defines settler colonialism as a *structure* of permanent invasion that focuses on usurping land rights of indigenous peoples.⁷⁷ It has also been explained as "a social formation and political order in which settlers claim sovereignty over a territory and seek to eliminate indigenous peoples' rights from those territories."⁷⁸ In many settler societies, establishing power on a territory often requires the practical elimination of natives.

There is an underlying logic of elimination operating within settler-colonialism.⁷⁹ Settler societies engender a normative relationality between the designations 'Native' and 'settler,' which imbues histories of intermingling, interdependence, or the attempted erasure of indigeneity as a marker of national difference. In the case of indigenous people the increase in population meant obstructing settlers' access to land in the U.S., thus the restricting racial classification of Indians was a direct way of furthering the logic of

76 Because settler colonists go to new lands in order to appropriate and establish replicas of the societies they left behind, they come and go, leaving Indigenous peoples to endure extensive dispossession under the changing demographics. The tendency among settlers was ultimately "not to emigrate to assimilate into Indigenous societies, but rather emigrate to replace them." See: Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edmonds, *Making Settler Colonial Place: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 2.

77 Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassell, 1999).

78 Edward Cavanagh and Lorenzo Veracini, "Definition," *Settler Colonial Studies* (blog), 2010, <http://settlercolonialstudies.org/about-this-blog/>

79 Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (2006): 387-390. Wolfe explains: "Elimination refers to more than the summary liquidation of Indigenous people, though it includes that." There are both positive and negative dimensions to settler colonialism. In its positive aspect, "the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler-colonial society." The positive dimension entails the creation of a new colonial society that is erected on the expropriated land base. The negative dimension entails the calculated efforts to disintegrate native societies.

elimination.⁸⁰ However, the primary motive for elimination is fundamentally *access to territory*, not race; “territoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element.”⁸¹

The impact of settler colonialism is visible in the landscapes it produces. In this way, the land itself . narrates the stories of colonization. Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edmonds explain that in settler colonies of Aotearoa New Zealand, north America, Australia, Fiji, Hawai’i, and south Africa legitimate spaces for First Peoples receded both geographically and conceptually. This phenomenon occurred as

late nineteenth century extinction narratives colluded with stadial theories of human development to locate Indigenous peoples in other times, or out of time, in ways that legitimized and naturalized spatial displacements. In this context, Indigenous peoples came to be considered and treated as legally and socially anomalous in their own lands.⁸²

The connection to land and society demonstrates how the power relations of settler colonialism continue to manifest, such that Native people live in relation to all non-Natives “though they never lose inherent claims to sovereignty as Indigenous peoples.”⁸³ Furthermore, the distinction between ‘Native’ and ‘settler’ informs all power in settler societies and their relations with societies worldwide.”⁸⁴ Settler colonialism has also been theorized by tracing the intellectual histories and methods of Native peoples practicing decolonization, resistance, and survival.⁸⁵

80 Settler colonialism typically employs the organizing grammar of race; Indians have been racialized in such a manner that “non-Indian ancestry compromised their indigeneity, producing ‘half-breeds,’ a regime that persists in the form of blood quantum regulations.” See: Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism,” 388.

81 Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism,” 388.

82 Banivanua Mar and Edmonds, *Making Settler Colonial*, 3.

83 Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 1.

84 Ibid.

85 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (New York: Zed Books, 1999); Robert Warrior, *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

Ideology & Indigeneity

The role of ideology is strong and clear in perpetuating the system of colonialism. As Gayatri Spivak observes ideology uses “transcendent concepts like morality or culture to justify colonialism as a civilizing mission and to conceal colonialism’s economic imperative and its violent methods.”⁸⁶ This ideological phenomenon is typically manifested in the domination of external territories without the consent of the indigenous populations. As an external territory of the U.S., Guåhan continues to represent the ideology of settler colonialism through the logic of elimination of Chamorus who suffer from geographic dislocations and displacements from their lands. There is a long history of land control by the U.S. military, and these lands continue to be threatened with the proposed military buildup. The U.S. military buildup is often explained as an economic and securitizing imperative, while more indigenous lands are being considered for military projects and development on an island that has already lost close to 30% of its landmass to the U.S. as the colonial settler who now claims sovereignty over its territory.

This ideological phenomenon connects with the work of Edward Said who showed the categories that dominant groups use to define subordinate peoples, spaces, and places—enabling colonizers to identify areas for conquest and to articulate colonial discourse.⁸⁷ Said’s work has inspired studies of U.S. colonialism at the turn of the twentieth century, which have deepened our understanding of American occupation guided by racialized knowledge and of the cultural constructions of colonial subjects.⁸⁸ Colonialism intersects with the indigenous Chamoru identity on a deeply-rooted level; as

86 Stephen Morton, *Gayatri Spivak: Ethics, Subalternity, and the Critique of Postcolonial Reason* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), 20. Also: Raymond Betts defines colonialism as a set of “attitudes justifying ideologies (racism, cultural superiority, or ‘White man’s burden’) that sustain colonial domination.” (*Decolonization*, 114).

87 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

88 Lanny Thompson, “Representation and Rule in the Imperial Archipelago,” *American Studies Asia* 1(2002): 3-39.

one member of the movement discusses, colonization damages understanding of self and of Chamoru indigenous identity:

I feel like what needs to get explained is this – how colonization gets kind of – the claws – how deep the claws of colonialism can get, to the point where people disown their own identity.... we do see the complexities of – and how deep colonialism has gotten into our own psyche. So you have legislators who are sympathetic to the movement. They realize what's at stake. They don't want to disown who they are. They don't want to disown themselves. We do have local leaders who have made – who are, I guess, not awake yet. They're still sleeping in their identity and their culture, that – and our local governor has decided to dismiss a whole people, the Chamorro people by using the term "Guamanian."... But that's the twisted thing that colonialism and imperialism does to the psyche of the indigenous.⁸⁹

This sentiment from the movement reflects the rhetorical power of control and colonization that is ever-present under U.S. colonial rule in Guåhan. A rhetorical perspective can contribute to further understandings of the structural dimension of settler colonialism and its logic of elimination. In particular, this project is concerned with the discursive dimensions of U.S. militarization as an imposition of force upon indigenous peoples globally.

For Amy Kaplan, the absence of the U.S. in the study of culture and imperialism within postcolonial scholarship “curiously reproduces American exceptionalism from without.”⁹⁰ This phenomenon obligates scholars “to study and critique the meanings of America in their multiple dimensions, to understand the enormous power wielded in its name, its ideological and affective force as well as its sources for resistance to empire.”⁹¹ Building from this call, this dissertation also utilizes rhetorical analysis to help understand how nationalism and American identity operate in social movements Guåhan.

⁸⁹ Interview 3, personal interview, Summer 2011.

⁹⁰ Amy Kaplan, “Left Alone,” 17.

⁹¹ Ibid.

Rhetoric of Social Movements

The Chamoru indigenous struggle is both a historical national liberation movement as well as a decolonization movement.⁹² Michael P. Perez explains that Chamoru movements parallel sovereignty struggles throughout Native America and Latin America and are informative to the sovereignty struggles in other U.S. territories, as well as in Hawai'i.⁹³ This dissertation attends to the overarching rhetoric of social movements in order to better understand the nature of colonization, identity, and resistance. Bowers, Ochs, and Jensen explain that when advocates for significant social change are faced with strong opposition from the establishment, the social movement groups must make choices about how to achieve their goals. This involves the development of strategies (general choices) as well as tactics (more specific choices guided by the general choices).⁹⁴ Strategies and tactics both "dictate the particular form any rhetorical discourse, action, or event takes."⁹⁵ Following this line of inquiry, this project examines the strategies and tactics deployed by the social movement in Guåhan.

Identity Formation

In social movements, the strategy of solidification is used to unite followers and can weave commonalities through diverse politics, demands, and identities within a movement. Solidification includes the rhetorical processes that the agitating group utilizes to reinforce the cohesiveness of the membership and to establish common identity.⁹⁶ Identity processes and collective identity are key components of social

92 This movement shares a number of parallels and similarities to the Hawaiian indigenous struggle. See: J. Kehaulani Kauanui "Off-island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 21 (1998): 681-693.

93 Michael P. Perez, "Contested Sites," 109.

94 John W. Bowers, Donovan J. Ochs, and Richard J. Jensen, *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control* (Long Grove: Waveland Press, 1993), 19.

95 Ibid.

96 Bowers, Ochs, and Jensen, *The Rhetoric*, 24. The authors explain that the types of individuals who are willing to join dissent movements are often difficult to control and that the movement leader face the task

movement dynamics.⁹⁷ Identity movements employ expressive strategies in order to transform dominant cultural patterns or to gain recognition for novel social identities.⁹⁸ Factors for mobilization tend to focus on symbolic and cultural themes that are connected with identity; they tend to be associated with “a set of values, symbols, beliefs and meanings that relate to belonging to a differentiated group.”⁹⁹ New Social Movements (NSMs) are thought to arise “in defense of identity,” such that individuals are collectively staking a claim to the right to realize their own identity and as a result these movements pose cultural challenges.¹⁰⁰ In many contemporary cases, new movements respond to marginalization with grassroots organization and development of a “new repertoire of actions that broke with old forms of political activity and began to tie individual members together in a strongly forged group identity.”¹⁰¹ These movements form situationally specific identities affirmed through framing processes and engagement in collective action.

The framing process is one of the rhetorical technique that facilitate identity-formation in movements. Hunt, Benford, and Snow explain how identity constructions

of maintaining energy and motivation among members to work in unison; during the Gas War, which saw an unprecedented amount of solidarity despite formal leadership, the strategy of solidification did not experience membership control issues.

97 See James M. Jasper, *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); David A. Snow, and PE Oliver, “Social Movements and Collective Behavior: Social Psychological Dimensions and Considerations,” *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, 571-599. eds. KS Cook, GA Fine, JS House (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995).

98 Jean Cohen, “Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements,” *Social Research* 52 (1985): 663-716.

99 Hank Johnston, Enrique Laraña, and Joseph R. Gusfield, “Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements,” In *New Social Movements From Ideology to Identity*, 3-35 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 7

100Alberto Melucci, “The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach,” *Social Science Information* 19 (1980): 218; Jürgen Habermas, “New Social Movements,” *Telos* 49 (1981): 36-37.

101 Harry E. Vanden, “Social Movements, Hegemony, and New Forms of Resistance,” *Latin American Perspectives* 34 (2007): 27.

are inherent in all social movement framing activities.¹⁰² Movement actors are actively engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning, and are deeply rooted in the politics of signification;¹⁰³ known as “framing,” this work of meaning and signification is an active process that “implies agency and contention at the level of reality construction.”¹⁰⁴ Framing works to “assert something about a group’s consciousness, or they make claims about aspects of a group’s character.”¹⁰⁵ It involves the “rhetorical strategies to affect the alignment of collective and personal identities;” thus, frames guide collective action through cognitive structures.¹⁰⁶ Enhancing a range of identities is a substantial component of social movements that occurs through joint action and interpretative work.¹⁰⁷

In addition to the framing process, identities are also formed through collective action. Jeffrey Rubin explains “collective action is simultaneously one of constructing and reconstructing unstable meanings within social movements.”¹⁰⁸ Movement antagonists are likely to be seen in terms of a common collective identity; such identities are dynamic forces, shaped and negotiated by movement members.¹⁰⁹ This means that

102 Scott A. Hunt, Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow, “Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities,” In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, eds. Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield (Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 1994), 185.

103 See: Robert D. Benford and David A. Snow, “Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization,” *International Social Movement Research 1*(1988): 197-217; Stuart Hall, “Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates,” *Critical Studies In Mass Communication 2* (1984), 91-114.

104 Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow, “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment” *Annual Review of Sociology 26* (2000):614.

105 Hunt et al., “Identity Fields,” 192.

106 Hunt et al., “Identity Fields,” 191.

107 Snow and McAdam, “Identity Work,” 46.

108 Jeffrey Rubin, “Ambiguity and Contradiction in a Radical Popular Movement,” in *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*, ed. Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998), 143.

109 Hunt et al., “Identity Fields,” 187. See also: Jo Reger, Daniel J. Myers, and Rachel L. Einwohner “Introduction: Identity Work, Sameness and Difference in Social Movements,” *Identity Work in Social*

leaders and movement participants are often faced with ambiguity in terms of mobilization and political confrontation. Through collective action, participants construct a shared sense of identity by drawing on both sameness and difference. Reger, Myers, and Einwohner explain that sameness and difference in activist identity work in movements is reflected in very complex ways—where movement identities are oppositional yet the line between “us” and “them” may not be as clearly demarcated as previous scholarship suggests. They suggest that activists’ work addresses both sameness and difference simultaneously, rather than considering them as distinct options that activists select from in constructing collective identity. This argument positions an intersectional approach to understanding multiple identities in activist work.¹¹⁰ As Bernstein explains, activists must make strategic decisions about whether to “suppress” or “celebrate” those differences from the majority.¹¹¹

Solidification tactics often include slogans, consciousness-raising groups, and expressive and esoteric symbols; these represent powerful and interesting artifacts that establish common identity within the movement.¹¹² As Robert E. Denton, Jr. explains, slogans “fulfill specific functions that aim at specific audiences” and the use of these slogans can “have a great impact upon the success of a movement in terms of expressing ideology as well as membership affiliation.”¹¹³

Movement, 1-20. Eds. Jo Reger, Daniel J. Myers, and Rachel L. Einwohner (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 4.

110 Jill M. Bystydzienski and Steven P. Schacht, *Forging Radical Alliances Across Difference: Coalition Politics for the New Millenium* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001).

111 Mary Bernstein, “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Gay and Lesbian Movement,” *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (1997): 532. Movement members emphasize their similarities with one another as well as their shared differences from those they oppose.

112 Bowers, Ochs, and Jensen, *The Rhetoric*, 24; Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 5.

113 Ibid.

Guåhan & Social Movements

As a result of its long colonial history, the Pacific is an important site rhetorical inquiry and analysis. It is a region that demonstrates complex interactions between indigenous populations and the political, economic, and social impositions of nation-states. The forces of colonization transformed Pacific societies into uniform centers of political and economic control; laying the foundation for the forces of militarization to follow.¹¹⁴ While scholarly literature representing a variety of fields has investigated globalization, colonization, and the Pacific, rhetorical study has yet to focus directly on their intersection in the Pacific territorial experience. What is even more profoundly missing from the existing literature is an analysis of Chamoru organizing and the various movement activities that have taken place since the turn of the twenty-first century. This work is especially relevant given the increase in U.S. military policymaking in the Asia-Pacific region. Thus, this dissertation focuses on indigenous responses to militarization and colonization in the Pacific by assessing the relationship between self-determination and decolonization movements and the consequences of militarization. My intervention into the existing literature addresses the need for study from the viewpoint and position of Guåhan; it places this location and the particular case of the Chamoru social movements at the center and then extends the scope to other areas of the Pacific where direct parallels or comparisons can be drawn.

Chamorus began demanding an end to military rule and recognition of civil rights as early as 1901, and during the first half of the century, indigenous leaders petitioned to receive political recognition.¹¹⁵ Before World War II, these Chamoru petitions fell upon

114 Jocelyn Linnekin, and Lin Poyer, "Introduction," in *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*, eds. Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990), 6. Colonial control led to the "intensified interaction between island peoples, and perhaps most significantly, created market centers, classic arenas for the negotiation of social boundaries."

115 Camacho and Monnig, "Uncomfortable Fatigues," 150.

deaf ears and it was not until the passage of the Organic Act in 1950 that Chamorus were granted a limited form of U.S. citizenship and civilian rule.¹¹⁶ From then through the 1990s, tensions soared as the movements remained divided over whether to sever ties from the U.S. or to maintain a closer relationship.¹¹⁷ The origins and transformations of a U.S. national identity for Chamorus have always been troubled. To this day, there is a diverse array of opinions and competing political interests operating within the Chamoru population. In spite of these differences, the contemporary movement has positioned itself in opposition to U.S. military buildup activity that has quickly become a trend since September 11, 2001.

Exploring the rhetorical and discursive practices of contemporary resistance provides a unique point of departure from the literature surrounding peacemaking and protest in the Pacific. To further understand the case of Guåhan as the intersecting site for these complex concerns, it is essential to first consider the formation and activities of indigenous social movements in the Pacific.

Indigenous Social Movements

Within the United States and Canada the term “indigenous peoples” is a relatively new designation that indicates an identity connected with an emerging global movement.¹¹⁸ The activities of the indigenous social movement developed out of survival strategies and cultural systems that have sustained values, beliefs, and communities for centuries. Adopting strategies of political organizing and resistance is an imperative

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Camacho and Monnig 2010, 151.

¹¹⁸ Ronald Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 4-5; 9-16; James Clifford, “Varieties of Indigenous Experience: Diasporas, Homelands, Sovereignities,” in *Indigenous Experience Today*, Eds. Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Storn (Oxford: Berg, 2007), 198. Indigenous people are “defined by long attachment to a locale and by histories of occupation, expropriation, and marginalization.”

action for populations marginalized by colonial strategies of displacement and ‘improvement’ in the use of their territories.¹¹⁹

For the marginalized indigenous Chamoru and broader population of Guåhan, the island’s territorial status continues U.S. colonial domination. As citizens, indigenous peoples are interpellated as equal, but because they are indigenous peoples their equality is negated.¹²⁰ This kind of contradictory interpellation confirms that indigenous peoples continue to be constructed in subordination by the logic of colonialism. As such, the Guåhan movement has built “solidarity with other indigenous peoples around the world and those struggling under the weight of American militarism or colonialism.”¹²¹

Although the movement has been explained in a variety of ways, its common thread is that it began at the periphery of dominant society before emerging onto the national and international arena.¹²² This international movement of indigenous peoples engages in patterns of political resistance that addresses grievances in international forums and high levels of international politics.¹²³

Pacific Indigenous Movements

Colonial structuring has resulted in economic, social, and health disadvantages, such that indigenous peoples of Oceania have redefined cultural identities in the interest of political efficacy.¹²⁴ Indigenous social movements in the Pacific have been considered in the broader context of decolonization and sovereignty movements around the world.

119 Clifford, “Varieties of Indigenous,” 29-30.

120 Chantal Mouffe, “Hegemony and New Political Subjects: Toward a New Concept of Democracy,” Trans. Stanley Gray. In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds., Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 95.

121 Ibid.

122 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 108.

123 Niezen, *The Origins*, 15-16.

124 Alan Howard, “Cultural Paradigms, History, and the Search for Identity in Oceania.” In *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*, eds. Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990), 277.

For Pacific Islanders, the struggles for sovereignty and decolonization are central fights for resistance activities.¹²⁵ Among indigenous groups, a current alternative choice to sovereignty is self-determination.¹²⁶ Indigenous peoples often focus their participation on self-determination movements because they represent control of land, resources, and livelihood. Thus, self-determination has also become a source of indigenous resistance against prevailing individual rights policies that are affirmed by states.¹²⁷ For the Pacific, indigenous self-determination is primarily understood in the context of international human rights.¹²⁸ However, the development of self-determination as a right couched in nationalist terms reveals the complexity of symbols and structures of nation-states.¹²⁹ The interface between contestatory indigenous movements and processes of democratization requires, other “conceptual resources” that enable the expression of oppositional cultural identities.¹³⁰ The public sphere is one such conceptual resource for understanding how oppositional groups critically engage the practice of democracy in the public sphere. Marcia Stephenson argues that the struggle to achieve autonomy and the importance of territorial demands, for territory and self-determination, can also distinguish an indigenous counterpublic sphere from other types of contestatory publics.¹³¹ Furthermore,

125 Vicente M. Diaz and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on Edge,” *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2001): 318.

126 Michael F. Brown, “Sovereignty’s Betrayals,” in *Indigenous Experience Today*, eds. Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Storn (Oxford: Berg, 2007), 185.

127 Niezen, *The Origins*, 146. For many states, indigenous peoples are problematic because of their outsider status in relation to protocols of cultural difference.

128 Makere Stewart-Harawira, *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization* (Karori: Huaia Publishers, 2005), 124-131; 189-196. Focusing on New Zealand as an area of indigenous resistance to globalization, the case of the Nisga’a and Ngai Tahu treaty settlements are examined in the context of identity construction and indigenous rights. See also: Vicki Grieves, “The ‘Battlefields’: Identity, Authenticity and Aboriginal Knowledges in Australia,” in *Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination Knowledge Indigeneity*, ed. Henry Minde (The Netherlands: Eburon Delft, 2008).

129 Ibid.

130 Nancy Fraser, *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the “Postsocialist” Condition*, (New York: Routledge, 1997), 70.

131 Marcia Stephenson, “Forging an Indigenous Counterpublic Sphere: The Taller de Historia Oral Andina in Bolivia,” *Latin American Research Review* 37 (2002): 101.

indigenous peoples' claims challenging political power and control over island autonomy have been met with opposition and resistance from their governing powers.¹³² This phenomenon contributes to the entanglement between indigenous self-determination movements in the Pacific and international law organizations such as the United Nations.¹³³

This is particularly true for the Chamoru movement, which has an extended history of presenting testimonies to the UN on the basis of the inherent right to self-determination. The movement in Guåhan “is composed of numerous organizations, some of which have been fighting for decades, such as *I Nasion Chamoru* or Organization of People for Indigenous Rights (OPI-R), and some created just recently, such as Famoksaian” and organizations such as We Are Guåhan and the Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice.¹³⁴ These organizations and others have focused on grassroots educational campaigns, protested at the government of Guåhan and the federal level, taken trips to testify at the United Nations.¹³⁵ The self-determination efforts and experiences of the Chamoru movement emerge from a precarious situation of being intertwined with and part of the national belonging of the U.S., while simultaneously being outside of political decision-making. As members of the movement stated about the push for self-determination:

132 Ulf Johansson Dahre, “After the Change: The Opposition Against Indigenous Movements in Hawai’I,” in *Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination Knowledge Indigeneity*, ed. Henry Minde (The Netherlands: Eburon Delft, 2008), 141-142; 146-147. This phenomenon demonstrates a clash between the indigenous movements that emphasize history and its influence on social relations and politics in contemporary society in the Pacific, and the position that the government should maintain strict neutrality and adhere to equal and universal standards of the human rights doctrine rather than afford special rights to indigenous peoples. The arguments assert that indigenous claims are unlawful cultural relativism when the government emphasizes rights based on ethnicity and histories of minority groups.

133 Niezen, *The Origins*, 188.

134 Bevacqua, “The Exceptional,” 35.

135 Ibid.

[Y]ou can't defer the issue forever because you are afraid you won't get the outcome that you want and that's what a lot of activists experience because it is such an uphill battle in most colonies; in most colonial situations the colonizer did not give citizenship to the people in the colonies. And so and then...Guam gets a lot of money from the federal government, a lot of people from Guam join the military, there are all these connections and it creates this incredible intimacy so the fear of breaking away from the United States is something most people don't want and...that's why a self-determination plebiscite is always going to reflect that intimacy that national emotional connection that people feel to the United States.¹³⁶

We're not part of the American polity in opinion and that's what self-determination is all about – choosing whether or not you want to be part of that polity because we still have the choice. We can be altogether or not part of that.¹³⁷

These examples indicate the complexity of self-determination movements in the context of the dominant symbols and structures of the U.S. and of “Americanness.” Members of the movement must attend to the symbolic and structural pieces, and to the material conditions that influence their efforts toward self-determination. Thus, understanding the rhetoric of social movements and Chamoru struggles informs broader inquiries into resistance and indigenous movements globally.

Identity-Based Resistance

Identity-based resistance is comprised of groups who are pushed to the margins of society in terms of political, cultural, or social aspects; these groups utilize identity as a means of resisting assimilation to the system of subordination.¹³⁸ These communities are comprised by peoples “with divergent histories and social locations, woven together by the political threads of opposition to forms of domination that are not only pervasive but

136 Interview 12, Personal Interview, Summer 2011.

137 Interview 8, Personal Interview, Summer 2011.

138 Manuel Castells, “Globalisation and Identity,” *Transfer: Journal of Contemporary Culture* 1 (2007): 63.

also systemic.”¹³⁹ Identity-based movements have often emerged when globalization and militarization pushes groups to the fringes. Because they are minorities and are either denied political rights or cannot resist as citizens, a number of social groups use the path of identity-based resistance.¹⁴⁰

This form of resistance offers a response to the growing gap between the state and its representatives. The process of achieving state control is extremely complicated and is often riddled with conflict. Antonio Gramsci argues that diverse classes or groups can unite under particular historical circumstances, and can form a collective will that may allow them to enforce their interests to gain control of the state.¹⁴¹ Additionally, Thomas Eriksen explains that identity-based movements have a number of common themes. These themes range from a sense of competition over scarce resources, conflict triggered by the exposure of inequality created by globalization, similarity among ethnic or indigenous groups of people to utilization of myths, cultural and political symbols and rhetoric to evoke personal experiences and group history, or collective identity established against a demonized Other.¹⁴² Rhetoric offers a way of understanding these common themes, especially the similarities among indigenous people, collective identity, and the use of cultural, and political symbols to mobilize identities as a means of resistance.

139 Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "Introduction: Cartographies of Struggle," in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 4.

140 Castells, "Globalisation," 63-64.

141 Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. 1929-1935. 2nd ed. Trans. Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1999), 228-229.

142 Thomas Hylland Eriksen, "Globalization and the Politics of Identity," *UN Chronicle*, Autumn 1999, accessed April 30, 2011, <http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/UNChron.html>.

Indigenous Identity & Rhetoric

Resistance against militarization has often centered on the issue of identity and has involved indigenous peoples from around the world. However, the research into the emergence of indigenous identities and their relationship to processes of militarization is overwhelmingly legal or historical.¹⁴³ Therefore, this project provides rhetorical research that recognizes how communication and discourse function as an undercurrent uniting individuals with a common experience of oppression. Thus, it is necessary to bring a rhetorical perspective to considerations of identity-based resistance, especially given the legacy of U.S. colonialism and militarization, and the significant impact these ongoing processes have on the inherent collective rights of indigenous peoples.¹⁴⁴

Stuart Hall's theory of articulation provides "a way of understanding how ideological elements come, under certain conditions, to cohere together within a discourse, and a way of asking how they do or do not become articulated, at specific conjectures, to certain political subjects."¹⁴⁵ The theory of articulation illustrates the importance of rhetoric in relation to social movement mobilization, reflecting the possibility of converging interests through a common discourse. William Roseberry proposes that the Gramscian concept of hegemony should be considered as a means of understanding struggle, and he argues that hegemony constructs a framework for experiencing, discussing, and acting upon social orders of domination. This common framework entails a discursive portion, that provides a language for talking about social relationships and establishes fundamental terms that act as nodal points around which

143 Anaya 1996, Barsh 1983, Hanson 2004, Morris 1992, Muehlebach 2001, Smith and Ward 2000. Also, for a detailed review of these works see Strong 2005.

144 Makere Stewart-Harawira, *The New Imperial*.

145 Stuart Hall, "On Postmodernism and Articulation: An Interview with Stuart Hall," ed. Lawrence Grossberg in *Stuart Hall, Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, eds. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen (London: Routledge, 1996), 141-142.

struggle and contestation can emerge. Thus, the language of contention is uniquely fostered within identity-based social movements that offer a critical arena for understanding the practical manifestations of the complex entanglement of cultural and political entanglements.¹⁴⁶ Although studies of resistance have been criticized for being overwhelmingly concentrating on explanations of resistance rather than examining power and the implications associated with located forms of resistance,¹⁴⁷ my theoretical formulation addresses this concern by accounting for power dimensions that are intertwined with Chamoru cultural and political forms of resistance. Since the emergence of an overt visible Chamoru resistance is a relatively new development on the island, applying this framework of resistance to contemporary Guåhan reveals the opportunities of numerous strategies of resistance.¹⁴⁸

Laclau and Mouffe also note the existence of agentive possibilities and the materialization of resistance; they argue that scholars must “identify the discursive conditions for the emergence of a collective action, directed toward struggling against inequalities and challenging relations of subordination.”¹⁴⁹ By analyzing the rhetoric of the contemporary Chamoru movement, this dissertation addresses Laclau and Mouffe’s call and examines the conditions in which collective actions of resistance have emerged. Identifying these rhetorical unities is a key factor in understanding how Chamoru identity

146 Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998), 5. Lila Abu-Lughod, “The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power Through Bedouin Women,” *American Ethnologist* 17 (1990): 41-45.

147 Lila Abu-Lughod, “The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power Through Bedouin Women,” *American Ethnologist* 17 (1990): 41-45.

148 James Perez Viernes, “Won’t You Please Come Back to Guam? Media Discourse, Military Building, and Chamorros in the Space Between,” *Center for Pacific Islander Studies Occasional Paper* 44 (2009): 105.

149 Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, 2nd ed. (Brooklyn: Verso, 2001), 153.

functions within the movement, and has acted as simultaneous forces of resistance and consolidation throughout the Pacific.

Loss of personal and cultural identity in social movements is of particular importance to Guåhan where movement members often face their own identity crisis in terms of their belonging and personal understanding. Division and complexity of the U.S.-Guåhan relationship has created an identity crisis among Chamorus that is understood in terms of how “American” one is.¹⁵⁰ Additionally, Chamorus have had intermittent success in their resistance movement efforts, in part due to the overarching narratives of “U.S. citizenship,” and the magnitude of U.S. military dominance on the island. The recognition of Chamorus as “Americans” that benefit from the “U.S. citizen” label also has an impact on the collective identity of the island. As a result, a number of the cultural values tend to go against the idea of resistance—even though the shared experience of colonization often influences movements to forge collective identities and fight injustice. As a member of the Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice explains,

...it's because we're such a colonized community and resistance is not, you know, in a cultural value in a cultural system where the value of respect is so important, it's managed. Activism is managed and woven into something... is being conceived and construed as disrespectful, which often times is probably our biggest challenge.¹⁵¹

Additionally, another local activist and organizer explains:

I used to fight all the time about identity, not ethnicity but nationality. I would say that I would always feel conflicted; I always said that I'm Chamorro first, before I'm an American.¹⁵²

150 Laura Marie Torres Souder-Jaffrey, *Daughters of the Island: Contemporary Chamorro Women Organizers on Guam* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1992), 2.

151 Interview 10, Personal Interview, Summer 2011.

152 Interview 26, personal interview, Summer 2011.

This reflection further illustrates the rhetorical dimensions of collective identity formation and identity-based resistance within the movement. The Chamoru experience reflects the promise of political and cultural contestation to reshape assaulted indigenous identities through a plurality of resistive acts.¹⁵³ For Guåhan, the productive possibilities of contestation and resistance must adopt a multifaceted approach to counter the converging forces of U.S. hegemony, colonialism, and militarization within a marginalized island space.¹⁵⁴ Multiple modalities of resistance grounded in the language of contention better equips the Chamoru indigenous movement for connecting the terrain of identity politics with organized acts of cultural resistance opposing U.S. militarization policies. Specifically, Chamoru resistance has taken a three-prong approach, encompassing issues of political reform, nationalism, and indigenous rights.¹⁵⁵ This varied trajectory of resistance offers unique opportunities for indigenous challenges to ideological systems of military domination, marginalization, and the particular experience of U.S. political oppression. Chamoru resistance understood within this discursive framework lays the groundwork for an analysis of the role of rhetoric within identity-based resistance and acts of political protest.

Thus, this dissertation addresses the various levels of the local and international activism that has emerged from Guåhan since the announcement of the military buildup. At the international level of the United Nations, activism highlights how self-determination efforts must challenge the hegemony of American influence and nationalism, and Guåhan's relationship to U.S. militarization. Rhetoric ties these issues

153 Michael P. Perez, "Chamorro Resistance and the Prospects for Sovereignty in Guam," In *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, ed. Joanne Barker (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 173.

154 Viernes 2007

155 Perez, "Chamorro Resistance," 175-179.

together, where discourse constructs and maintains the primacy of American colonial control and Chamorus must resort to efforts beyond the local level to challenge these elements of colonial control. Through domestic and international activism, the rhetoric of social movements is positioned to bring awareness of U.S. hegemonic policymaking in the Pacific and of the impact that militarization has upon the region. These efforts also assert the importance of critiquing U.S. nationalism, which both justifies and maintains the system of inclusive exclusion for Guåhan. The activism efforts at various levels also address the primacy of American colonial control.

Nationalism and the Rhetoric of National Belonging

What is unique to this project is the situation of all of these elements—colonialism, indigeneity, and social movements—converging into a rhetorical perspective. The rhetorical perspective that frames this project offers an approach for understanding the complexity of the case of Guåhan, where the intersecting subjects of colonization, identity, and resistance converge. Rhetoric provides a framework for these phenomena and the issue of nationalism. Studies have extended the discussion of present-day nationalism to consider cultural and political subjects as they relate to states and nations.¹⁵⁶ Among indigenous peoples the terms “nationalism” and “nation” are highly contested, leading to considerable disagreement about use of the terms.¹⁵⁷ However, few

156 John A. Hall, “Nationalisms: Classified and Explained,” *Daedalus* 122 (1993): 1. Among the questions raised are considerations over whether race and ethnicity must be given new salience in studies of the modern nation-state.

157 Among scholars writing about indigenous groups and state governments, the utility of these terms remains contested. Augie Fleras and Jean Elliott (1992, xi) support the use of the term and consider the potential political benefits of its use arguing “those struggling to have their sovereignty reinstated go beyond the vocabulary of race, class, or ethnicity to adopt the vocabulary of nationhood” and state that aboriginal groups have “moved beyond the narrow view of themselves as a minority” (see *The Nations Within: Aboriginal-State Relations in Canada, The United States, and New Zealand*). In contrast, Alcida Ramos (1998) cautions against the use of the term “nation” by stating it is a slippery concept when applied to the West that becomes opaque in the context of non-Western political units (see *Indigenism: Ethnic Politics in Brazil*).

communication scholars have addressed the rhetorical function of nationalism. Therefore, for this dissertation, the appeals to national identity and national belonging are considered as key components in the rhetorical framing of militarization and movements in Guáhan.

Homi K. Bhabha considers the historical and contemporary impact of nation-building and nationhood. Bhabha explains that the unraveling story of colonialism and its legacies must be negotiated with the traces of “the memories of displacement that make national cultures possible.”¹⁵⁸ This is a rhetorical phenomenon that warrants attention, as “the language of culture and community is poised on the fissures of the present becoming the rhetorical figures of a national past.”¹⁵⁹ As such, the past fuses with the present such that the consciousness of the people is built upon a repetition of the colonial legacy. Nationalism has been recognized as the means by which colonial conquest was brought to an end, with nationalist resistance playing a role in bringing about independence.¹⁶⁰

Nationalism is considered to be a rationalizing instrument, and a particular ideology offering a system for organizing societies after mass mobilizations emerge.¹⁶¹ This ideological perspective considers nationalism to be in competition or conflict with other movements.¹⁶² For some, nationalism rests on the prior notion of social

158 Homi K. Bhabha, “On the Irremovable Strangeness of Being Different,” In Four Views on Ethnicity Special Issue, *PMLA* 113 (1998): 36-37. See also, Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1993).

159 Homi K. Bhabha, “DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation,” in *Nation and Narration*, Ed. Homi K. Bhabha (New York: Routledge, 1990), 294.

160 John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Manchester University Press, 1995), 156-157. Breuilly clarifies that this resistance tends to be one of a variety of mechanisms employed to put pressure on imperial power.

161 Ernst B. Haas, “What is Nationalism and Why Should We Study It?” *International Organization* 40 (1986): 725. For discussions of nationalism as an ideology, see: Richard Handler, *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism in the Twentieth Century* (New York: New York University Press, 1979). Smith’s argument contrasts with Gellner’s approach to nationalism as industrial in character. See Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

162 Haas, “What is Nationalism,” 712. Haas explains nationalism to be in contrast with movements such as liberalism, socialism, etc.

mobilization, it is a belief held by a group of people, a “doctrine of social solidarity based on the characteristics and symbols of nationhood” that implies a situation where popular participation in politics prevails.¹⁶³ To this point, Benedict Anderson describes the nation as an “imagined political community” where citizens connect through a sense of horizontal comradeship as they participate in everyday practices. He argues that nationalism refers to a linguistic-based practice through which members of a mass population express their identity with other citizens and the nation.¹⁶⁴

Charles Tilly makes a case for abandoning traditional discussions of nationalism to focus instead on “an analysis of national self-determination as a justification for political action.”¹⁶⁵ The contemporary reality of indigenous politics of resistance is that these groups are pushing for self-determination and are often expressing this principle through equal status with nation-states as “peoples” or “nationhood.”¹⁶⁶ Another perspective considers nationalism to subsume ideologies by focusing on what a given “people” believes of itself in distinction to other units. Benedict Anderson supports this perspective, arguing that nationalism connotes a manufactured linguistic identity falling under the realm of imagining and creation.¹⁶⁷ This approach views nationalism as group identity, drawing connections between nationalism and revolution.

Through belief in political myths, groups of individuals often come to identify themselves as national citizens, creating a unity and collective identity around the nation.¹⁶⁸ Additionally, Maurice Charland illustrates the ways in which national subjects

¹⁶³ Ibid., 727.

¹⁶⁴ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1983), 110.

¹⁶⁵ Charles Tilly, “National Self-Determination as a Problem for All of Us,” *Daedalus* 122, no. 3 (1993): 29.

¹⁶⁶ Ronald Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 245.

¹⁶⁷ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 12.

¹⁶⁸ Michael Calvin McGee, “In Search of ‘The People’: A Rhetorical Alternative,” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 242-245.

enact national identity.¹⁶⁹ Charland argues that rhetorical scholars should understand how audiences come to experience themselves as belonging to a particular collective identity; ultimately, this will lead to a better understanding of why certain persuasive messages are more effective for certain audiences. Furthermore, Michael McGee argues that many rhetorical scholars who refer to “the people” as a collective often neglect the complex social and political context in which national citizens function as a rhetorical audience.¹⁷⁰ Thus, McGee argues that studies of identification through political myths can demonstrate the social function of rhetoric by revealing the ways people come to understand themselves and the world around them. Ernesto Laclau indicates that ‘the people’ should be understood as a relation between social agents that provides one way of constituting the unity of the group; this group unity is articulated through a plurality of demands that construct a broad social subjectivity.¹⁷¹

This “popular nationalism,” inspires sentiments of national belonging.¹⁷² Although views on the nation differ in many ways, there is widespread agreement about the persuasive power of the rhetorics of national belonging. As Circe Sturm argues in the context of the Cherokee Nation, Cherokee identity is “socially and politically constructed around hegemonic notions of blood, color, race, and culture that permeate discourses of social belonging in the United States.”¹⁷³ As a result of a “continuing dialectic between the national and the local, many Cherokees express contradictory consciousness, because

169 Maurice Charland. “Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Québécois,” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133.

170 McGee, “In search of ‘The People,’” 242.

171 Ernesto Laclau, *On Populist Reason* (London: Verso, 2007), 73-74.

172 Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 110. In contrast, “official nationalism” exists when the ruling class attempts to maintain loyalty and legitimacy from national citizens in national terms and is often characterized by conservative, reactionary policies that conceal political motivations behind a nation’s governing structures and institutions.

173 Circe Sturm, “Blood Politics, Racial Classification, and Cherokee National Identity: The Trials and Tribulations of the Cherokee Freedmen,” *American Indian Quarterly* 22 (1998): 231.

they resent discrimination on the basis of race and yet use racially hegemonic concepts to legitimize their social identities and police their political boundaries.”¹⁷⁴

The issue of national identity is a complex issue in Guåhan. From 1898 through the twentieth century, military, political, and economic considerations have converged to hold Guåhan in a state of political limbo that continues to present day. Thus, “Guam seems to be neither part nor whole” and it is from this ambiguous political status that the island is poised in a tenuous relationship with the U.S.¹⁷⁵ It is my hope that an exploration of Guåhan’s military buildup will illuminate the hegemonic struggle to maintain a common understanding of American national belonging. This contradiction is expressed rhetorically through a number of popular slogans and discourse about the island in relation to the U.S. It is marked discursively in terms of its relation to the U.S. nation-state that categorizes and classifies the island in a dependent and colonial relationship.

This dependent discourse is exemplified by the slogan, “Guam, Where America’s Days Begin.” This slogan is used to market the island and communicates to tourists and island residents alike that the island of Guåhan is characterize only in relation to the U.S. Additionally, the Pentagon defines Guåhan as a hub for its power projection, often using phrases such as: “The Tip of the Spear,” “Fortress Pacific,” and “America’s unsinkable aircraft carrier.”¹⁷⁶ These and other slogans such as “Guam: America in Asia,” “Guam: The Edge of America,” and “tyranny of distance” continue to reinforce the dependent connections of the territory to the U.S., the military importance of the island, and also the spatial dimensions of island as both at the edge of and periphery to the U.S. Additionally, the lyrics of a popular song that Chamorus sang in resistance to Japanese occupation during World War II state: “Oh Mr. Sam/ My Dear old Uncle Sam/Won’t you please

174 Ibid., 231.

175 Stade, *Pacific Passages*, 47.

176 Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam,” n.p.

come back to Guam!”¹⁷⁷ These lyrics were composed by Pedro Taitingfong Rosario (Tun Pete Siboyas) and continue to illustrate the complex and contradictory status of the island as simultaneously both/neither in relation to the U.S. One Chamoru activist explained the difficulty of the discourse of belonging by stating:

The U.S. Constitution doesn't even fully apply. It only applies to the extent that the U.S. Congress wants it to apply and only so-called fundamental rights apply in Guam but they've never adequately defined what those rights are...people are constantly like “oh, we're so Americanized” but we're not. We're still so disenfranchised.¹⁷⁸

This activist is voicing the problematic nature of the discourse of national belonging for the people of Guåhan. This problem is exacerbated for the indigenous persons who bear the burden of living on one of the longest-colonized places in the world; it is their experiences that are valuable to emerging social movements in combatting the historical trajectory of injustice that continues to manifest in the twenty-first century. It is from this precarious status that indigenous social movements have emerged to demonstrate opposition. Yet, articulating this opposition to the U.S. is rhetorically vexed by the simultaneous expressions of Guåhan as part of American national belonging.

The Chamoru Case

Today, the legacy of U.S. colonialism and empire-building relies upon the mechanism of establishing overseas military bases created with the apparent agreement of the officials acting in the area.¹⁷⁹ In the Asia-Pacific region it seems that “all of the Pentagon road maps lead to Guam” which is quickly becoming one of the major hubs for

177 Viernes, “Won't You Please,” 103.

178 Interview 8, Personal Interview, Summer 2011.

179 Cynthia Enloe, forward to *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*, ed. Catherine Lutz (New York: New York University Press, 2009), ix.

U.S. military activity in the world.¹⁸⁰ By increasing the forward-deployed forces on Guåhan, the U.S. military hopes to achieve the goals of increasing power projection, deterrence, counter-terrorism, and support for contingent countries in Asia (such as Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, and South Korea).¹⁸¹ Using the threats of terrorism and the potential for North Korean nuclear developments to reach Guåhan, the U.S. has justified its military intervention in the Pacific.¹⁸² By employing the rhetoric of the War on Terror to rationalize increased military protection, contemporary U.S. policy ignores the inhabitants of the island and functionally transforms the Chamoru people into a dispensable backdrop to the global War on Terror.¹⁸³

Specifically, the 2006 Roadmap agreement stands to push Chamorus further to the margins by inundating the island with thousands of military members and associated personnel. In the wake of this agreement, a project of this scope is particularly salient to contribute to an understanding of the rhetoric of militarization as an extension of colonialism in the Pacific and to inform broader inquiries of U.S. military policy toward its “unincorporated” territories.

My dissertation explores how Chamorus evince cultural resistance as a form of contestation against U.S. militarization. This project builds from the assumption that it is necessary to examine the communicative and rhetorical processes of contemporary resistance, and from the discursive tactics of self-determination movements that manifest in various ways among indigenous people in the Pacific. Additionally, the stunted

180 Joseph Gerson, “Empire and Resistance in an Increasingly Dangerous Era,” *ZNet*, December 1, 2004, <http://www.zcommunications.org/empire-and-resistance-in-an-increasingly-dangerous-era-by-joseph-gerson>.

181 Shirley A. Kan and Larry A. Niksch, “Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments,” *Congressional Research Service* 22570, January 19, 2010, <http://openrs.com/document/RS22570/>.

182 Greg Fry and Tarcisius Tara Kabutaulaka, *Intervention and State-building in the Pacific: The Legitimacy of ‘Cooperative Intervention’* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), 18.

183 Julian Aguon, *The Fire This Time: Essays Under U.S. Occupation* (Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2006), 8.

cultural and language revitalization process in Chamoru communities builds a strong case for communication research and collaboration on the topics of social movements and rhetorics of resistance. I argue that language is granted increasing importance as a form of symbolic power for Chamorus. I also consider that the Chamoru language and cultural revitalization is operating as a powerful means of political protest within Chamoru communities. I also argue that Chamoru language revitalization efforts are laying the foundation for resistance to all acts of U.S. colonial and military ideology.

As I mentioned earlier, the lack of attention within U.S. media and news coverage regarding the Chamoru social movement efforts and the opposition on the island to increasing military presence demands that a project of this scope be conducted. Furthermore, Chamoru struggles must be examined within the historical context of colonial and neocolonial projects, which have established a political economy of stratification. By building understanding of the political, social, and economic context of the movement, I hope that this project forges connections with other contemporary struggles and offer insight to studies of social movements. In particular, my efforts to construct an interdisciplinary approach in the rhetorical analysis of this movement offers a unique vantage point and contribute to an understanding of the complexity of social struggle in the context of military and colonial practices. The research questions I have proposed are significant in understanding the nature of resistance in Pacific Island communities as the 21st century unfolds.

CHAPTER PREVIEW

Six chapters comprise this project. This first chapter has historicized and theorized indigenous social movements and activism in contemporary Guåhan. It introduces the questions guiding the dissertation and establishes the rationale for the

particular importance of these questions for communication scholars. It also provides a literature review that includes research addressing indigeneity, social movements, and rhetoric. The review addresses shortcomings in the literature and explains the contribution of my work to the field of communication studies, which are bringing indigenous studies and specific focus on Pacific indigenous social movements into a rhetorical perspective that addresses U.S. colonization, militarization, and ideology.

In chapter 2, I address the necessity and value of studying indigenous social movements in the Pacific and elaborate my methodological and theoretical orientations for the project. I create and develop the both/neither concept in order to read and analyze the intersecting identity dilemmas operating within the movement. This chapter outlines an indigenous studies posture toward rhetoric and advances both/neither as a conceptual category for articulating the relationship between indigenous identity, colonization, and activism in Guåhan. I explain why the both/neither concept and decolonizing methodology are sound methods of inquiry and investigation in rhetorical studies.

Following the description of the both/neither concept and decolonizing methodology for rhetorical analysis, I turn to the three case studies of my selected texts described above. In each chapter I document how the movement enacts both/neither identities while I also interrogate the ways that militarization and colonization manifest in contemporary society. Each case study charts the hegemonic struggles of indigeneity, identity, and activism waged against the mark of colonial control and territorial status in Guåhan.

In chapter 3, I examine Chamoru both/neither identities at the international level. This chapter continues the analysis of both/neither identities, with a focus on how these identities are raised at the United Nations. In this chapter, I mobilize resources from United Nations testimonies from 2005-2012. Additionally, this chapter addresses my own

experience as a petitioner at the UN. When examining Chamoru testimonies, I consider the particular themes of citizenship, indigenous rights discourse, and the role of the United Nations in the movement.

In chapter 4, I use the method of both/neither identities to analyze the identities emerging from the Chamoru social movement at the “national” level. This chapter examines the particular efforts waged at the local/national level. I mobilize resources from the selected artifacts, namely *The Grey Papers* series produced by We Are Guåhan. When considering the movement group We Are Guåhan, I examine the complexity of activism in Guåhan and how it has to contend with American influence and overarching discourses of national belonging. I also examine ideological dimensions of U.S. military buildup and the rhetorical formation of a collective identity of activism from within Guåhan.

In my final case study chapter, I chart the resistance efforts of the social movement organization. I focus specifically on efforts waged to resist militarization in Guåhan. This chapter addresses We Are Guåhan’s repertoire of collective action from 2010-2012. It focuses on the efforts this group makes in opposing the Department of Defense’s proposal to build a firing range in the area known as Pãgat. This chapter discusses their rhetorical tactics, organizing, community efforts, and their representations of Pãgat and the sacredness of culture. This chapter argues that there is an indigenous community element to this activism, and it uses rhetorical efforts to position its demands at both the local and international level.

Finally, I conclude the project with a consideration of the United States’ legacies of colonialism within the broader context of militarization throughout the world. This chapter discusses the findings from previous chapters and provides explanation for the implications of these findings for indigenous social movements and communication

studies. I also address the implications for social movement organizing and resistance from indigenous populations in the Pacific. I argue that movement actors utilize a vexed rhetoric of both/neither identities to contend with power from U.S. colonization. My analysis reveals the complex and contradictory subject positions from which contemporary social movements challenge the common sense of U.S. national belonging in Guåhan. In the chapter that follows, I detail the both/neither concept and the method for the project. I use a decolonizing methodology to navigate through the waves of rhetorical and discursive facets of the movement.

Chapter 2: Decolonizing Methodology & the Construction of Both/Neither Identities

In order to explore answers to the research questions outlined in the previous chapter, and begin to understand the nature of rhetorical and discursive practices of activism and the contemporary indigenous social movement in Guåhan, I utilize an interdisciplinary methodology that combines rhetorical analysis with other approaches. This framework is necessary to ground the considerations about dominant assumptions on issues of resistance, American national identity, and militarization from the perspective of a colonized place such as Guåhan. In the preceding chapter, I detailed these intersecting and complex issues and explained the need for a rhetorical perspective to analyze these phenomena; I also highlighted the concept of both/neither as an analytical tool or concept for understanding the unique struggles operating in the territorial space of Guåhan. For this project, I use the concept of “both/neither” when analyzing the rhetoric of identity/Americanness and further, to develop this concept when considering the spectrum of resistance that encompasses decolonization to U.S. statehood or independence. I argue that individuals who are opposed to the U.S. military build-up utilize rhetorical strategies that are neither advocacy neither for full decolonization nor statehood, but draw from elements of both ends of this spectrum. My larger commitment is to adopt a decolonizing methodological approach combined with rhetorical analysis of selected artifacts. The focus on decolonizing methodology is what drives the work towards interpretations of the rhetorical evidence. Below I explain my methodology for the project and further describe the concept of both/neither and its relationship to rhetorical studies.

DECOLONIZING METHODOLOGY

Decolonization has referred to the withdrawal of colonial powers from direct constitutional and legal control over their territories; it is a concept bound up with strongly held beliefs about culture and nation, and is deeply rooted in imperial ideology. However, today colonial control and imperial rule no longer manifest in overt and hostile taking of land as was common in the era of European colonialism. Instead, colonialism operates in more covert ways, through the control of labor markets and neoliberal reforms and by exerting military and political pressures throughout the globe.

As Kevin Bruyneel explains, “The imposition of and resistance to colonial rule” define modern U.S.-indigenous relations.¹⁸⁴ Indeed, the other lesson of the history of U.S.-indigenous politics is that “indigenous postcolonial resistance is not going away, and it is important to take account of the strategies this resistance may use.”¹⁸⁵ Thus, the shifting terrain of colonization requires new ways to analyze colonial phenomena and resistance to it. Additionally, decolonization is strongly connected to the topic of social movements. Writing about the internalization of oppression in Africa, the existentialist Frantz Fanon argued that the success of decolonization lies in a “whole social structure changed from the bottom up,” a change that is “willed, called for, demanded” by the colonized; it is a historical process that can only be understood in the context of the “movements which give it historical form and content,” and never “takes place unnoticed, for it influences individuals and modifies them fundamentally.”¹⁸⁶ Fanon’s work demonstrates the importance of decolonization in both the process of social movements and to the colonized individuals who struggle collectively against oppression. Attending

184 Kevin Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 223.

185 Ibid., 223-224.

186 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Richard Philcox (New York: Grove Press, 2004), 35-36.

to the physical toll of colonization and the necessity of rhetorical work and consciousness is crucial for Fanon, especially because colonized people tend to internalize the identity of their oppressors and ultimately perform those identities. This linkage informs the decolonizing methodology I use for the project, which attends to the rhetorical manifestations of colonization and to the efforts that social movements exert to oppose the ongoing legacy of colonial control in the Pacific.

Decolonizing and indigenous methodology “has emerged as a research process with its own methodology and while it can draw from both interpretive and critical/emancipatory theories, it does not easily fit into a pre-existing Western category.”¹⁸⁷ This method shows how the decolonization process begins in the mind and branches outward, making decolonization the “intelligent, calculated, and active resistance to the forces of colonialism that perpetuate the subjugation and/or exploitation of our minds, bodies, and lands, and it is engaged for the ultimate purpose of overturning the colonial structure and realizing Indigenous liberation.”¹⁸⁸ Linda Tuhiwai Smith refers to a decolonizing methodology as one that centers indigenous concerns and then comes to know and understand theory and research from our own perspectives and purposes as indigenous peoples.¹⁸⁹ As Smith explains, the challenge is to place our own histories and at the center of our writing, to take up a position articulated by many writers within the category experiences of ‘indigenous’ and otherwise marginal communities.¹⁹⁰ As a

187 Margaret Kovach, “Emerging from the Margins: Indigenous Methodologies,” in *Research as Resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-Oppressive Approaches*, ed. Leslie Brown and Susan Strega (Toronto: Canadian Scholars’ Press, 2005) 29. See also: Battiste, M., Bell, L., and Findlay, L. M.

“Decolonizing Education in Canadian Universities: An Interdisciplinary, International, Indigenous Research Project.” *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26, no. 2 (2002): 82-95; Shawn Wilson, *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2008).

188 Waziyatawin Angela Wilson and Michael Yellow Bird eds., “Beginning Decolonization,” in *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook* (Santa Fe: School of American Research, 2005), 2.

189 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999), 39.

190 Ibid., 19.

method, decolonization first seeks to problematize Western ways of knowing that have continuously denied the validity of indigenous knowledge, language, and culture.¹⁹¹ The method encompasses indigenous ways of knowing and emphasizes a “researching back” where decolonization is the objective.¹⁹² Indigenous voices have been overwhelmingly silenced in the Western academy, so indigenous scholars in the social and other sciences struggle to write, theorize, and research as indigenous scholars.¹⁹³ The politics of academic writing provides an opportunity for individuals to write back against the colonialism and cultural imperialism found within and outside of universities.¹⁹⁴

I have already taken the first step of decolonizing methodology: to recognize my positionality and relationship to the project, and to consider the mutual benefit between the research and the indigenous community. My project is strengthened by the cooperation of Chamoru activists with extensive knowledge and experience with peace movements and combating social injustice in the Pacific. I also engage Pacific studies scholars who possess culturally grounded and situated knowledge of the area and difficulties affecting Guåhan. As Houston Wood argues, “it is especially important that the emerging cultural studies for Oceania prominently emphasize Pacific Islander ways of knowing. After centuries of colonialist-inspired neglect, indigenous researchers have begun documenting the complexity, subtlety, and validity of indigenous epistemologies.”¹⁹⁵

Rooted in subaltern epistemologies, Chamoru struggles against U.S. militarization and political status are informed by their particular indigenous social positions

191 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd ed. (London: Zed Books, 2012), 185.

192 Ibid., 7.

193 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999), 29.

194 Cherryl W. Smith, “Kimihiā Te Matauranga: Colonization and Iwi Development,” (master’s thesis, University of Auckland, 1994), 13.

195 Houston Wood, “Cultural Studies for Oceania,” *The Contemporary Pacific* 15 (2003): 341.

representing Other forms of knowledge.¹⁹⁶ Thus, subaltern sensibilities are a useful vantage point for engaging indigenous rhetoric that has emerged to establish unique political and cultural agency for change. Additionally, the concern in postcolonial theory for issues of national identity and the troubled implications of nationalism in a world of diasporic and marginalized communities resonates directly with the complex territorial status of Guåhan.¹⁹⁷ As a territorial space and a site dependent upon and structured within the framework of U.S. colonization and the nation-state, Guåhan offers a productive place from which to engage these theoretical intersections. I build from a collaborative framework of indigenous epistemologies in order to bring both the history and presence of Chamoru activism to the forefront, aligning the context of Guåhan's movement with other contemporary struggles.

Other steps in a decolonizing methodology include articulating critiques of previous research, especially conducted by outside researchers, and bringing to bear indigenous approaches that consider indigenous epistemology and culturally safe research practices. The decolonizing method demonstrates overlaps and intersections; it also reveals key insights about in-betweenness that the both/neither concept illuminates.

196 Gayati Chakravorty Spivak, *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayati Chakravorty Spivak* (New York : Routledge, 1996.), 290. Spivak has argued that another example of how the subaltern cannot speak is evidenced by the fact that Indian general historiography has rejected the work of *Subaltern Studies*, refusing to consider it to be appropriately historical. This illustrates that a certain epistemological dimension must be factored into considerations of 'the history' of particular social struggles (Spivak 1996, 290).

197 Keith L. Camacho, *Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory, and History in the Mariana Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011), 3. Camacho urges scholars to address Guam and the divided histories of this archipelago. His work aims to "explore the roots of these divisions as products of competing colonial histories, and to create, instead, inclusive venues for representing Chamorro cultural and political narratives of the past."

Ethnographic Approach

As a member of the Chamoru diaspora, I have a particular interest in understanding the complications and policies facing Guåhan and affecting the Mariana Islands region. When I heard of the military buildup I promptly sought information about the plans and Islanders' responses to it. I began searching for every piece of information I could get my hands on—reading local news coverage of the buildup and searching for resources on blogs and independent websites. My position as a member of the Chamoru diaspora directly informs and contributes to the methodology employed in this dissertation project. I am fortunate to have my family's support and aid in connecting my research. These family connections have also helped me build contacts with Chamorus on Guåhan; their efforts have made significant contributions to my summer research trips for this project. I acknowledge that my position as a member of the Chamoru community provides me with the privilege of gaining access and entrance into the local community and activist groups with whom I work and interview. My fieldwork and research trips have revealed that the movement phenomena must be engaged through interdisciplinary activist research rather than merely through distant observation. This also demonstrates the importance of incorporating an ethnographic approach into the dissertation's broader decolonizing methodology.

An ethnographic approach affords a number of advantages for my work. As Lanita Jacobs-Huey argues, "ethnographers' critical reflexivity regarding their subject positionings and 'voice' may constitute a counterhegemonic rhetorical strategy for negotiating multiple accountabilities."¹⁹⁸ As a scholar, I seek to engage in critical

198 Lanita Jacobs-Huey, "The Natives Are Gazing and Talking Back: Reviewing the Problematics of Positionality, Voice, and Accountability among "Native" Anthropologists," *American Anthropologist* 104 (2002): 791-792. Jacobs-Huey further argues that self-identification as an indigenous scholar is rarely "a means through which researchers 'play the native card' via a noncritical privileging of their 'insider' status.

reflexivity in writing, self-positioning and the employment of politically engaged orientations—this process and practice offers a way of redressing representations of indigenous communities.¹⁹⁹ Michelle Fine explains the activist stance in which the ethnographer adopts a clear position that both intervenes in hegemonic practices and advocates for uncovering the material effects of marginalized locations.²⁰⁰ It is a position of social inquiry that offers alternatives, and is one that directly aligns with Jürgen Habermas’ critical theory model where social life is critiqued and analyzed for the political purpose of overcoming oppression.²⁰¹

Critical ethnography within communication studies emerges from the premises that through conscious human intervention, cultural practices, language use, and social exigencies can be altered through conscious human intervention.²⁰² And, critical researchers can serve as advocates who engage in dialogue with others in organized efforts against oppression and injustice.²⁰³ This approach is useful in communication activism scholarship, where scholars “intervene into discourses and study the processes and outcomes of their interventions. In so doing, they strive to make a difference through research rather than from research by hoping that someone else will use the research to

Instead, claiming native status may act tactically as both a normalizing and an exclusivizing endeavor, as well as a signifier of the decolonization of anthropological thought and practice” (791).

199 Ibid., 799.

200 Michelle Fine, “Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research,” in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994), 72.

201 Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), 40-41. Habermas places emphasis on forms of capitalist oppression through the overt polemics of the researcher.

202 Lloyd F. Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 2; Hall, “Signification, Representation, Ideology,” 93; James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

203 Lawrence R. Frey et. al., “Looking For Justice In All The Wrong Places: On a Communication Approach To Social Justice,” *Communication Studies* 47 (1996): 110-112.

make a difference.”²⁰⁴ Finally, ethnographic analysis has been a primary way in which Pacific Studies scholarship has advanced—and the success of this method has been coupled with emphasizing Islander agency, local voice, and indigenous epistemologies within projects.²⁰⁵

For these reasons, this dissertation uses situated knowledge and experience of Chamorus to ask and answer fundamental questions about the general dynamics of social identities.²⁰⁶ As George Lipsitz argues, “Outstanding research on social identities emanates from scholars of color and from institutional sites of ethnic studies designed to ask and answer questions that are both particular and universal, that see ethnicity and race both from close up and from far away.”²⁰⁷ Lipsitz explains that there is a terrible price to pay for the blinders imposed on us by the absence of situated knowledge, and that from the basis of this erasure we are all deprived of “valuable knowledge about ourselves and about our society.”²⁰⁸ Engaging situated knowledge, therefore, is key to gaining a deeper understanding and to removing these blinders to reveal the context. As Donna Haraway explains, situated knowledges can provide unexpected openings and create connections, in a sense “the only way to find a larger vision is to be somewhere in particular.”²⁰⁹ Drzewiecka and Halualani have also argued that understanding the dynamic relationship

204 Kevin M. Carragee & Lawrence R. Frey eds., “Introduction: Communication Activism for Social Justice Scholarship,” in *Communication Activism Vol. 3: Struggling for Social Justice Amidst Difference* (New York: Hampton Press, 2012), 7.

205 Vicente M. Diaz, *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2010), vii.

206 Here, I draw from the work of George Lipsitz who has argued for the importance of utilizing situated knowledge of Chicanos in order to gain a more in depth understanding of the social and political location of this group (see below: *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness*, 60).

207 George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Tempe: Temple University Press, 2006), 60.

208 George Lipsitz, ed. “Stan Weir: Working-Class Visionary,” in *Singlejack Solidarity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 347.

209 Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 196.

between structural forces and situated cultural practices is fundamental to understanding the complex articulations of identity, agency, and discourse that may reflect exclusive nationalist appeals.²¹⁰ Stuart Hall notes that subjects are produced within discourse and “must submit to its rules and conventions, to its dispositions of power/knowledge. The subject can become the bearer of the kind of knowledge produced by discourse. It can become the object through which power is relayed.”²¹¹ This phenomenon points to the role of discourse and rhetoric in response to Otherization and the long-lasting impacts of colonization. Rhetoric provides an interdisciplinary method that is one of political and cultural analysis allowing us to better understand the intersection of postcolonial theory and indigenous studies as entering the domain of the ethical and political.

These critical ethnography scholars all point to how situated knowledge emerges from the collective experience of individuals who carry powerful weight and substantial credibility when addressing concerns within their communities. Eric K. Yamamoto and Susan Kiyomi Serrano explain that, in the aftermath of the attacks on September 11, 2001, the collective experience of Asian Americans recalled the loaded weapon of internment from World War II and the Korematsu case in the Supreme Court. Their situated knowledge and experience with internment carries powerful weight when considering how to prevent forms of internment today.²¹² This example demonstrates how situated knowledges can emerge as a source of collective trauma, but also function as a source of generation. From the histories of war, colonization, and the complex relation with the U.S. nation-state, to the trauma as a historical and present day legacy among

210 Jolanta A. Drzewiecka and Rona Tamiko Halualani, "The Structural-Cultural Dialectic of Diasporic Politics," *Communication Theory* 12 (2002): 245-342.

211 Stuart Hall, "Foucault: Power, Knowledge, and Discourse," in *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, ed. Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2001), 79-80.

212 Eric K. Yamamoto and Susan Kiyomi Serrano, "The Loaded Weapon," *Amerasia Journal* 27/28, (2001/2002): 59-60.

collective memories of the Chamoru people, the island provides the nexus for complexities with which communication studies must grapple.

To promote understanding of these issues, my work supplements these approaches to the Pacific with communication studies scholarship. This method follows Stanley Deetz's argument that communication within the political, social, as well as economic and legal structures must be examined.²¹³ Just as emergent Pacific Studies work in the area of Micronesia is concerned with the ways in which colonialism operates through representational and narrative strategies, my dissertation begins from the assumption that analysis of rhetorical and discursive practices is a prerequisite to uncovering contemporary manifestations of colonial control and military dominance in the region.

Thus, communication is paramount to analyzing and understanding the complexity of territorial politics. This project offers to communication studies an extended purview toward the Pacific—one that enables considerations of indigenous epistemologies and indigenous cultural politics within the study of rhetoric. First, in terms of public identity, groups issue rhetorical claims of identification and connection to and against the U.S. nation-state.²¹⁴ Second, methods must be developed to address the “symbolic and creative aspects of identity narratives and cultural practices, and to situate them within enabling and constraining structural dimensions such as the nation-state.”²¹⁵ Recognizing the dialectic between the cultural and the structural directs attention to the “deep interplay between material and political structures which impose limitations and

213 Stanley Deetz, *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 219.

214 Here, I build from Drzewiecka & Halualani's (2002) argument that specific forms of communication are relevant to diasporic groups in relation to the homeland.

215 Drzewiecka and Halualani, "The Structural-Cultural Dialectic," 363.

parameters on human agency and subjectivity, on the one hand, and the active way of negotiating meaning and positionality within those structures, on the other.”²¹⁶

In fieldwork I have conducted, my ability to advocate for the work on Guåhan was a factor much appreciated by the community partners on island. They expressed concern that this project continue and have a direct impact on the Chamoru communities and those living in diaspora. While recognizing the importance of direct action in the communities of Guåhan, they also were eager to have spread information and education about the issues of the military buildup to community groups off-island. My participation with community groups has highlighted both the benefits and the challenges facing activist work on the island. By observing, interviewing, and working alongside these individuals I gained first-hand experience and understanding of the practices of contemporary resistance efforts. These experiences further demonstrate the necessity of incorporating an ethnographic approach.

As Lipsitz stated, “No one ever chooses their pigment or their parents, but everyone chooses their politics and their principles.”²¹⁷ In this sense, one’s identity derives from their politics—rather than their politics from their identity. This insight points to the need to consider: what identity is called forth in a particular circumstance or in a given situation? From this perspective, the situation calls forth an identity that fits the needs of the community. Contemplating the emergence of identity from politics in this way demonstrates the opportunities for laying the groundwork to build solidarity with and among distinct community groups. This ethnographic approach operating within a decolonizing methodology facilitates my rhetorical analysis of the movement; it provides

216 Ibid.

217 George Lipsitz, “Why Asian American Studies Matters Now” (lecture, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, September 6, 2012).

foundational steps toward understanding the discursive and rhetorical facts of the efforts against militarization in Guåhan.

RHETORIC OF BOTH/NEITHER

I develop the concept of “both/neither” as a rhetorical manifestation within indigenous resistance and identity. Understanding the concept of both/neither in relation to Guåhan provides the opportunity to name the oscillating identity and voice of those active against militarization. As an unincorporated territory, Guåhan is afforded a political status that can be characterized as both/neither. To clarify this distinction, Guåhan is represented as “both” a political landmass with citizenship status afforded to the inhabitants, a government with local elections, and members in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Yet, its political status is also characterized as “neither,” because although Chamorus are granted U.S. citizenship rights in theory, in practice they are restricted to voting only in the local plebiscite prohibited from presidential elections. The both/neither concept also encompasses identification issues. For Chamorus, this is evidenced through how the community uses and appeals to both law and culture of the broader colonial entity (both) while at the same time insisting on its own difference from it (neither). This results in an ambiguous rhetorical and cultural identity that can correspond neither to the exclusively national or international nor the vernacular or local experience. Kevin Bruyneel’s work explains “the enduring presence of colonial ambivalence has maintained the parameters of this false choice, putting indigenous sovereignty and political life in a seemingly impossible colonial bind that has positioned indigenous tribes as “domestic to the United States in a foreign sense.”²¹⁸ This phenomena of being domestic in a foreign sense is one that is not lost on Guåhan.

218 Bruyneel, *The Third Space*, 220.

Furthermore, although the American perspective adheres to a state-centered understanding of sovereignty, Bruyneel argues that indigenous politics refuse the constraints and boundaries of settler-state and the nation. Such refusals “demonstrate that indigenous political identity, agency, and autonomy reside in postcolonial time and space, always already across the temporal and spatial boundaries marked out by the settler-state and the colonialist political culture.”²¹⁹ Instead, indigenous political actors and institutions are articulating another way to map out a “people’s relationship to time and space in North America, and they can offer the third space of sovereignty as a politically and discursively locatable alternative.”²²⁰ This third space is Bruyneel’s conceptualization of an “antistatist autonomy that can be an alternative to the polar imaginaries that either see state sovereignty as the unavoidably exclusive font of legitimate political space or postulate a political world in which we have somehow moved beyond state sovereignty altogether.”²²¹ Expressing and cultivating a third space of sovereignty requires boundary-crossing and a discursive shift in the way indigenous political actors articulate their relationship to the U.S. nation-state. I draw from Bruyneel’s conceptualization of the third space of sovereignty to forge the both/neither concept for this project. Both/Neither encompasses the rhetoric surrounding Guåhan’s situation as an island that is simultaneously exterior to the American nation while also falling under the legal umbrella of the U.S. constitution. This concept is useful for describing the discourse of the island’s ambiguous political status, and it parallels the indigenous political efforts as explained by Bruyneel. Additionally, the rhetoric of both/neither brings to the foreground the phenomenon of in-betweenness that is manifested by the literal distance of the island to the U.S. and its overlapping proximity to the U.S. through military and security policy.

219 Bruyneel, *The Third Space*, 221.

220 Bruyneel, *The Third Space*, 221.

221 Bruyneel, *The Third Space*, 222.

At the broadest level, my method falls under the heading of ideology criticism that considers how dominant ideology is held in relation to institutional power and consciousness of the people.

To develop this concept of both/neither, when attending to rhetorical artifacts, I employ a five-step process. First, I discover metaphors and themes of place and space. This step will address the anxieties of belonging to and/or fitting in with a particular space, location, or place—and how individuals communicate about the overall status of Guåhan. Second, I examine references to America and the United States as a place “out there” beyond the landmass of Guåhan, as well as discourse about the U.S. as entrenched throughout the island. In this step I also examine the rhetoric of militarization as ideology, and then compare this ideology to local communication practices of identity.

Third, I attend to the way distance and proximity is communicated, and how the issue of space and place is treated both literally and figuratively in discourse. This step will also consider how individuals refer to themselves and construct their identity as rooted in a particular locale, through their references to villages, the land, etc. It will also consider metaphors and descriptions of home, these terms are other core cultural values that further connect with the construction of identity as rooted and tied to space and place.

Fourth, I examine artifacts for their use of metaphors of kinship and belonging, which will help attend to the language used to communicate connections and relationships to the U.S. and other communities among indigenous Chamorus. This step calls attention to themes of family and folklore operating within texts and interviews. It also highlights recurring patterns among the communicative significations of “Americanness,” and “Chamoru” identity. It addresses stories that people use to communicate about their burdens of organizing, activism, and resistance. Furthermore,

this step will attend to the language used when individuals construct their identity and positionality within the movement.

Fifth, and finally, I listen to learn how metaphors and examination of discourse that simultaneously converges and diverges reveal informative insights about the communicative dimensions of indigenous resistance and identity.²²² I identify similarities, differences, oppositions, and contradictions among the meanings expressed.

Before proceeding through these steps, I must define and explain the category of both/neither at work across all of the forgoing themes and metaphors.

BOTH/NEITHER CONSTRUCTIONS

The both/neither concept allows scholars and activists to understand and to analyze the rhetorical construction of identity and in-betweenness in Guåhan. Consider first, the term “unincorporated territory”: This designation reflects the precarious sense of national belonging for the island, and is an oxymoron. When describing Guåhan’s political status or relationship to the U.S. has coined the phrase “unincorporated territory.” This phrase includes both “un” meaning not and “incorporated” meaning “join, include, unite;” thus it is a term of art that simultaneously seeks to exclude and include. Furthermore, in a singular phrase “unincorporated” is connected with “territory,” which is a term that carries a legacy of colonial baggage from the times of conquest and control over Others. I highlight this example as one way the both/neither concept is made manifest in everyday discourse and language about Guåhan. In the Chamoru language, there are two different pronouns for “we.” These are the inclusive pronoun “hit” and the exclusive pronoun “ham.” The situation of Guåhan can be

222 This method of consideration for communication practices of identity construction is also supported by intercultural communication projects about identity issues in Pacific communities. See: Rona Tamiko Halualani, “ ‘Where Exactly is the Pacific?’ Global Migrations, Diasporic Movements, and Intercultural Communication,” *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 1 (2008): 7-8.

considered through this linguistic paradigm—where in the context of the United States of America it is unclear which “we” Chamorus comprise. Are they “hit,” part of the inclusive “we” with the U.S.? Or, are they “ham,” excluded from the “we” that counts as the U.S.?²²³ From the primary phrase in which the island is categorized and understood, it is trapped within a binary discourse of inclusive exclusivity.

Another more recent example of both/neither comes from the U.S. government. The U.S. military focus has shifted to the Asia-Pacific region this Pentagon strategy is referred to as the “Pacific Pivot” which signals to China that the U.S. will not allow its ascendance into the U.S. historic zone of military and economic domination (a policy that dates back to the occupations of Hawai’i, Guam, and the Philippines in the early 19th century (see Joseph Nye 2011). Here the alliteration of the phrase makes it easy to use without consideration for the variegated parts that are implied. First, a pivot means an axis or a turn –indicating a central or focal point. This pivot is modified by the Pacific, a vast region of islands and peoples. What is constructed here is simultaneously a homogenous and heterogeneous force. The “Pacific” becomes one homogenous entity, despite the drastic diversity and unique composition of political governments, states, countries, and territories in the region. In this way, the naming of “the Pacific” creates the “both” half by bringing the Pacific together in line with the U.S. military policy in the region.

Next, the term “pivot” which signifies a central core or axis, a turning point; this constructs “neither” because it illustrates how the “turn” in U.S. policy is merely a shift or temporary configuration of U.S. military and security strategy. Additionally, this “pivot” is only made manifest by the U.S. desire to secure and protect its foreign interests

223 This question has been raised, and explored in part, by the work of Laurel Anne Monnig in “Proving Chamorro: Indigenous Narratives of Race, Identity, and Decolonization on Guam” (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007), 392.

against China. This example presents another manner in which the discursive construction of importance and “strategic” necessity of the Pacific region is once again belied by the use (and abuse) of the Pacific peoples and lands for U.S. military policy. The Pacific is only of importance for U.S. military purposes for a specific period of time, and is only for the U.S. military use. As the above examples of both/neither demonstrate, this project must attend to the linguistic and discursive constructions that inform and perpetuate ideology.

IDEOLOGICAL CRITICISM

Ideological criticism is a strategic component of my methodological approach. Communication scholars such as Michael Calvin McGee have highlighted the need for linking the concepts of ideology and rhetoric, arguing that scholars should be able to “produce a description and an explanation of dominant ideology, of the relationship between the ‘power’ of a state and the consciousness of its people.”²²⁴ McGee also points out that ideology and rhetoric are mutually reinforcing means of social control with rhetoric functioning systematically to persuade communities of particular ideologies.²²⁵ Thus, investigating the connection between ideology and rhetoric is a deliberate aspect of exploring the contemporary articulations of Chamoru activism and social movements that often must contend with appeals to national identity. Specifically, I am interested in how dominant ideological assumptions about the American nation and American national identity are used within explanations of (and justifications for) the military buildup. By focusing on the rhetorical framing of the U.S. military buildup, I seek to better understand the connection between militarization and appeals to national identity.

224 McGee, “The ‘Ideograph’” 15 (see chap. 1, n. 71).

225 Ibid., 6, 23. Ideology and disciplinary apparatuses are dependent upon the space between and transitional objects to carry out their civilizing missions.

Additionally, a focus on power and domination is necessary for this dissertation as it is broadly concerned with the relationship between a colonial territory and its colonizer.

The forces of ideology have played a strong role in the impetus for American expansion and intervention throughout history, and are phenomena that continue today. Terry Eagleton explains ideology as “a set of values, meanings and beliefs which is to be viewed critically or negatively,” these beliefs are maintained by the “motivation of propping up an oppressive form of power.”²²⁶ I am ultimately interested in the social, political, and economic motivations that perpetuate ideological assumptions. Ideological constructs are often thought to “lend coherence to the groups or classes which hold them, welding them into a unitary....identity.”²²⁷ Ideology “in advanced capitalist societies is internally fissured and contradictory, offering no kind of seamless unity for the masses to internalize; and for another thing the culture of dominated groups and classes retains autonomy.”²²⁸ Eagleton further contends, “Subaltern social groups often have their own rich, resistant cultures which cannot be incorporated without a struggle into the value-systems of those who govern them.”²²⁹ According to Antonio Gramsci, hegemony refers to the extent to which members of society consent to systems of power that are sustained by dominant ideology. While there are continuous challenges raised against power systems by those whose interests are not being served, the social system often remains stable with dominant ideology absorbing and coopting contesting ideas.²³⁰

As Dana Cloud and Joshua Gunn explain, the process of ideological influence is regarded as eminently rhetorical; and, the aims of ideology critique are embedded within

226 Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (New York: Verso, 1991), 43-45.

227 Ibid.

228 Ibid., 35.

229 Ibid., 36.

230 Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, trans. and ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 12.

critical research on social movements.²³¹ Hegemony refers to “the process by which a social order remains stable by generating consent to its parameters through the production and distribution of ideological texts that define social reality for the majority of the people.”²³² Thus, hegemony is “a political type of relation, a form” of politics “but not a determinable location within a topography of the social.”²³³ Hegemony is a dynamic process of negotiation between dominant ideologies and challenges to them. Because hegemony can operate from a variety of points throughout society, it is difficult to trace and pinpoint; however, what can be mapped out is the hegemonic form that militarization discourse has taken in contemporary politics in Guåhan.

In this dissertation, I am concerned with understanding the resources for struggle against ideology, which is key to critical analysis of the repercussions of colonialism and imperialism operating today. This is especially pertinent given that ideology produces a situation in which the conditions of colonialism are frequently accepted as a pragmatic option, which can often cause “subaltern groups [to] endorse the right of their rulers to govern because they can see no realistic alternative.”²³⁴ Such acceptance is precarious and risks backsliding into normative acceptances of colonial practices. Additionally, the “progress” associated with ideological programs of modernization and civilization papers over the inherent violence of colonial power and knowledge. These effects of colonial ideology continue functioning to suppress indigenous knowledge, and are particularly salient to the discussion of the Pacific.

231 Dana L. Cloud and Joshua Gunn, “Introduction: W(h)ither Ideology?,” *Western Journal of Communication* 75 (2011): 407, 413.

232 Dana L. Cloud, “Hegemony or Concordance? The Rhetoric of Tokenism in ‘Oprah’ Winfrey’s Rags-to-Riches Biography,” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 117.

233 Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, 2nd ed. (Brooklyn: Verso, 2001), 139. Emphasis in original.

234 Eagleton, *Ideology*, 56.

Trauma studies place emphasis on memory and history are issues that scholars have long been exploring in the Pacific.²³⁵ However, the U.S. exceptionalism in trauma studies and postcolonial literature is one that remains to be dealt with in the context of Guåhan and its particular situation as a territorial space that brings these sorrows to bear. Indeed, it is a phenomenon that points to the obligation that scholars have “to study and critique the meanings of America in their multiple dimensions, to understand the enormous power wielded in its name, its ideological and affective force as well as its sources for resistance to empire.”²³⁶ Building from this call, this dissertation utilizes rhetorical theory to help understand the how nationalism and American identity operate in Guåhan. Given the complexity of the intersecting issues that comprise the everyday existence in Guåhan, this decolonizing methodology provides a sort of mechanism for navigating through the troubled waters of colonization. This decolonizing methodology encompasses ethnographic perspectives, and illuminates the both/neither concept to craft understandings of the rhetorical constructions of identity in a colonized space. This methodological approach also enhances the use of ideological criticism as a procedure for analyzing the discourse and rhetoric of the U.S. and its exceptional orientation toward Guåhan.

In the chapter that follows, I analyze the ways in which both/neither identities are raised at the United Nations from 2005-2012. This time period represents a return of Chamorus to the tradition that began in the 1980s, petitioning for self-determination. The resurgence of international activism was largely motivated by the U.S. military buildup. In this chapter, I also address my experience as a petitioner at the UN. Finally, in

235 See Camacho, *Cultures of Commemoration*, (p. 59 n. 197); Vicente M Diaz, *Pious Sites: Chamorro Cultural History Between Spanish Catholicism and Liberal American Individualism in Cultures of United States Imperialism*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993).

236 Amy Kaplan, “Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association,” *American Quarterly* 56 (2003): 10.

analyzing the testimonies, I attend to the discourse of indigenous rights, issues of citizenship and national belonging, as well as the role of the UN within the overall movement efforts to challenge U.S. colonial control and militarization.

Chapter 3: Chamoru Testimonies Before the United Nations

The announcement of the U.S. military buildup in 2005 sparked a return voyage of a Guåhan delegation to the United Nations after an almost ten-year absence.²³⁷ The U.S. designation of Guåhan's as an "unincorporated territory" translates into a limited application of the U.S. Constitution.²³⁸ In spite of their marginalized political position, Chamorus have resorted to diverse modes of engagement with international law to practice their inherent right of self-determination.²³⁹ They have used the UN as a forum for democratic engagement with and opposition to the U.S. However, the UN also represents a paradoxical realm in which Chamorus do not neatly situate within any specific identity category with regard to the nation-state or the transnational arena of the UN.

The both/neither identities of Chamoru petitioners influence their language of contention and manner of articulating demands, which produces discursive dislocations with and from the political realm. Both/neither identities are articulated as petitioners appeal to *inclusion with the U.S.* (by virtue of the island's political status and the peoples' designation as U.S. citizens) while simultaneously articulating *exclusion from the U.S.* (to establish a collective local identity and to craft demands as indigenous, autonomous peoples). Together these both/neither identities create a complex rhetorical mixture of **identity**, as indigenous Chamorus, and **strategy** adapted to U.S. institutions and nation-

237 A delegation spoke on the Question of Guam at the UN Special Committee in 2005, after a lag in visits that may be attributed to the Guam government.

238 This is further complicated by the U.S. Insular Cases—a legal framework that hinders political power. For a discussion of the Insular Cases, see Lanny Thompson, *Imperial Archipelago: Representation and Rule in the Insular Territories under U.S. Dominion after 1898* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010).

239 Stade, *Pacific Passages*, 47 (see chap. 1, n.17).

state-centered arenas that ultimately contradict. To better understand how these discourses operate, I consider the question raised by Keith L. Camacho:

What kinds of Pacific Islander interventions—that is to say, indigenous vernaculars for ‘self’ and ‘other,’ ‘village,’ and ‘city,’ ‘land’ and ‘sea’—occur because of America’s colonial presence in the Pacific and in the diaspora?²⁴⁰

Camacho’s query situates the complex and contradictory terrain in which both/neither identities emerge. He at once highlights the colonial presence of “America” within the Pacific that has influenced how indigenous Pacific Islanders attempt to articulate and understand themselves in relation to and at times in opposition from the U.S.

In this chapter, I conduct a rhetorical analysis of UN testimonies on the “Question of Guåhan” from 2005-2012, and describe my own experience as a petitioner in October 2012.²⁴¹ I examine UN decolonization efforts and the language operating in UN testimonies to consider how petitioners discursively support decolonization, self-determination, and opposition to the U.S. military buildup in Guåhan.²⁴² I explore the temporal and spatial dimensions of the UN as a site for international decision-making and decolonization. I argue that the UN testimonies evince the “both/neither” identities identified in Chapter 2, in which testifiers express a vacillating sense of national belonging *with the U.S.* while also communicating a deep-rooted sense of dislocation *from the U.S.* Expressed as physical, political, and cultural dislocations, the testimonies articulate the complex political status of Guåhan as a U.S. territory that is considered by Bruyneel to be “domestic in a foreign sense.”²⁴³

240 Keith L. Camacho, “Transoceanic Flows: Pacific Islander Interventions across the American Empire,” *Amerasia Journal* 37 (2011): ix.

241 The “Question of Guam” is the label for business items that address Guåhan and relate to the UN Charter and Resolution 1514 pertaining to Non-Self-Governing Territories. This label also identifies the focus of petitioner statements and organizes the speakers at UN meetings.

242 The 2005-2012 period represents the resurgence of UN testimonies motivated by the impending U.S. military buildup and the necessity of raising the critical issue of Chamoru self-determination.

243 Bruyneel, *The Third Space*, 221 (see chap. 2, n. 184).

Perspectives in rhetoric and communication studies have shaped my view of Chamoru engagement with the UN, the language of UN testimonies, and the manifestation of persuasion within my community. I strive to see my work “*in situ*—related to the circumstance, and history of the artifact,” whether spoken or silenced.²⁴⁴ Exercising silence in dominant discourse complicate both/neither identities that struggle to find a place for articulation within national and international arenas. Often, indigenous resistance and voices against militarization are simultaneously silenced and/or limited by the legal framework of the UN. Silence is an intentional choice that encompasses various power strategies. It is a critical part of meaning making and these meanings can only be determined *in context*.²⁴⁵ Discourse affirms particular characteristics while implying others; discourse implies actions, roles, and even ways of seeing what is to be avoided.²⁴⁶ This process commands critics to explore the restrictions and constraints beyond a text that serve to hinder rhetorical agency.²⁴⁷ Examining extradiscursive constraints directly

244 Kent A. Ono and John M. Sloop, “Commitment to *Telos*: A Sustained Critical Rhetoric,” *Communication Monographs* 59 (1992): 50. See also: Edwin Black, “The Second Persona,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-119. Rhetors also have an ethical duty to examine audiences created within political texts; Philip Wander, “The Third Persona: The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism,” *Central States Speech Journal* 34 (1983) and attend to what is unspoken or silenced within discourses.

245 Barry Brummett, “Towards a Theory of Silence as a Political Strategy,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, no. 3 (1980): 289-303; Michael Lee, “The Populist Chameleon: The People’s Party, Huey Long, George Wallace, and the Populist Argumentative Frame,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92, no. 4 (2006): 355-78; Robin Patric Clair, “Organizing Silence: Silence as Voice and Voice as Silence in the Narrative Exploration of the Treaty of New Echota,” *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 3 (1997): 315-37; Adam Jaworski, *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, (Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1997); Richard L. Johannesen, “The functions of silence: A Plea for Communication Research,” *Western Speech* 38 (1974); Raymie E Mckerrow, “Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis,” *Communication Monographs* 56 (1989): 91-111; Bernard L. Brock and Robert Lee Scott, *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-century Perspective*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1972); Wander, “The Third Persona,” 1-18.

246 Wander, “The Third Persona,” 209-210. This discursive phenomena is what Wander calls the formation of a Third Persona, “the ‘it’ that is not present” and refers to being negated including alienation through language “but also negation in history, a being whose presence, though relevant to what is said, is negated through silence.” The Third Persona is created in part by that which is negated through the Second Persona (intended audience).

247 “The Null Persona: Race and The Rhetoric of Silence in the Uprising of ’34,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2.2 (1999): 179. Cloud explains the process of being negated and how the formation of a Third Persona applies to the rhetor, such that rhetors can construct themselves in the role of a null persona to

relates to Guåhan, where the local communities and interests are excluded from dominant rhetoric.²⁴⁸

CHARTING THE CYCLE: UN HISTORIES OF DECOLONIZATION & GUÅHAN

The history of UN decolonization efforts is derived from its 1945 Charter,²⁴⁹ which grants the “people” or “inhabitants” of Guåhan the right to self-determination.²⁵⁰ Self-determination articulates the rights of peoples to determine their control of resources, cultural development, political status, and subsistence practices.²⁵¹ A “matter revealed in what people say to each other, in resistance through political uses of language, oral and written,” the issue of sovereignty is a *discursive* one, with resistance occurring in political language exercised within the UN forum.²⁵² As a source of

indicate what is ineffable. Therefore, rhetorical critics must consider the various discourses surrounding silences within texts. See also: Wander, “The Third Persona,” 3-4.

248 Attending to silences and audiences not invoked by the rhetor suggests a purposeful neglect of communities and interests that are often excluded from dominant rhetoric (See Black, “The Second Persona”; Cloud, “The Null Persona”).

249 “Charter of the United Nations,” accessed February 27, 2013,

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>. The charter recognizes self-determination as a mechanism of recourse for determining the legitimacy of control over particular geographic space and populations (See: Burke A Hendrix, *Ownership, Authority, and Self-determination*, (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008), 17; Joanne Barker, *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-determination*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Diana Kly and Yussuf Naim Kly, *In Pursuit of an International Civil Tribunal on the Right to Self-determination: Collected Papers & Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Right to Self-Determination, the United Nations, and International Civil Society*, (Atlanata, GA: Clarity Press, 2006); Yussuf Naim Kly and D. Kly, *In Pursuit of the Right to Self-determination: Collected Papers & Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Right to Self-Determination & the United Nations*, (Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press, 2001).

250 Article 73 of the United Nations Charter demands that members of the United Nations and states administering over non-self-governing territories “recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount” (UN Charter 1945, chapter XI). For a detailed description of international law approaches see: Julian Aguon, “On Loving the Maps Our Hands Cannot Hold: Self-Determination of Colonized and Indigenous Peoples in International Law,” *UCLA Asian Pacific American Law Journal* 16 (2010-2011): 47-73.

251 S. James Anaya, *Indigenous Peoples in International Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 129-153; Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism*, 146 (see chap. 1, n.166). In addition to self-government and social welfare, cultural integrity, and nondiscrimination are considered to be elements of self-determination.

252 Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism*, 146 (see chap. 1, n. 166).

indigenous resistance, sovereignty is considered a foundational concern upon which other rights depend.²⁵³ According to the UN, the category “indigenous” provides has force and weight in an international arena. It functions to provide global organization and solidarity between peoples struggling for self-determination. However, the indigenous category also raises debates over “authenticity,” which impact Chamoru efforts to achieve decolonization.²⁵⁴ I address these complexities below to demonstrate the paradox of both/neither identities in the context of UN decolonization efforts.

The Chamoru population is divided over what the nature of its political status and relationship with the U.S. should be. Since the 1980s, Chamorus have been pursuing their internationally recognized right of self-determination, challenging U.S. colonization by testifying about Guåhan at the United Nations.²⁵⁵ The UN has designated Guåhan as one of seventeen non-self-governing territories (NSGTs) in the world, meaning it has not achieved self-determination through independence or free association with an independent State.²⁵⁶ U.S. domestic law designates Guåhan as an unincorporated territory, which has a profound effect on its quest for self-determination.²⁵⁷ Chamorus have

253 Ibid. See also: Barker, *Sovereignty Matters*; Hendrix, *Ownership, Authority, and Self-determination*, ; Kly & Kly *First International Conference*; idem, *Second International Conference*.

254 Niezen, *The Origins of Indigenism*, 3-5, 48. The UN established a Working Group on Indigenous Populations in an attempt to define “indigenous people.” For a history of these efforts, see: Oren Lyons, *Voice of Indigenous Peoples: Native People Address the United Nations*, ed. Alexander Ewen (Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 1994), 3-4, 48.

255 Joseph F. Ada and Leland Bettis, “The Quest for Commonwealth, the Quest for Change,” *Issues in Guam’s Political Development: The Chamorro Perspective*, 1996; Van Dyke, Jon M., Carmen Di Amore-Siah, and Gerald W. Berkley-Coats, “Self-Determination for Nonself-governing Peoples and for Indigenous Peoples: The Cases of Guam and Hawai’i,” *University of Hawai’i Law Review* 18 (1996), 623-648. Previous scholarship has engaged the debate over who holds the right to self-determination in Guåhan

256 French Polynesia was reinscribed on the UN Committee of Decolonization’s list of non-self-governing territories after being removed from the list in 1947. See: Matthew Russell Lee, “French Polynesia Put Back on Decolonization List,” Inner City Press Investigative Reporting From the United Nations (May 17, 2013): accessed May 28, 2013, <http://www.innercitypress.com/un3tahiti051713.html>.

257 The other U.S. administered non-self-governing territories on the UN list are: American Samoa (Pacific) and the U.S. Virgin Islands (Caribbean). For a complete list of the seventeen non-self-governing territories in the world, see: <http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/nonselfgovterritories.shtml>.

widened the net of UN efforts by attending a broader spectrum of decolonization meetings to emphasize sovereignty, self-determination, and indigenous rights. However, no significant progress has been made toward promoting self-determination of Guåhan under the UN mandate. Vivian Dames states, “The meanings of both ‘self-determination’ and ‘peoples’ remain contentious and fluctuate with U.N. practice.”²⁵⁸ The “UN itself communicates contradictory results as to its decolonization efficacy. At times, the official stance is one which reports its achievements in the area of world-wide decolonization; yet at other times, the institution relates its woeful lack of progress.”²⁵⁹ This UN record complicates indigenous peoples efforts to achieve self-determination within the forum.

This contradictory stance and function of the UN related to Guåhan is further complicated by the idea that decolonization itself is a “contested concept,” Stewart Firth explains this conundrum for Guåhan:

Here independence is so remote a possibility that politicians can employ the stirring rhetoric of decolonization without fear that it might occur. In Guam most talk of decolonization is strictly for non-decolonising purposes... the Chamorro self-determination movement, at least in its widely supported form, seeks merely an alternative form of connection with the United States...²⁶⁰

Firth highlights the discursive domains of decolonization that are minimized because of the back-and-forth political situation between Chamorus and the U.S. The UN political language of decolonization is further complicated by its inability to capture the complexity of territorial identity. Therefore, the UN “both” holds promise for indigenous

258 Vivian Dames, “Rethinking the Circle of Belonging: American Citizenship and the Chamorros of Guam” PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2000), 41.

259 Laurel A. Monnig, “ ‘Proving Chamorro’: Indigenous Narratives of Race, Identity, and Decolonization on Guam,” (PhD diss., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2007).

260 Stewart Firth, “The Rise and Fall of Decolonisation in the Pacific,” in *Emerging from Empire? Decolonisation in the Pacific*, ed. Donald Denoon (Canberra: Division of Pacific and Asian History, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, 1997): 18-19.

Chamorus working toward decolonization, while “neither” adequately addressing nor allowing Chamoru participation in self-determination absent permission from the U.S.

In Guåhan, where there is a long history of colonialism by Spain and the U.S., “indigenous authenticity” often maintains strictures where scholars such as anthropologists “proceed by couching political processes of “authenticity” as hinging on Western-rooted, historically-situated tendencies of groups to self-consciously reify aspects of their “bounded,” “continuous,” “distinctive,” “culture.”²⁶¹ The fact that Spain colonized Guåhan, pre-U.S. colonization, does not negate the authenticity of Chamorus and their culture, despite political criticisms to the contrary. In response to these criticisms, Pacific Islanders have questioned the legitimacy of researching indigenous subjects and have challenged the strictures of Western scholars by “denouncing their colonial and ‘racist’ framework and ‘methodologies.’” These debates expose the truths of identity and authenticity not as mere fodder for anthropologists and their cultural analysis, but at the *very heart of indigenous struggles*.²⁶² The debate over indigenous authenticity troubles contemporary efforts to hold a self-determination plebiscite for Guåhan. The increasing challenges of Guåhan’s both/neither political status influence economic, social, and security policies in the region. While Guåhan is under the jurisdiction of U.S. federal laws and government policies and is continuously mandated to comply with national policies, the local population has no voice or vote and is excluded from U.S. decision-making processes.²⁶³ Additionally, because the concept of decolonization is highly contested Chamoru efforts to achieve self-determination within the UN are continually vexed.

261 Laurel Monnig, “ ‘Proving Chamorro,’” 34.

262 Ibid., 35. Emphasis added.

263 The self-determination plebiscite is tentatively planned for 2015.

Collecting Testimonies: Artifacts Without an Archive

To uphold its charter goals of eradicating colonization, the UN holds annual decolonization proceedings that offer opportunities for indigenous peoples to work toward self-determination.²⁶⁴ The decolonization proceedings occur during the five-month period from May through October,²⁶⁵ affording a small window of opportunity to petition. Testimonies carry the legacy of more than twenty years of delegations from Guåhan; they communicate the personal effects of living under colonization, connect with other self-determination efforts, generate contestation, and spark collective deliberation over decolonization disputes. Yet, petitioner statements are not catalogued in the UN documents archive,²⁶⁶ or the United Nations Bibliographic Information System (UNBISNET) that indexes speeches.²⁶⁷ There is a startling lack of visibility and recognition for petitioners after the UN decolonization proceedings end; all too quickly their words are forgotten and literally left without a trace in the official UN record.

264 “Charter of the United Nations,” *accessed February 27, 2013*, <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>. Charter XI explains UN responsibilities for monitoring the progress towards self-determination in the territories, and obligates the Administering Powers to give information on the conditions within their territories with the express purpose and command of moving toward decolonization in these areas of the world.

265 The UN cycle starts with the Regional Seminars that alternate between the Pacific and the Caribbean, this is followed by the meeting of the Committee of 24 (C-24 or Special Committee on Decolonization) in July, and then the 4th Committee (Special Political and Decolonization Committee) in October. To conclude the cycle, the General Assembly meets and receives reports from the various committees and meetings addressing decolonization around the world. (See also: “Special Political and Decolonization 4th Committee,” *The United Nations and Decolonization*. accessed February 27, 2013, <http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/fourthcomm.shtml>.) The decolonization calendar coincides with the Pacific typhoon season, which can further complicate the physical safety of petitioners who often travel extremely far distances to testify at the UN. Tropical typhoon season for Guåhan is June through December, with peak typhoon season taking place between late August to mid-November.

266 Instead, testimonies are briefly summarized in a final report submitted by the particular committees to the UN General Assembly; this report often only mentions the petitioners’ names with an occasional inclusion of a few select remarks from petitioners’ statements.

267 The system provides citations for speeches made to the General Assembly, Security Council, and other sessions with the full text of speeches provided since 1983. UNBISNET covers from 1979 onward, offering instant access to full text resources in the six official languages of the UN, including resolutions adopted from 1946 onward. Yet, full-text petitioner statements are not catalogued.

I compiled a list of 44 petitioners who spoke on the “Question of Guam” at UN decolonization proceedings from 2005-2012.²⁶⁸ I gathered the bulk of the full text testimonies from blog posts on the Internet, and turned to my community connections in Guåhan to help locate the remainder.²⁶⁹ I have compiled 36 full-text testimonies of the 44 presented from 2005-2012.²⁷⁰ My analysis attends to the full-text documents in an attempt to expose voices that otherwise remained unheard within the limited time of UN proceedings and excluded from the official UN record.²⁷¹

IN OUR OWN WORDS: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF UNITED NATIONS TESTIMONIES

Testimonies evince both/neither identities by *simultaneously* communicating a U.S. national belonging *along with* a deep-rooted sense of dislocation from the U.S. nation-state. At the same time that petitioners raise their arguments in opposition to the U.S. as a governing power and entity over Guåhan, testimonies also push toward recognition within a framework of U.S. democratic rights and citizenship.²⁷² In contrast to this framework that draws *connections to* and *belonging with* the U.S., there is a stark

268 Edward Alvarez’s 2011 statement to the UN focused on the “Issues and Concerns of Civil Society on Guam,” and offered many names of those who testified on the Question of Guam from 2005-2010 (p.9-10). My own research revealed 5 petitioners were missing from the list, likely because it did not include the full cycle of UN decolonization proceedings. Thus, I expanded the scope to include all decolonization proceedings up through 2012.

269 Many of the websites I used are dedicated to Pacific Islander issues and/or independently run by Pacific Islander organizations and individuals. The most helpful websites and blogs featuring petitioner full-statements were: Overseas Territories Review, and *Minagahet* that had compiled testimonies to the 4th Committee in 2006 and 2008.

270 Of the total of 44 testimonies given during 2005-2012, my full-text compilation is missing 8 (5 from 2005, 4 from 2009, and 2 from 2010). I am grateful to the past petitioners who have shared testimonies and for their efforts to search for, copy, scan, and share their words with me as I navigated the waves of Chamoru efforts to continue the struggle against colonization.

271 The temporal restriction of the UN forum contributes to a silencing effect within the UN forum that has lasting effects beyond the meetings. Petitioners often cannot read their entire testimony, and the full-text documents do not appear in the official UN record.

272 This phenomenon occurs in testimonies that argue for issues such as: recognition of Guåhan constitution, positioning individuals as “citizens,” efforts to educate and expand their local government, support for issues from the representative from Guåhan in U.S. Congress.

opposition when testimony discourse dislocates Chamorus from the U.S. and the umbrella of discussions on sovereignty, land, language, and resources. I have found three types of dislocation within the testimonies; these are physical, political, and cultural in nature and are the main focus for my analysis. At the same time at these dislocations are articulated, the testimonies also gesture toward political, physical, and cultural belonging with the U.S.

Political dislocation is communicated by the petitioners' discussion of their lack of full voting rights and their disenfranchisement from the sources of political power in the United States Federal Government. Belonging is expressed through references to citizenship, and Guåhan's political representation within the U.S. Congress. **Physical dislocation** occurs when testimonies discuss the various complications affecting Chamorus in diaspora, highlight the spatial distance from the United States, and discuss the physical barriers being constructed by the U.S. military within their own lands. Simultaneously, physical belonging is articulated as petitioners reference being on U.S. soil and a part of the United States. **Cultural dislocation** is described in the testimonies when petitioners address loss of language, loss of land and being closed off from key areas of the island, and the dislocation from their cultural practices and traditions that results from Americanization. At the same time, belonging to the U.S. culture is a discursive element from the testimonies. These dislocations should be understood in conjunction with both/neither identities, since petitioners often express dislocation as a characteristic of the contradictory status of Guåhan as "both" an unincorporated territory of the U.S. that "neither" fully fits as a separate specificity. Below, I explore these three dislocations through a textual analysis of the testimonies presented from 2005-2012.

Political Dislocations: Both/Neither Identities without Representation

Chamorus on Guåhan tend to associate themselves by their surname, their clan, and their village. This helps them relate their personal identity to others on the island; often they find through village ties, that they are related to one another. This manner of communicating self in relation to others helps to sustain kinship networks. Similarly, the UN testimonies identify speakers in relation to their roots first, and then situate themselves within the decolonizing mission of the UN.

In each testimony petitioners situate themselves as indigenous, individual Chamorus who support self-determination for Guåhan.²⁷³ This move signals the primary rhetorical tactic of identity formation, where “frames” function as interpretive packages that activists develop to mobilize constituents.²⁷⁴ These frames create compelling cases for the injustices of particular conditions and communicate the efficacy of collective agency to alter such conditions. Petitioners utilize frames that construct injustice for Guåhan as a result of U.S. colonization and the planned military buildup. Identity frames also strategically distinguish the opposition, by depicting antagonists through “us versus them” tactics.²⁷⁵ This rhetorical strategy of identification unites followers and weaves commonalities within a movement. Interestingly, these “us versus them” tactics for the movement are complicated by Guåhan’s both/neither identity. As a result, the testimonies strive to construct a common ground and collective Chamoru identity but these efforts are often contradicted by the simultaneity of testimony appeals for inclusion with the state and international bodies to administer rights.

273 In the testimonies I collected, only a small portion of petitioners were not of Chamoru heritage. These individuals still identified themselves following much of the same format as other Chamoru petitioners who stated their name, where they were from geographically, and made reference to their ancestral lineage.

274 See: Snow et al 1986; Gamson 1988; Snow and Benford, “Ideology, Frame Resonance”; Benford 1993; Tarrow, *Power in Movement*. 144-145.

275 Hunt, Benford, and Snow, “Identity Fields,” 94.

Petitioners create identity through the strategic deployment of the Chamoru language and provide a distinctive vernacular discourse. These tactics present in the testimonies highlight the impact that U.S. policies have on the culture, language, and identity of the Chamoru people. Cultural practices provide continuous reminders of an identity distinct from that imposed upon a group; among such practices are the culturally grounded discourses that construct ties of solidarity. Gerard Hauser argues that such discourses are “*recursive* social action whose continuity provides stability to national identity while simultaneously promoting instability within the larger society.”²⁷⁶ This observation is relevant to my analysis, as I follow that pattern in identifying the complex performance of dissent alongside national belonging. While Hauser’s point focuses solely on “national” identity, this phenomenon parallels the both/neither identities in Guåhan. Hauser’s discussion of vernacular discourse also aligns with indigenous perspectives of their own colonization experiences.

Petitioner statements deploy several rhetorical tactics and engage various themes, including: identity formation, self-determination, militarization, political participation, and opposition to the U.S. Testimonies craft and create language of advocacy, and petitioners bear witness to the effects of U.S. colonization and militarization occurring in their homeland while at the same time articulating the need for indigenous control over their political status and their lands. These testimonies carve out a moment in time, where the petitioner’s words can give voice to the grave situation that is either silenced or ignored by mainstream media discourse. Each speaker begins by acknowledging the UN committee, and often, by specifically recognizing the Committee Chairman. As I explain in further detail below, this discursive move aligns with the Chamoru cultural framework

²⁷⁶ Gerard A. Hauser, *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), 114.

of *inafa' maolek* where one practices *manginge'*—the expression of respect and honoring of persons of authority. Chamoru testimonies predominantly use the term “administering authority” as opposed to “the United States.” By naming the U.S. in this way petitioners discursively construct Guåhan as an island controlled by a foreign entity while also positioning the U.S. within the terrain of UN vocabulary for non-self-governing territories. The testimonies also appeal to the UN by asking for support on implementing a decolonization agenda for Guåhan. In this way, petitioners use discourse that places focus on external sources of support. This externalization of power for Guåhan’s decolonization efforts also demonstrates the contradictory nature of both/neither identities. Chamorus petition to the framework of international law, appealing to it as the source and guarantor of their inherent rights to self-determination. This contradiction continues as testimonies call for action from the public interests of the UN constituents even though the UN provides no direct representation for Guåhan within the international body. Taken together, these rhetorical maneuvers also signal the petitioners’ appeals for inclusion with the UN while simultaneously articulating a distinct position as an autonomous indigenous collective.

Speaking of Self-Determination

Petitioners argue that self-determination, which the U.S. has repeatedly denied to Guåhan, is a right established by international law. The testimonies assert that the UN must act on behalf of Guåhan to eradicate this injustice. UN Charter XI articles 73 and 74, expressly command the UN and Administrative Powers to work toward decolonization and self-determination for the NSG territories.²⁷⁷ Guåhan petitioners

²⁷⁷ “Charter of the United Nations,” Article 73 & 74. accessed February 27, 2013, <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>. The United Nations’ Charter XI explains its responsibilities for monitoring the progress towards self-determination in the territories, and obligates the Administering

expressly interpret the UN's obligations under Charter XI that self-determination must be given priority and direct action within international legal proceedings that grant Chamorus their established political right.²⁷⁸ Other areas of the UN legal framework also ground self-determination arguments; petitioners reference General Resolutions 1514 and 1541 and the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples to support their claims. Testimonies connect the issue of self-determination with international law, or emphasize it as a basic part of humanity and the basis for political enfranchisement of the population on Guåhan. These appeals to UN resolutions in order to guarantee *self*-determination are oddly paradoxical.

By calling upon power and law to grant self-determination, Chamorus experience a difficult tension as they rely upon a discourse of human rights with the overarching rhetoric of self-determination when petitioning about guarantees codified in international law. In spite of this tension, petitioners utilize discourse of demilitarization to establish a foundation for peacemaking based on inherent rights of self-determination. In the testimonies I unpack below, the excerpts emphasize how U.S. militarization restricts petitioners' collective ability to self-determine. Testimonies also critique the U.S. as a governing authority over the island. Additionally, terms such as "our" and "Chamorro" establish division between the citizens of Guåhan and the U.S. military stationed there. These examples reveal the paradoxical tension that occurs when both/neither identities are raised within the UN forum.

Powers to give information on the conditions within their territories with the express purpose and command of moving toward decolonization in these areas of the world.

278 Santos Perez, "Chamorus Address United Nation, Urge Need for Self-Determination" (Blog). November 3, 2008, <http://craigsantosperez.wordpress.com/2008/11/03/>. See also, Julian Aguon, "On Loving the Maps," 47-73.

Leon Guerrero rooted her call for self-determination within the lineage of Chamoru activists who have stood in opposition to the U.S.:

I fight the same fight that took the lives of Ron Rivera and former Senator and founder of *I Nasion Chamoru* Angel Santos. Our message has been loud and clear – the Chamoru people of Guåhan deserve to exercise our basic, inalienable human right to self-determination. (Leon Guerrero 2008, Testimony excerpt)

In addition to the Chamoru struggle present in other testimonies opposing U.S. militarization, Leon Guerrero's statement demonstrates the political dislocations Chamorus have suffered in struggling to achieve self-determination. Her testimony also establishes a collective identity of Chamorus by using "our" to signal the common history and goal that many Chamorus have died fighting to achieve.

Another petitioner argues that the buildup presents an added barrier to self-determination:

The sum effect of U.S. cultural hegemony and militarism is to permanently deny Chamoru people our long and uphill struggle for self-determination. The military buildup we speak of today,... is the latest act of negligence and abuse on the part of the US as the official Administering Power of Guam. (Naputi Lacsado 2006, Testimony excerpt)

Naputi Lacsado's testimony illustrates both/neither identities as she explains that the U.S. military buildup directly contradicts Guåhan's inherent right of self-determination. As she critiques U.S. hegemony and identifies actions "on the part of the U.S.," her testimony strives to distinguish the U.S. from Guåhan and the "Chamoru people." This discursive move also opposes the collective "we" against the U.S. while concurrently identifying that the U.S. is the "official Administering Power" over Guåhan. Other petitioners also connect the U.S. to its human rights obligations with regard to the territories. In doing so, they condemn the U.S. as the "Administering Power" over Guåhan:

Moreover, this military buildup of Guam goes against the Administering Power's moral and legal obligations to protect our human rights. (Flores Perez 2008, Testimony excerpt)

These testimonies exhibit both/neither identities by referring to U.S. as the "Administering Power" of Guåhan, while simultaneously exerting a collective indigenous population with an inherent right to self-determination. Petitioners also use the term "Administering Power" to launch critique against U.S. colonial control over the island:

The silence from the administering power on this issue reinforces the point that Guam can no longer remain a colony in perpetuity. (Calvo 2011, Testimony excerpt)

This testimony from Governor Eddie Baza Calvo of Guåhan signals the untenable nature of the island's political status and criticizes the U.S. for its continued silence. This discursive construction of the U.S. authority over Guåhan further exemplifies both/neither identities in local island politics. The governor is positioned at the UN to speak in condemnation of the U.S., although he is simultaneously beholden to U.S. federal laws and its imposed policies on the island. Petitioner statements also argue that the buildup will have a detrimental effect on local island politics:

US troops have a US Constitutional Right to participate in Guam's local elections. If this is an example of US policy regarding local governance, then Chamorro self-determination is gravely endangered. (Flores Perez 2008, Testimony excerpt)

In this testimony, Flores Perez separates the U.S. military and Constitution from the local, Chamoru population. This discursive move illuminates the double-standard of both/neither identities such that the U.S. Constitution more fully protects U.S. military personnel than its own "citizens" that reside in Guåhan. Since Guåhan residents' primary opportunity for political power resides in the local elections, the ability of U.S. military personnel to vote in Guåhan elections will jeopardize political agency for the island's local residents. This testimony also highlights the both/neither concept in political

discourse, such that the U.S. military buildup stands to take precedent over local government and decision-making.

The lack of political participation on Guåhan is also exposed as a problematic and unjust situation linked to race:

We, the people of Guam, recognize that race continues to define the boundaries of the nation and the constituents of a militarized territory. Why are the American people in the Mariana's denied the right to vote? Why are there American bases in Guam if the people lack political voting rights? What role has race played in the political relationship between the United States and their Chamoru territories?
(Tuncap 2008, Testimony excerpt)

Tuncap positions the people of Guam as “American people” while simultaneously referencing the island as a constituency of another nation—people of a “militarized territory.” By positioning the lack of voting rights alongside the topic of American bases, he also demonstrates how the U.S. military and government discriminate against Chamorus. David J. Roberts, a non-Chamoru who shared his testimony in solidarity with the Guåhan delegation at the UN, provided this insight of the U.S.-Guåhan political relationship:

The collective amnesia that currently ignores the United State's role as colonial power in Guam is a major obstacle for Chamorus' struggle for self-determination.
(Roberts 2009, Testimony excerpt)

Roberts considers the UN silence and amnesia about the U.S. and its colonial control to be an impediment to its mandate of supporting the right to self-determination. His testimony goes argues that the island's dependency status is an obstacle for mobilizing wider public support, since many Americans do not know about the nature of the U.S.-Guåhan relationship.

These testimonies from the Chamoru delegation to the UN reveal how human rights discourse is bound up with the overarching rhetoric of self-determination. Even as

it seems apropos to use the discourse of rights when petitioning about guarantees codified in international law, it is this very framework that creates tension for Chamorus since their both/neither identities are positioned precariously in the struggle for self-determination.

However, which? scholars have critiqued the discursive formation of rights and argued that although testimony is a useful form of documentation and rights language bears rhetorical power, “the human rights field has little to offer in terms of either ‘remedies’ for victim or insights for prevention.”²⁷⁹ This critique should be tempered with any discussion of the transformative and subversive capacities of self-determination rhetoric in the context of the UN.

Arguments for redress are persistent across Chamoru testimonies, made evident by the connections drawn from self-determination to political participation, and to citizenship. Lacking self-determination, Chamorus assert a both/neither identity that hinders other areas of political power making. This dislocation affects the entire political spectrum: Guåhan’s elected officials, Chamorus enlisted in the U.S. military, and civilians both in diaspora and at home. Particularly revealing is the direct impact that lacking voice, vote, and self-determination have on how Chamoru petitioners discuss these effects in the UN. Testimonies are rife with discourse that points to limitations and political dislocations endured by the people of Guåhan. Under both/neither status, even the locally elected politicians are at the disposal of the U.S. Focusing on testimony excerpts from elected officials reveals the complexity of contestation as a member of the Guåhan government positioning demands within the paradox of international law. In the testimonies below I consider how local politicians articulate their opposition to

279 Lori L. Heise, “Violence Against Women: Translating International Advocacy into Concrete Change Conference on the Interventional Protection of Reproductive Rights: The Impact of Reproductive Subordination on Women's Health,” *American University Law Review* 44 (1995): 1210.

colonization by criticizing the U.S. government for its double standard of democracy, historical atrocities inflicted during World War II, and the ongoing oppression and injustices caused in Guåhan.

In 2008, Senator Vicente Cabrera Pangelinan submitted a UN testimony that demonstrates a tension between political participation and exclusion within Guåhan. Senator Pangelinan is denied the right to vote in U.S. federal elections, yet he was elected to represent Guåhan. His testimony is juxtaposed against U.S. representative democracy, which outwardly extends representation for Guåhan in D.C. through the presence of an elected delegate in the House of Representatives while denying full participation in politics.²⁸⁰ The testimony is also juxtaposed against the U.N. governing body, already heavily influenced by U.S. veto power. Marking the revival of the Guam Decolonization Commission in 2011, Governor Eddie Baza Calvo submitted testimony that spoke to the burden of over 500 years of colonialism, urging:

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the United Nations, the people of Guam need your help. We are bearing a great burden. Colonialism has weighed down upon our people for nearly 500 years. This half millennium of external rule has taken its toll. (Calvo 2011, Testimony excerpt).²⁸¹

Calvo continued to challenge the peripheral exclusion of the Chamoru people by recalling the five hundred-year history of colonial oppression in the Pacific. This recollection is a temporal discursive move directly connected with Walter Mignolo's observation that "the identification of the sixteenth century as the beginning of modernity/coloniality is...something that is ingrained in a different colonial experience. Indigenous movements

280 The Senator's prepared testimony was read by a Chamoru attorney on the senator's behalf by Ailene Quan.

281 "Calvo Calls for Appointments to Decolonization Commission," Office of Governor Eddie Baza Calvo. accessed February 5, 2013, <http://governor.guam.gov/2011/04/28/calvo-calls-appointments-decolonization-commission/>.

also have been emphasizing, lately, the five hundred years of colonization.”²⁸² Referencing oppression and colonization, the governor makes the case both for indigenous rights to self-determination and the urgency of a de-colonial project “500 years overdue.” Calvo’s testimony embodies modes of thought challenging the U.S. logic that has maintained Chamorus as a marginalized people.

This historical ostracization carries over to recent injustices committed against Guåhan in present-day U.S. colonial control:

The Chamorros of World War II endured slavery, occupation, murder, and genocide. Yet, the U.S. Government is silent in its obligations to war reparations. Our island anxiously awaits the day where our people can receive the same amount of respect, as fellow Americans who endured unimaginable evil during that time. (Calvo 2011, Testimony excerpt)²⁸³

Calvo directly indicts the deafening silence from the U.S. regarding war reparations and responsibilities for atrocities it committed to Guåhan. By calling attention to the plight of Chamorus during World War II, his testimony also positions Chamorus as a collective people who have suffered but not yet received the same recognition as their “fellow Americans.” These examples reveal both/neither identities by locating Guåhan within the realm of U.S. governance and responsibility, while simultaneously situating Chamorus as a people not quite the same as “Americans.” These remarks from a government official also mirror the tenuous relationship between the U.S. and Guåhan. Revealing an overt critique of U.S. ideology, it constructs the UN as an audience commanded to address this history of colonization and genocide. Calvo’s testimony, along with other elected

282 Walter D. Mignolo, “Coloniality of Power and Subalternity,” in *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, ed. Ileana Rodríguez (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 435-436. I have also examined the focus on communicating colonialism as a 500 year process in my previous work, see Tiara Naputi, “Guerra del Gas: Resistance, Subaltern Counterpublics, and Indigenous Resistance in Bolivia” (master’s thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2009).

283 Governor Calvo’s testimony was read aloud at the UN by Clare Baza Calvo, president and founding member of the Conscious Living Nonprofit Organization.

officials, occurred just a few weeks after he convened the Guåhan Commission on Decolonization for the first time in about a decade.²⁸⁴ Within this context, Guåhan politicians testified at the UN to continue to the push for self-determination.

Dr. Judy T. Won Pat, speaker of the Guåhan legislature, was the next elected politician to provide testimony in October 2011. On the heels of the acting governor's sharp criticism of U.S. silence and inaction toward decolonization, Speaker Won Pat reiterated problems of the U.S. colonization, arguing that Guåhan's inhabitants have had to bear "witness to economic exploitation and political oppression by the incumbent administering power." Her testimony petitioned the UN to take action to ensure the fundamental rights of Chamorus to self-determine and to ensure that deciding their own political status is "not impeded or otherwise influenced by the administering power" (Won Pat 2011, Testimony excerpt). Throughout the testimony, she directly tied the record of injustice against inhabitants of Guåhan to the U.S. federal government.

Collectively, testimonies from members of the Guåhan legislature exemplify their political displacement and the legacy of Chamoru dislocation from the U.S., and from other inherent rights to political redress. Traditional political alternatives for voicing grievances and appealing to federally elected representation do not fully apply to Guåhan, because their U.S. Representative is denied legislative voting rights. Therefore, locally elected officials in Guåhan are often among those who petition at the UN. These testimonies are powerful examples of how Chamoru both/neither identities complicate the process of political power making, even for the local elected officials. Compounding this dilemma, the testimonies illustrate how colonization and military encroachment have resulted in political dislocations that continue to hold Guåhan in a precarious position

284 "Decolonization Meeting Held," *Marianas Variety*, September 26, 2011, <http://mvguam.com/letter-to-the-editor/20040-decolonization-meeting-held.html>.

between local, U.S., and international arenas. These testimonies also construct political dislocations that carry overlapping layers of disconnections, particularly about how Chamorus are physically and culturally displaced.

PHYSICAL DISLOCATIONS: PUSHING CHAMORUS TO THE PERIPHERY

Both literally and metaphorically, Chamoru testimonies detail the impact of U.S. colonization from afar and the harms of spatial and physical distance caused by the U.S. military occupation of their land and water. Metaphorically, testimonies reveal spatial dislocation by expressing how Chamorus are left out, with no input from U.S. government considerations and decision-making. Petitioners speak from a place of strong opposition to the U.S. military buildup plans, criticizing the U.S. for ignoring the Chamoru people and excluding them from meaningful consultation. The testimonies also utilize a discourse of dislocation when criticizing physical military presence that threatens Chamoru livelihood. Chamorus articulate a physical dislocation from within their lands, while simultaneously critiquing the overt proximity of the U.S. military that causes this internal distancing. The testimonies often combine arguments about the literal barriers of the military buildup with the metaphorical barriers of Chamoru exclusion from decisions about their own lands.²⁸⁵

Using excerpts from testimonies, I argue that the discourse of dislocation is primarily revealed in relation to water and land. In the testimonies I have gathered, petitioners connect militarization to these core natural resources of the ocean and their

285 Ancient Chamoru society was matrilineal, with the mother's line controlling land and other resources. Matrilineage members had privileged access to ancestral lands, and authority to determine who else could use them. However, lands were maintained by clans using a decentralized authority and kinship system to pull resources together and benefit as a group. For more on Chamoru kinship and land tenure, see: Lawrence J. Cunningham, *Ancient Chamorro Society* (Honolulu: The Bess Press, 1992), 170; Glenn Petersen, *Traditional Micronesian Societies: Adaptation, Integration, and Political Organization in the Central Pacific* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009), 219.

island. This discourse of physical dislocations communicates the ways in which Chamorus are pushed to the periphery by U.S. militarization and colonization. They also express marginalization resulting from privatization. In the section below, I move through a description of these arguments in order.

Dislocating Our Waters

American security policy constructs Guåhan and the surrounding island waters as a “strategic” waterfront protecting the U.S. from perceived enemies in Asia and the Pacific region.²⁸⁶ Challenging this securitizing logic toward water, Julian Aguon’s testimony utilizes a discourse of dislocation that connects militarization to physical disruptions in the island’s surrounding seas:

US military realignment in the region seeks to homeport sixty percent of its Pacific Fleet in and around our ancient archipelago. With no input from the Chamoru people and over our deepening dissent, the US will flood its modern colony with 55,000 people as part of realignment plans. (Aguon 2006, Testimony excerpt)

The physical distance is expressed as a threat from the military imposition of over half of its fleet to the geographical waters surrounding the island and its region. Water metaphors are also used to articulate the physical impact of the military. As Aguon argues the U.S. will “homeport” its Pacific Fleet and “will flood” the island, he describes the massive population boom as an inundation that comes by sea to the area. This tactic conveys that whatever the buildup brings to the shores will translate into further distancing of Chamorus from their accessible lands and the physical space within the island. This testimony also argues Chamorus have been excluded despite their growing opposition toward the military buildup, revealing the metaphorical dislocation of

286 Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho, “Introduction: Militarized Currents, Decolonizing Futures,” in *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), xxiii.

Chamorus as they are pushed to the periphery of political power making and are not even given a seat at the table.

This testimony also demonstrates the continued distance Chamorus experience – from both their surrounding waters and their lands. The magnitude of the buildup illustrates how the local areas are physically cut off, often leaving people with no running water while the military conducted “war games” off the island’s shores.

Just this June, the largest joint military exercise in recent history conducted what has been casually called war games off our waters. 22,000 US military personnel, 30 ships, and 280 aircraft partook in “Valiant Shield.” That weekend, water was cut off to a number of villages on the Navy water line. The people of those villages went some thirty out of sixty days without running water (Aguon 2006, Testimony excerpt).

Aguon’s testimony combines the local fresh water supply and the island’s surrounding seas into a collective resource that sharply contrasts against the sheer quantity of U.S. military equipment, people, and power that disturbed these water resources. By discussing “our waters” against the “Navy water line,” this excerpt highlights the Chamorus collective orientation toward water in opposition to the military’s possessive mentality about the resource. These examples of physical dislocations from the island’s local and surrounding waters, express how natural resources are threatened by the military buildup.

Privatizing Collective & Public Resources

Testimonies also highlight how privatization links inextricably with the larger scheme of militarizing Guåhan, requiring extensive privatization of natural resources and public services for military personnel and their dependents inside the fence. As another testimony explains, militarization combines with privatization to exclude the local population from political empowerment and access to their own lands:

The massive militarization of our island home undermining our human right to self-determination before we even had the chance to vote on a political status is being coupled with an aggressive privatization agenda being pushed by the local Chamber of Commerce, which is dominated by U.S. Statesiders. (Flores Perez 2008, Testimony excerpt)

The process of privatization prioritizes U.S. interests that crowd out the local population, directly thwarting efforts to achieve self-determination. This quotation juxtaposes indigenous claims to natural resources (i.e. “our island home”) against privatization efforts dominated both by military elites and local groups “dominated by U.S. Statesiders.” Privatization contrasts the local inhabitants’ deep connection to place and their island home, even as they risk being uprooted by military and economic interests from outside the physical boundaries of Guåhan or from “Stateside.”²⁸⁷ This criticism is acutely prudent considering the aggressive agenda of U.S. privatization on Guåhan, which represents one of the largest efforts at resource privatization on “U.S. soil”; it began with siphoning off their electricity and telecommunications sectors and now focuses on outsourcing management of waste and water system to private companies.²⁸⁸ Drawing attention to the potential outcome of the military buildup as the privatization of once-public areas, this testimony reveals how the discourse of dislocation encompasses negative impacts both on water and on land.

Dislocating Our Lands

The U.S. military already controls approximately 33% of Guåhan lands today.²⁸⁹

The military build-up plans to take additional land; increasing U.S. military occupied

287 J. Kehaulani Kauanui, “Off-Island Hawaiians ‘Making’ Ourselves at ‘Home’: A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?,” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 21 (1998): 685-688. Kauanui’s work makes strong connections with this phenomenon of discursive dislocations in the UN testimonies as it discusses how nationalism is created in off-island sites and how Hawaiians are displaced and located off-island. In distinct yet similar fashion, Chamorus living on Guåhan often make enclaved statements about people and interests encroaching from off-island.

288 Julian Aguon, *Just Left of the Setting Sun* (Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2006), 45-47.

289 Lutz, “U.S. Military Bases,” n. pag. (see chap. 1, n. 19).

lands to a total of 40%. The DOD plans originally included seizing 2,200 acres in the ancient historical and sacred Chamoru village of Pãgat to build a live firing range complex.²⁹⁰ Against this backdrop, petitioners make their case against the build-up by focusing on the physical costs of the military, on the people, and the loss of land.²⁹¹ Testimonies apply a discourse of dislocation that combines militarization with these physical barriers to land access. In the excerpts that I collected, Chamorus retell the legacy of displacement from their natural environment by directly associating U.S. military presence with land-grabbing and negative impacts ranging from health to self-governance. As one petitioner explains:

U.S. military presence in Guam and Micronesia has resulted in radiation exposure, environmental devastation, and toxic contamination of the island and its people. These catastrophic effects are evidenced in the poor health outcomes of Chamorros. (Natividad 2011, Testimony excerpt)

This testimony goes on to state that Guåhan residents are not eligible to receive compensation for radiation exposure resulting from atomic testing during 1940-1960.²⁹² This grave health condition was caused by U.S. military presence and exacerbated by a lack of direct involvement from the U.S. government to remedy its own catastrophe. This testimony reveals both/neither identities operating among Chamorus whom have unwillingly become ill from U.S. imposed military operations on their lands, and are now forced to be dependent upon the U.S. government to provide them with medical care.²⁹³

290 UN Special Committee on Decolonization, "Chamoru Self-Determination Pa'Go," Testimony presented by LisaLinda Natividad, May 30, 2012, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2012_guam.pdf.

291 UN Special Committee on Decolonization, "Chamoru Self-Determination Pa'Go," Testimony Presented by Edward Alvarez, May 30, 2012, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2011_guam.pdf.

292 Natividad and Kirk, "Fortress Guam," (see chap. 1, n. 21). The Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of U.S. Congress does not apply to residents of Guåhan despite the exposure to downwinds from atomic testing in the Marshall Islands.

293 A great deal of Guåhan residents already go "off island," to seek medical care in the Philippines, Hawai'i and other places given the high cost of medical coverage and care on the island.

By communicating the harsh reality of the colonial condition for Chamorus, Natividad exposes the duality of American presence and its adverse effects on the people.²⁹⁴ Natividad also creates unification among “Chamorros” from Guahan by positioning “Guam and Micronesia” as its own entity with its own peoples. Her testimony conveys Guåhan as an autonomous island area even as it critiques overt military occupation and “U.S. military presence” that has led to dispossession of the people from their own land.

Chamoru petitioners communicate physical dislocation from the land in their own accounts of the Chamoru exodus and of their families’ decisions to leave Guåhan. The testimonies tell stories of Chamorus dislocated from within their own lands by the U.S. military. They also warn of Chamorus’ impending displacement as they leave a homeland that is becoming increasingly unsustainable due to U.S. denial of their right to self-govern. As they share these difficult experiences of being distanced from Guåhan, petitioners create identity framed around the common value of shared land. They build connections by rhetorically claiming land as a collective resource, referring to Guåhan as “our island home,” “our homeland,” and “our land.”²⁹⁵ This move also reveals the both/neither identity of Chamorus, as petitioners claim their collective island homeland while simultaneously arguing against the actions of “America” and the “U.S. mainland.” Petitioner statements at once strive to create an independent Chamoru identity against the U.S., while concurrently expressing their deep entanglement with the U.S. as a governing

294 LisaLinda Natividad, “HITA I MANAO’TAO YINI NA TANO [We are the People of this Land],” *(Re) Collection: Women for Genuine Security*, April, 2009, <http://www.genuinesecurity.org/Newsletter/wearethepeopleofthisland.html>.

295 See especially: Alvarez, UN Special Committee on Decolonization, “Chamoru Self-Determination Pa’Go,” November 28, 2006, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2011_guam.pdf, (see chap. 3, n. 268).; Cristobal, UN Special Committee on Decolonization, “Chamoru Self-Determination Pa’Go,” November 28, 2006, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/dp_2006_cristobal.pdf.; Idem, “Chamoru Self-Determination Pa’Go,” May 18, 2010; Idem, “Statement of the Non-Self Governing Territory of Guam,” May 30, 2011.

body that controls their lands and denies them political rights. This situation complicates petitioners' demands for redress at the UN.

In Dr. Natividad's petition, she called upon the UN Special Committee delegates to focus on specific actions and to do something different in the face of the "dismal realities of our island home."²⁹⁶ This call within her testimony demonstrates the paradox of asking the *UN* for *self-determination* rights. Using the direct language of the UN Universal Declaration of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination, Natividad asks the Special Committee to take actions to bring about change and resolution to the "question of Guam." She states, "While these firm words [of the Universal Declaration of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination] express support for our circumstances, our Guam experience has been that it is not coupled with the authority to bring about change in such circumstances."²⁹⁷ Here, the language of "authority" to self-determine is stripped from Guåhan, even as Natividad articulates her argument that the island aligns with the Universal declaration and its inherent right of self-determination. Raising this demand for self-determination to the UN Special Committee entails a complex act of relying upon UN resolutions to "make a case" for self-determination within international law, even as Guåhan is bound by U.S. domestic law and an act of self-determination still requires the approval of the U.S. as the "administering power" to recognize such actions within the UN framework.

In spite of the paradoxical forum of the UN, petitioners use other rhetorical strategies to connect with the land. By framing the land as a collective part of Chamoru identity, claims to place are strengthened in testimonies as their means of critiquing the U.S. military for declaring ownership and authority of "controlled lands" in Guåhan. In

²⁹⁶ Natividad 2011, Testimony excerpt. http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2012_guam.pdf.

²⁹⁷ Natividad 2011, Testimony excerpt (see above).

particular, testimonies use “local” as a rhetorical device, where petitioners claim land through kinship networks rather than basing their claims in a proprietary framework. Rhetorically framing land through the “local,” also creates a platform for petitioners to build strong relational ties among their family and the broader indigenous community of Chamorus. With kinship and local claims, Chamorus use their testimonies to further challenge U.S. legitimacy of colonizing and claiming ownership of the land through militarization. Thus, petitioners establish a critique of U.S. hegemony with their statements, even as their discourse operates within the paradox of UN self-determination proceedings.

Several testimonies reveal the complexity of articulating demands at the UN as a means of asserting opposition to the U.S. The excerpts below illustrate how petitioners share stories of their own kinship networks and of the wider Chamoru population that suffers as a result of U.S. colonization. Meg Roberto’s story explains:

My great-grandfather’s dying wish for his family was for them to be able to *leave* the island...With an ever-growing military base, he realized that the opportunities for his family were being swallowed and limited the ability of his family to survive now or in the future. He wanted what the military personnel could receive for their children; a superb education and equal access to resources. So when he died in service to the U.S. army, the military kept one promise to our family, a ticket to the United States and the permanent removal from our land. While movement back and forth across the Pacific was intermittent, it became very clear that the island was already less of a home and it was necessary to move on and become as ‘American’ as possible. That is why I call my great-grandfather ‘displaced.’ His actions were the ones of a man dispossessed of his land and desperate for options. (Roberto 2009, Testimony excerpt)

Her testimony uses the discourse of physical dislocation to criticize the metaphorical dividing line that excludes civilian residents from the benefits afforded to military personnel and their dependents on the island. She indicates that “the island was already less of a home and it was necessary to move on and become as ‘American’ as possible.”

This statement provides a strong example of physical dislocations and the duality of U.S. colonial control in Guåhan. Her testimony blames the U.S. military for disrupting her family's roots and sense of place on their island "home." She tells how, paradoxically, it was only through leaving the island that her family would be able to achieve an American identity. By telling the tale of removal from land and loss of home, Roberto also shares the both/neither chasm of hundreds who leave their home to gain an "American" identity, despite their status as American quasi-citizens. While classified as U.S. citizens, many Chamorus still do not consider themselves to be completely "American" until they leave the island. Roberto's testimony communicates the extreme complications of both/neither identities, such that the Chamorus' path to citizenship is paved with dispossession and a difficult struggle over identity and place.

Moving from the story of one family's exodus from their home, another petitioner shares the impact of population loss by arguing that the buildup will further exacerbate this grave situation:

Already more Chamorus live in the U.S. mainland than on the island. As a representative of the Guåhan Indigenous Collective, I urge you to help bring an end to this great exodus. I ask you to include in your draft resolution that the U.S. military build-up on Guåhan is a direct impediment to the decolonization of Guåhan and the right of Indigenous Chamorus to decide our future and survive in our homeland. (Leon Guerrero 2006, Testimony excerpt)

These statements, presented three years apart, share the story of Chamorus suffering under displacement from their island homeland. Both petitioners link physical displacement to the U.S. military buildup. Both testimonies challenge the dominant narrative of U.S. national identity, arguing that it does not translate into "local" sentiments of national belonging. Both petitioners also argue that Chamorus are being pushed by the U.S. further into the periphery of their lands, paralleling the warning from Epli Hau'ofa, who discusses that the colonially created countries of the Pacific region

who, if acting alone, “could indeed ‘fall off the map’ or disappear into the black hole of a gigantic pan-Pacific doughnut.”²⁹⁸ Against the West’s minimizing discourse of the Pacific that denies the peoples ability to create their own spatial reality, Hau’ofa recalls the cultural history of Oceania and the mobility and border crossing of contemporary Pacific Islanders.²⁹⁹ This mobility disregards national borders and carries an expansion of the Oceanic world that critiques Western constructions of space.³⁰⁰ In a similar fashion, Chamorus must avoid being classified in an “empty space,” where U.S. hegemonic dominance considers the island world of the Pacific as isolated and diminutive in order to justify colonization of lands and peoples.³⁰¹ Instead, Pacific Island peoples must create coalitions and express oppositional discourse to continuous control and imposed authority that characterizes island spaces within national boundaries. Acting in concert, Chamorus can raise rhetorical devices of their land and space to assert opposition to U.S. colonization and militarization.

Militarization & Security

The Pacific Islands have long been described as small and seemingly insignificant by Western discourse. As a result, Guåhan is often entirely removed from the dialogue and vision of U.S. politicians. Petitioners challenge this silence by discursively naming the situation of U.S. colonization in Guåhan and critiquing U.S. security policy. Their testimonies also place the U.S. denial of political participation among their central concerns. As a result, petitioner statements at the UN rhetorically construct physical

298 Epeli Hau’ofa, “The Ocean in Us,” *The Contemporary Pacific* 10 (1998): 392.

299 Epeli Hau’ofa, “Our Sea of Islands,” *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (1994):152; Epeli Hau’ofa, “A Beginning,” in *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, edited by Vijay Naidu, Eric Waddell, and Epeli Hau’ofa (Suva, GU: University of the South Pacific School, 1993), 127.

300 Wolfgang Kempf, “Cosmologies, Cities, and Cultural Constructions of Space: Oceanic Enlargements of the World,” *Pacific Studies* 22 (1999): 98.

301 Hau’ofa, “The Ocean in Us,” 396.

distance and dislocation as a means of voicing opposition to U.S. militarization and security discourse.

Petitioner statements discursively depict the dilemma of *militarization without representation* by questioning the centrality of American “security” concerns in the Pacific. The U.S. dominant discursive elements maintain the primacy of hegemony and security, which Chamoru testimonies resist by referring to Guåhan as a “colony” or a “colonized” space. By labeling Guåhan in this way, petitioners discursively construct the island as a physical space under continued U.S. colonial control in the twenty-first century. This colonization is deeply resisted by Chamorus:

Our resistance to the increased military presence on Guam is rooted in an exploitative relationship with the U.S. military. Militarism has historically been used as the imperial hammer that ensures the suppression of Guam’s colonized peoples. As one of the longest colonized peoples in the world, Chamorros have experienced the ill effects of militarization for many centuries. (Natividad 2011, Testimony excerpt)

Depicting a common identity of Chamorus as colonized but simultaneously resistant peoples, Natividad states “our resistance” as a means of rallying the indigenous population against the “imperial hammer” of the U.S. military. Her testimony also offers historical context for contemporary resistance to militarization, and in doing so, provides sharp criticism of the ongoing legacy of colonization bore out of Guåhan’s “exploitative relationship with the U.S. military.” This naming process discursively transforms the island from a marginal territory that sustains the U.S. military agenda into a colonized geographic space meriting urgency in U.S. and international political arenas alike. The testimonies call attention to the plight of the island because of its designation as a non-self-governing territory, and challenge the common sense of U.S. military governance on the island.

Chamoru petitioners also argue that they are left without political representation as a result of U.S. colonization through militarization. To articulate this affect, testimonies allude to the island's distance from the U.S. government and from opportunities for political power. These allusions represent both an 8,000-mile physical disconnection and the material disconnection of being denied participation in their own political processes. Petitioners critique the U.S. for denying them political rights while contrasting their situation against the increasing political rights of the U.S. military both on and off the island. Despite the high enlistment rates of Chamorus in the U.S. military, petitioners discursively divide the "local" population from the military service members that stand to gain local political access when relocating to Guåhan. This division continues as petitioners criticize the U.S. military for making decisions about the island and imposing its policies on the local landscape from afar. In this manner, testimonies establish collective identity among the Chamoru people by arguing they are a population threatened by increasing military presence that will push them further into the fringe of political participation within their own island's decision-making processes.

Testimonies also establish common identity by rhetorically constructing Guåhan as a physical place that is united by the Chamoru people in opposition to U.S. militarization:

In this time of great need for Chamorros and Guam, with the overwhelming burden of inequality accumulating, the expediting of the current US militarization, the huge conflicts of interest of those entrusted with preserving our human rights and their subsequent disregard for it, it is essential to ensure that all the accomplishments of our forebears on behalf of decolonization and self-determination be maintained. (Flores Perez 2007, Testimony excerpt)

Arguing back in 2007, that *now* is the time to address decolonization and self-determination, Flores Perez positions the U.S. militarization as the culminating event threatening Chamoru human rights. Still unresolved in 2013, this concern for human

rights is repeated by yet another petitioner who links the military buildup to the political exclusion of Chamorus:

This hyper-militarization poses grave implications for our human right to self-determination because the U.S. currently asserts that its citizens, this transient population, have a ‘constitutional right’ to vote in our plebiscite. (Santos Perez 2008, Testimony excerpt).

Here, political rights and self-determination are inextricably entwined. Santos Perez argues that the projected U.S. military expansion plans on Guåhan will exacerbate an already dire situation of political ostracism for the Chamoru population. These testimonies also critique the double standard of U.S. voting rights and citizenship. Petitioners discuss political rights for Guåhan by discursively constructing a group identity for Chamorus. This identity is characterized by a “local” and indigenous belonging to the land, based in Chamoru kinship networks, and rooted to their ancient history of collective orientations to space. Testimonies argue that electoral and constitutional rights should *only* be granted to the Chamoru population and should not be extended to “transient” military personnel. The non-local and outside populations are often rhetorically positioned in opposition to Chamorus and other locals living on-island, who have a collective identity and share a collective understanding of the land. Testimonies convey discontent and separation from those outside of Guåhan—a discursive move that deepens the physical divide between the U.S. and the island’s population. The literal and metaphorical characteristics of physical dislocation overlap within the testimonies, such that Chamorus must simultaneously push away from, and pull towards the U.S. framework of rights, recognition, and political participation. Petitioners tend to address the cultural damage that stems from these physical dislocations; their testimonies reflect the relic of colonialism and its adverse impacts on the cultural continuity of Chamorus living on the island.

CULTURAL DISLOCATIONS: STRIVING FOR *INAFI' MAOLEK* AMONG DECENTERED CHAMORUS

Testimonies push toward *inafi' maolek*, the Chamoru cultural concept of restoring harmony or order. Literally translated into “to make” “good,” *inafi' maolek* is said by Chamoru scholars to be the foundation of Chamoru culture and is based on the assumption that mutual respect must prevail over individualism.³⁰² Therefore, if “there was once a state or condition that was somehow altered, perhaps by an act of commission or omission, that must be restored to its original state or condition.”³⁰³

This desire for harmony entails six traditional Chamoru values of *respetu*, *manginge'*, *mamahlao*, *chenchule*, *che'lu*, and *påtgon*.³⁰⁴ The views of *inafi' maolek* are described in terms of reciprocity and the significance of practicing mutuality over individualism within social contexts in the broader community as well as the nuclear family.³⁰⁵ Although petitioners cycle through decolonization proceedings year after year, often repeating their organizational structure and communicative strategies within their testimonies, it is this very format that ties the movement to rich cultural tradition and sustains the efforts against colonization. Beginning their testimonies by recognizing the UN governing body and identifying themselves as Chamorus connected to their family clan and to the island (as either diasporic populations, or local inhabitants), the petitioners

302 For accounts from Chamoru scholars see: Dr. Robert Underwood and Dr. Katherine A. Aguon in the Hale'Ta Chamorro Heritage Books series. See also: Dr. Lawrence Cunningham, *Ancient Chamorro Kinship Organization* (Agat: L. Joseph Press, 1984).

303 “Inafi' maolek: Striving for Harmony,” *Guampedia*, accessed March 15, 2013, <http://guampedia.com/inafamaolek/>.

304 According to Dr. Katherine Aguon's work (see above, n. 303), *inafi' maolek* creates harmony by building on the six values which are: 1. *Respetu* – the provision of respect afforded to our elderly and others significant individuals within the family and community; 2. *Manginge* – an expression of respect given to elders and persons of authority; likened to a kiss, this expression of reverence is displayed by the motion of a slight touch of the nose to the back part of a person's right hand; 3. *Mamahlao* – to be shamefaced, embarrassed or ashamed; 4. *Chenchule* – present (money) donation, thing that is given away, gift not specifically associated with any particular event; 5. *Che'lu* – Relationships with siblings; 6. *Påtgon* – Children are valued and raising them is everyone's responsibility.

305 Cunningham, *Ancient Chamorro Kinship Organization*.

demonstrate *respetu* (respect for family and community) and *manginge'* (respect for authority, elders, offering of reverence) for their place in the Chamoru history and culture and for the UN authority. Their statements also reflect a shared sense of *che'lu* (sibling relationships) and *påtgon* (children as communal responsibility), when petitioners claim the importance of their kinship networks among Pacific island peoples and take collective responsibility for caring for the future generations of their island population.

While I argued at the outset that the standardized format for testimonies could be problematic, I now consider how testimonies reflect deeply-rooted cultural practices that clear paths for petitioners to reinvigorate their discourse against enduring silence, displacement, and the legacies of colonization and militarization that otherwise supplant Chamoru culture. One petitioner statement makes a strong case for restoring balance and recentering Chamoru lives that have been disconnected for so long:

Borrowing from our sister American colony in the South Pacific—Samoa, there is an ancestral belief system that is based on a “Sacred Center.” Sa moa means “sacred center.” It is the belief that all things begin and lead back to a “sacred center.” This belief is shared throughout the Pacific and is based on a Pacific epistemology. It is a belief that, like a ring has no beginning and no ending but at its core lays the respect for the land and the family unit. As U.S. cultural hegemony and the military taint the land, the bloodline, the mind and the spirit of Chamorus and other Pacific Islanders, we become increasingly disconnected and displaced from that “sacred center.” (Naputi Lacsado, 2006).

Naputi Lacsado articulates collective identity for Chamorus by aligning them with other islands, positioning Chamorus as the sister kin to Samoans. This discursive move also includes noting the similarities between Samoa and Guåhan as colonies that both belong to “America.” Yet, as she explains this colonial belonging to the U.S. she also carves out the Pacific as a distinct space with a specific worldview. Arguing that the “sacred center” represents respect for land and family and is a shared belief among indigenous peoples from the Pacific, her testimony contrasts this cosmovision with U.S. forces that infect

“the land, the bloodline, the mind and the spirit.” These discursive tactics mark the U.S. as the damaging force to Pacific lands, peoples, and cultures. Her petition also labels the U.S. as the catalyst for dislocating Chamorus and other Pacific Islanders. Through U.S. colonization, these collective peoples continue to be removed from their sacred spaces.

Testimonies also chart the legacy of the Chamoru culture and the history of Chamoru petitions for decolonization and self-determination at the UN. In tracing this history, many petitioners build connections with the surrounding community by rhetorically constructing a unified voice, expressing cultural dislocation as a result of colonization. This rhetorical construction is achieved through the use of “we” language and terms that convey unification of the Chamoru community members. When petitioners discuss “our island,” Chamorus were constructed as occupying a collective space. When petitioners refer to “the people of Guam” and “our people,” they construct Guåhan as a place with a unified people. This use of “we” language is a common way to create identification with the audience; yet this discourse creates a paradox whereby any substance is definable only in terms of what it is not, such that it is “an identification by which he [sic] both is and is not one with that with which and by which he [sic] is identified.”³⁰⁶ This identification paradox of being simultaneously “both” and “not” generates collective motivation while negating individual motives; it functions by simultaneously inviting identification while denying participation.

Relating this phenomenon to identity framing in social movements, the Chamoru decolonization movement demonstrates a complexly layered effort to establish identification among movement actors while outwardly struggling for a sense of place within nation-state centered categories of political identity. The political status of Guåhan

306 Kenneth Burke, “*Rhetoric of Motives*,” (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

as a “U.S. unincorporated territory” is at once a defining characteristic of Chamoru identity, and simultaneously an area of critique within Chamoru struggles to self-determine. It is within this bounded area that movement frames of Chamoru indigenous identity often employ contradictory rhetorical strategies in their efforts to align collective identities against the U.S. While enhancing a range of identities is a focal point of social movements, for the Chamoru decolonization movement this range of identities encompasses a wide spectrum of both/neither classifications. As testimonies indicate, the spectrum of rhetorical construction of both/neither identities includes: American, U.S. citizen, colonized, dispossessed, indigenous, Chamoru, and local. These identity markers highlight the expansive nature of Chamoru identity articulations that simultaneously strive to create an “us,” while being riddled by the seeming impossibility of characterizing Chamoru identity apart from the U.S. In the movement’s effort to create a collective Chamoru “us” identity that opposes the U.S. “them,” petitioner statements still articulate themselves as *both* part of the U.S. while remaining *neither* quite the U.S. nor totally separate from it.

This identity paradox also has implications for the movement appeals to the UN as an institutional power and arbiter of indigenous rights. By striving to explain themselves as separate and distinct from the U.S., Chamoru petitioners rely upon the international framework of the UN that is itself paradoxically situated within the terrain of international law and the U.S. as a member state with veto power. The U.S. government objected to the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, an international charter that Chamorus testimonies have used to ground their arguments for self-determination as a people. Despite the burgeoning number of international charters asserting the rights of indigenous peoples, this framework of laws is still limited in its implementation and accountability at the level of the nation-state. While Chamoru

organizing at the local level is moving toward the indigenous framework of representation and recognition from the UN, these efforts still yield uncertain consequences at the national level of U.S. governance. Furthermore, despite raising their voices at the UN, Chamorus have yet to see political gains or any trickle-down effect from the UN institutions to the U.S. and ultimately to the local political landscape of Guåhan.

Against these identification paradoxes, petitioners achieve collective motivation by rhetorically constructing a homogenous audience of Chamorus and a collective understanding of the island of Guåhan. However, because political elites are often detached from the people,³⁰⁷ the petitioners' strategy of creating identification with the UN audience is complicated by their own ever-present both/neither status in the testimonies. This both/neither status functions against the petitioners' ability to persuade the UN to take collective action against colonization. While it invites identification among Chamorus and the broader UN audience, it also denies participation from the U.S. who bears responsibility for its colonial actions.

These both/neither identities also connect to "we" language as they strive to construct a unified Chamoru "us" in opposition to the United States. The movement's collective identity framing must grapple with the complex layers of "neither" quite belonging to the U.S. nation-state while at the same time the U.S. claims "both" ownership of Guåhan and control over its inhabitants. Roberto provides an example of "we" language by identifying and situating herself within a common community. This collective is comprised of people that share a history and contemporary experience of colonization:

307 Black, "Second Persona."

Along with my Chamoru community, I am here to speak about the effects of colonialism on our people. I am specifically here to testify on the physical and emotional effects of displacement our people have endured as a result of colonialism. (Roberto 2009, Testimony excerpt).

While Roberto uses her testimony to rhetorically construct Chamorus as a community, she also articulates the experiences of Chamorus dislocations spanning across physical, emotional, and cultural areas of life. Roberto's simultaneous discursive production of community and dislocation demonstrates how both/neither identities are characterized by contradictions. Furthermore, by using the term "displacement," Roberto provides a strong example of how the condition of U.S. colonialism has lasting effects that sever people from their sense of place and rootedness to their culture.

The simultaneity of both/neither identities is also revealed in the way that testimonies contrast the dislocations caused by colonization against their rhetorical construction of community and collective sense of place throughout the Pacific. Testimonies reference and identify their Chamoru experience in relation with other islands and peoples connected throughout Oceania. Building these ties reflects the historical lineage of seafaring as a communal practice across the Pacific islands. These discursive connections navigate the Chamoru experience of colonization out of the periphery of U.S. dominant discourse and recenter their struggles within the purview of international arena. This discursive tactic is essential for peoples throughout the Pacific and Oceania, who must take caution to avoid creating divisions and instead heed Hau'ofa's words: "If we do not exist for others, then we could in fact be dispensable."³⁰⁸ With this command, Hau'ofa calls upon peoples of Oceania to maintain community and strong relational ties for one another.

308 Hau'ofa, "The Ocean in Us," 396.

Chamoru testimonies also traverse the history and heritage of the island and the region, often drawing from their cultural experiences and incorporating the Chamoru indigenous language. The Chamoru language represents a culturally grounded discourse that draws attention to the identity and solidarity of the indigenous people of Guåhan. While the Chamoru language is recognized as one of the official languages on the island and is used on government documents and websites, the language is threatened by extinction within the next generations.³⁰⁹ Under these circumstances, Chamoru language usage is a principal component of the resistance conducted at the UN, and it functions as a tool that Chamorus wield to assert their inherent right to self-determination as a people. This linguistic and cultural identity is placed in stark contrast to the hegemonic U.S. identity that is connected to forces of military buildup, environmental degradation, displacement, and cultural erosion.

In their statements from 2005-2012, petitioners use the Chamoru language to displace the normalcy of U.S. governance and to establish a case for self-determination, to call attention to the purpose of testimony, and to give appreciation for the opportunity to address the UN forum on the foremost problems relating to Guåhan. Senator Vicente Cabrera Pangelinan, a member of the Guåhan Senate, and Governor Eddie Baza Calvo each offer an example of vernacular discourse in their testimonies by stating:

Ginen y anti y espiritu yan y man fotna na taotao Guåhan na hu presenta este na testimonu, yan u fan libre y taotao pagu. It is from the soul and the spirit of our ancestors that I present this testimony today for the liberation of the people. (Pangelinan 2008, Testimony excerpt).

Kao siña un ayuda ham ni' ManChamoru. Kao siña un rikoknisa i direchon-måmi para in-din-tet-minan maisa. Ayuda ham humago' i guinifen-måmi. Manespisiât

309 A report conducted by the Haya Cultural Heritage and Preservation Institute in 2005 assessed the level of Chamoru language usage and the status of the Chamoru language according to the number of fluent speakers (Cited in Aguon, "The Fire This Time," 55-56, see p. 50 n. 183).

ham. Mambanidosu ham. ManChamoru ham. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the people of Guam. (Calvo 2011, Testimony excerpt).

Here the Chamoru language provides unifying identity among indigenous petitioners, even as it distinguishes Chamorus from the extended audience of the UN members. This phenomenon is evidenced throughout most of the testimonies where petitioners' use of the Chamoru language calls attention to their cultural identity and indigenous heritage. These linguistic choices are purposeful, yet the testimonies are never presented completely in Chamoru. Petitioners tend to quickly revert to speaking in English as they explain the purpose of their testimony and express their appreciation for the opportunity to address the UN forum. In this way, petitioners demonstrate an inclusive stance toward the UN and assimilate to the English language in their testimonies while simultaneously incorporating their indigenous language.

The format of using the Chamoru language during greetings, expressions of gratitude, and closings are typically followed by the English language translation. If time permits, petitioners will read the accompanying translation to the UN audience. This style of language usage mimics the Chamoru cultural tradition and practice of recognizing elders by *fanginge'*, a tradition of showing respect to elders by kissing/sniffing their right hand or *âmen*, a term used with small children when directing them to kiss the hand of the elder.³¹⁰ In a similar fashion, Chamoru petitioners pay their respect to the UN committee by extending a greeting and acknowledgement of those around them. This is typically done by stating "*Hafa Adai yan buenasi!* (Hello and good day)," simply "*Hafa Adai* (greetings)." Petitioners offer their appreciation to the UN for the time they have been allotted to speak, being allowed to speak, and/or the opportunity to share in front of the international body; they also tend to thank the UN for hearing, listening, considering,

310 "Cultural Traditions," Hale'Ta Series, Department of Chamorro Affairs, Government of Guam.

accommodating, and paying attention to their testimonies about Guåhan. Typically this gratitude is expressed by stating either: “*Dankolo na si yu’us ma’ase* (Thank you very much)” or “*Saina ma’ase*’ (Thank you).”³¹¹ From these examples, vernacular discourse can be seen as creating unity as well as peaceful division. The testimonies offer recursive social action by following the Chamoru language up with English translations that establish sharp resistance to continued colonial formations on Guåhan, and point toward the purpose of testifying as one of producing a peaceful alternative to U.S. territorial rule.

Testimonies also employ another remarkable strategy by telling how U.S. colonization has provoked displacement from the Chamoru language and culture. While many testimonies incorporate the indigenous language, others detail how the U.S. has prevented Chamorus from learning their language:

I’m what you might call a success story in the colonizer’s handbook. I’ve been educated by one of the best universities in the world. I speak English with no recollection of my mother tongue. A child dispossessed and told to believe in the power of assimilation. This is the pathway to success, I am assured [sic]. Not only have the colonizers of Guåhan assured me of this, but my family as well. I am a success story of the United States colonization of Guam. (Roberto 2009, Testimony excerpt).

This testimony communicates Chamoru dispossession from their cultural roots as a means of achieving “success” through “assimilation” with the United States. By doing so, Roberto expresses both/neither identities by positioning herself as thriving only because she has assimilated to the U.S. Her testimony communicates the contradiction for Guåhan, in which Chamorus achieve a U.S. identity but it is characterized by a lack of connection with their Chamoru language and culture. Even as Guåhan is considered

311 The majority of collected UN testimonies include some formal written expression of gratitude, for examples of how these are incorporated into the statements see Cristobal 2007; Tuncap 2008; Lujan Quinata 2010; Torres 2012. It is possible that petitioners include or omit such offerings of appreciation based on their allotted time.

“both” part of the U.S., expressing this U.S. identity for Chamorus means they must simultaneously deny their own identity and accept their precarious “neither” position.

These forty-four testimonies from 2005-2012 represent a number of important layers of communication activism and oppositional discourse to the U.S. Although the testimonies evince dislocations, this phenomenon of being displaced or incapable of being located is similar to the difficulty of finding Guåhan on a map. The lack of place and the disconnections found in the testimony documents also parallels the material conditions that Chamorus endure on a daily basis. These both/neither identities are the byproduct of hundreds of years of colonial control, and represent the insidious effects of U.S. silence toward its oppression of the people of Guåhan.

MY FOUR MINUTES AT THE UN

In exploring this period of UN testimonies, I also consider my own testimony in October 2012 to ground the analysis as someone who has had the rare opportunity to bear witness on behalf of my people. I reflect on my experiences as a petitioner and on my journey I made to the UN, bringing my experiences in harmony with those whom have gone before me. Working through this experience, I consider how efforts to bring attention to our plight are situated within the UN and how testimonies may help move toward decolonization for Guåhan and Chamorus around the world.

My consciousness about Chamoru efforts at the UN was late-blooming, and my interest in reading UN testimonies came even later when I found an online compilation of the 2006 testimonies to the 4th Committee. This document demonstrated to me the magnitude of this form of communication about decolonization for Guåhan. During the summer of 2011 in Guåhan, after conferring with a number of individuals whom have given testimony at the United Nations, I inquired about being a petitioner. I wanted to use

my position as a Chamoru in diaspora to advocate for Guåhan, and to follow in the footsteps of those whom I respect and admire for bringing critical attention to colonization. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the 4th Committee meetings that year, but made deliberate schedule adjustments to attend in the fall of 2012 and started the approval process to be a petitioner representing Guåhan.³¹² Once I received approval to petition, I began preparation of my testimony; for further insight, I consulted others who had previously testified on behalf of Guåhan.

In October 2012, I represented Guåhan at the United Nations Decolonization Committee (4th Committee) meetings in New York City. On Friday, October 5, 2012, just days before I was to travel to New York, I received an e-mail outlining the procedures for the Hearing of Petitioners at the Fourth Committee meeting. This e-mail provided information for where and when the meeting would be held and provided guidelines for petitioners, primarily that the 4th Committee had set the time limit for statements at four minutes. The e-mail from the 4th Committee also stated:

A timing mechanism will be installed, whereby the red light on the speaker's microphone console will blink at three minutes. This should be a signal to speakers to conclude their statements within the allotted time. Speakers are reminded to deliver their statements at a reasonable speed, so that the interpreters can do the best job possible.³¹³

This e-mail notification effectively censored my testimony before it began. With an allotment of only four minutes to speak on the injustices and harsh effects of colonization, I was disheartened and doubtful of my ability to make a difference with

312 I am grateful to the assistance and support from Ed Alvarez, who spearheaded my application process to be a petitioner and guided me through the steps of preparing my testimony. I also greatly appreciate the encouraging words and editing eyes of Hope A. Cristobal and Lisa Natividad, both of whom read over my testimony and offered suggestions for me as I prepared to represent Guåhan at the 4th Committee Meeting.

313 Dino Del-Vastro, e-mail message to author, Disarmament and Peace Affairs Branch, GAEAD Department for General Assembly and Conference Management (DGACM) at the United Nations.

such a short testimony. Writing a four-minute testimony immediately proved to be one of the most challenging tasks for me, with such a short time limit I felt the need to silence myself from speaking about concerns that could not or would not fit within the parameters I was given. I searched for recent testimonies and also drew from testimonies I had found from my research into the military buildup. I consulted with those who have gone before me to this same space, to give testimony on the “Question of Guam” and to speak on behalf of our needs as a community, as a people, as a non-recognized entity.

I was scheduled to present first in the lineup of petitioners at the 4th Committee meeting on Tuesday, October 9, 2012. Despite my best efforts to keep my testimony short, and after cutting out several paragraphs just hours before I was to present, I was unsure if my testimony would be under the four minute time mark and I began dreading the red light of the timing mechanism that the e-mail had described. My trepidation about the timing of my testimony was displaced by fears far greater as I entered the space for the Decolonization Meeting. The room was very large and somewhat daunting since the physical distance of the petitioners from the rest of the seats for official members and committee chairpersons. Petitioner seats are on the very back row of the room and do not have plaques indicating a country or other affiliation. Instead, there is a small standard nameplate that reads “Petitioner” that is reserved for anyone who is scheduled to provide testimony during the 4th Committee proceedings. Petitioners faced the front of the room where an elevated panel of chairpersons presides; these few individuals were seated facing outward looking over the delegates. Everyone else who spoke was facing toward the seated panel at the front of the room, yet petitioners were seated in the very back of the room often well out of eyesight from the other delegates and the video screen projecting a live feed of those who were speaking. The spatial dimensions of the room and the speaking format for petitioners reflected the hierarchical power of the UN. Within

this decolonization forum, I read my petition while the official delegates were seated with their backs to me, and I found myself wondering if my words were falling deafly upon the backs of delegates' heads and translation earphones. Twice during my statement, I received warnings from UN staff to slow down the rate of my delivery and to speak at a more reasonable pace. The first time was just a few seconds into my testimony, when a staff member who had escorted me to the petitioner seat came very close to me and flashed up a "Speak more slowly" card. I received a similar warning again as my testimony continued, which added to my frustrations since I desperately wanted to speak my whole truth despite being restricted to a mere four minutes.

After the 4th Committee meeting ended, I was approached by Hermes Penaloza and another individual from the UN Decolonization Unit; they wanted to discuss the latest developments in the Davis lawsuit, which I had spoke of in my testimony. I left the Conference Room 1 and proceeded to a small alcove where the two gentlemen mentioned the conversation they had with Julian Aguon, the delegate from Guåhan during the meeting. They were curious about how things were progressing with the Davis lawsuit and the efforts to move forward with a self-determination plebiscite.³¹⁴ In particular, they asked me questions about Dave Davis and his lawsuit in the Guåhan court. His case claims that he was discriminated against during the voter registration for the upcoming self-determination plebiscite. I tried to answer their questions as best as I could, but found myself feeling disconnected, wishing that I had been living in Guåhan longer than two

314 The Davis lawsuit is a civil rights lawsuit waged by long time Guåhan resident Dave Davis, who argued against the plebiscite to determine Guåhan's political status. He argued his rights were violated when he attempted to sign-up for the referendum because he did not fit the definition of a "native inhabitant of Guam." For further details, see: Kevin Kerrigan, "Federal Judge Dismisses 'Without Prejudice' Davis Lawsuit Over Political Plebiscite," *Pacific News Center*, January 9, 2013, http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=30429:davis&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156.

months out of the summer, wishing that I had more experiences with the day-to-day struggles of living on island. Most of what I knew about the Davis lawsuit had come from asking members of the Guam Decolonization Commission or from reading the Guåhan newspapers and blogs. Although I had spoken about this particular issue in my own testimony, I primarily focused on how the lawsuit threatens the self-determination plebiscite that is already long overdue for Guåhan. During my chat with the men from the UN Decolonization Unit, I was still reeling from the entire experience of testifying, and my stomach was still in knots with leftover nervous energy and about the pressure of reading my testimony in under four minutes.

In the end, I got the sense that my meeting with these members of the Decolonization Unit was more of a formality than anything else. They were both friendly and seemed genuinely interested to hear what I had to say about Guåhan, but our chat only lasted a few minutes and I was left wondering whether anything that I had done that day at the UN had made any difference. They mentioned how they would be preparing to put together their report to the 4th Committee, and I was unsure of what else I could contribute. There was nothing said on their part that seemed to indicate that they had any solutions, especially not in the short-term with regard to the Davis lawsuit. We talked about the status of the political situation in Guåhan, but were not talking about what changes and/or opportunities the 4th Committee could provide or contribute to lend support to the local island efforts. This experience left me feeling stuck, and somewhat trapped in the space of the UN. Even with all of its promise of decolonization, my extremely limited speaking time and the short conversation after the official UN committee proceedings left me feeling that the UN did not care to provide enough time to really understand the plight of Guåhan or any place that is truly striving for decolonization. I was also struggling to quell my anger about how my testimony had just

been added to the UN dustbin of forgotten, undocumented, artifacts without an archive. In spite of these frustrations, I was glad that I had taken the time to write my testimony and carry the message of my community living in Guåhan. The experience also made me profoundly aware of my own both/neither identity as a member of the Chamoru diaspora. This experience also gave me a deeper understanding and appreciation for the efforts of Chamorus to articulate our need for decolonization at the UN. This experience also put me in the same position as others before me who have struggled to communicate about colonization from such a politically precarious both/neither situation. This brief, autoethnographic account of my experiences at the UN also helps me reflect upon my petitioner experience and work through the limits and possibilities of this forum. I can now consider the benefits and limits of the UN forum from my first-hand knowledge, which strengthens my analysis of UN testimonies and other texts. This position also strengthens my reflections on how both/neither identities revealed within the UN testimonies might have more salience in the broader movement for decolonization of Guåhan.

ASSESSING THE LIMITS OF THE UN

The Chamoru movement's engagement with the UN has not translated into success in terms of achieving political rights or sovereign status. By directing public attention in an issue-specific and temporary manner, the UN operates within the established format of national public spheres.³¹⁵ In this way, the UN can be regarded as what Fraser calls a "weak" public, since it lacks the institutional power to compel nation-states to act, and its international laws have historically lacked enforcement

315 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 1989), 177.

mechanisms.³¹⁶ The problems of enforcement mechanisms can be connected with the primacy of the ideal of absolute sovereignty for nation-states.³¹⁷ The world is a global political realm in which “nation-states must justify their actions to a global public because of the discourse produced by NGOs and other transnational governing institutions.”³¹⁸ Although NGOs and transnational organizations attempt to hold nation-states accountable, they may still comprise “weak” publics in relation to the U.S. nation-state.

This phenomenon can be better understood when considering that conventional arenas, such as the UN, have historically dominated the process of decolonization and the actions of social movements. Through legal bureaucracy, constitutional lawyers and their categories of analysis have diverted attention from the main outcomes of decolonization.³¹⁹ The enforced norms of discourse and established formats for UN hearings seriously hinder the deliberative potential for witnesses who enter the forum as activists for social change. Similar observations have been made regarding the limitations of U.S. Congressional hearings; controlling mechanisms can include the content of hearings as well as the modes of expression.³²⁰ As a “weak” public, the UN does not afford any decision-making power to witnesses. Certainly a major obstacle for witnesses remains their inability to “directly participate, through voting, in the final

316 Nancy Fraser, *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*, (New York: Routledge, 1997), 134.

317 Marie Mater, “A Structural Transformation for a Global Public Sphere? The Use of New Communication Technologies by Nongovernmental Organizations and the United Nations,” in *Counterpublics and the State*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 218.

318 Ibid., 216.

319 Geoff Bertram, “The Political Economy of Decolonization and Nationhood in Small Pacific Societies,” in *Class and Culture in the South Pacific*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, (1987):17.

320 Daniel C. Brouwer, “ACT-ing UP in Congressional Hearings,” in *Counterpublics and the State*, ed. R. Asen and D. Brouwer, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001), 87-110.

determination of policy proposals.”³²¹ From this understanding of the transnational forum of the UN, we can better understand the limitations and possibilities it offers for self-determination movements that utilize peaceful means for achieving its self-determination goals.

The Chamoru case demonstrates some limits to a transnational frame. Counterpublics facilitate the creation of oppositional discourse, yet for the Chamoru movement the decision to direct such discourse to the transnational public of the UN has diluted the transformative potential of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in favor of U.S. territorial interests. By utilizing the UN as a medium for communicating opposition to the U.S., the Chamoru counterpublic is relying upon a “weak” public to channel its discourse against U.S. territorial rule. Positioned within a transnational political arena, the movement is subjected to human rights violations, colonialism, and nationalism. Such positioning for indigenous rights struggles is often troublesome because, on the one hand, it reflects an appeal to the global logic of nations and peoples and on the other hand, it necessitates dependency upon a nation-state or transnational structure to guarantee particular rights.³²²

Such skepticism exists toward appealing to conventional means for achieving decolonization for Guåhan. Some contend that the decolonization question should not be asked solely in standardized terms set out by the UN, international treaties, laws, or U.S. conceptions of democracy.³²³ On the one hand, the UN testimonies represent a forced choice for Chamorus who have been continuously denied recourse by the U.S. Conversely, by turning to the “weak” transnational public of the UN, the Chamoru counterpublic is positioned within standardized international discourse that lacks the

321 Ibid.

322 Ståde *Pacific Passages*, 48.

323 Camacho and Monnig, “Uncomfortable Fatigues,” 149.

decision-making authority needed to transform opinion formation into concrete political influence on the U.S. In this sense, both the UN committee and the Chamoru counterpublic function as “weak” publics.

Despite the creation of international laws with enforcement policies, international regimes, and transnational agreements, the issue of decolonization has yet to be addressed in UN international governing documents. Thus, building the case for decolonization and self-determination through the UN presents an uphill battle when U.S. interests so heavily saturate the transnational forum. Although the UN has provided a place for Chamorus to voice concerns and facilitate opinion formation, they still lack voting rights and direct action capacity with regard to the U.S. violations of international law. As a result, the Chamoru decolonization movement requires new methods of engagement in the struggle against political exclusion.

In a transnational era when public spheres do not neatly line up with state entities, the creation of strong publics becomes much more salient. Although problematic in many respects, for the Chamoru counterpublic the shift toward the transnational forum provides a contemporary example of how counterpublic theory must be expanded to consider the diverse instruments of engagement for challenging colonial powers in a postwestphalian world. The Chamoru counterpublic certainly deploys a variety of tactics for engaging dominant political discourse, however the movement is limited by culminating its efforts in appeals to a transnational organization in which the U.S. has veto power. In this configuration, the status of the counterpublics and their relationship to the nation-state remains tenuous. Ultimately, the transnational public sphere requires unique configurations in order to yield both opinion formation and decision-making authority. While the appeal to transnational entities holds the promise of such authority, the case of the Chamoru counterpublic demonstrates the limits of such engagement. In calling for a

turn to a transnational frame, Fraser argues that theorists must reconsider the core premises of public theory with regard to efficacy and legitimacy of public opinion. Heeding this call is necessary for public sphere theory to maintain its critical and political edge and the promise of contributing to struggles for emancipation.

THE AMBIVALENT PROMISES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Recognizing the concept of both/neither as it maps onto UN testimonies helps understand the discursive constraints operating within Chamoru testimonies. While the overwhelming majority of UN testimonies are limited in their ability to effectuate change toward decolonization for Guåhan, my argument is that the process is not completely futile. As a site, the UN has the potential to be a unique type of discourse that carries both thick and thin forms of human rights vernacular. Because the UN has not been overrun with militarizing and securitizing rhetoric, there are many productive possibilities for change and decolonization. Understanding the identity struggle of Chamorus and its implications on their testimonies within the paradoxical framework of UN self-determination rights demonstrates that the efficacy of testimonies depends on overcoming the metanarrative of “America/Americanness.” Furthermore, petitioners must recognize how to rhetorically construct their demands within the UN forum that carries a number of structural and temporal limitations. These uncertainties of Americanness and institutional limitations are areas of critique that I have raised with regard to how testimonies function. While Chamoru both/neither identities must grapple with the overarching metanarrative of “America” in terms of national belonging, militarization, and human rights—it is this very spectrum of discrepancies that provides opportunities for Chamorus to assert a collective identity in opposition to the U.S.

The institutional limitations of the UN forum are further complicated by the limitations that Chamorus face in relation to the United States Federal Government. The lack of full political representation and participation counteracts the promise of utilizing other avenues to petition. The Guåhan representative lacks voting rights which hinders direct engagement with political channels. Furthermore, using the format and forum of the international governing body of the UN to hold the U.S. accountable remains a dead end for many groups seeking redress and recognition. The metanarrative of America/Americanness seems to be hindering the efficacy of Chamoru testimonies at the UN. It may be the case that testimonies would be more effective if they strive to find ways to distance themselves from “American” rhetoric. Doing so will help avoid the metanarrative of America that seems to thin out the discourse of human rights.

Appealing to the U.S. within the UN framework adds up to robbing the emancipatory potential of the UN as a unique platform and forum for Chamoru decolonization efforts. Instead, testimonies need to be more radical in their discursive approaches. Perhaps one manner of discursive opposition would be for petitioners to give testimony that does not allude at all to the U.S. control over Guåhan or reflect the both/neither concept within its communicative tactics. Thus, instead of presupposing that Chamorus can only be understood in relation to or with the U.S. nation-state, the testimonies could more radically challenge the prefiguration of Guåhan as a necessary component of the U.S. (in terms of security, military, economic purposes).

In all of these ways, the UN affords a paradoxical rhetorical opportunity for testifiers to represent the demand for decolonization. In contrast, in the next chapter I move from the international level of movement efforts at the UN to narrow in on the specific experiences at the local level of indigenous activism against the U.S. military buildup in Guåhan. My emphasis is on charting the path of the local opposition to the

U.S. military buildup since 2006. I consider the issue of media coverage and the emergence of We Are Guåhan (WAG) and their efforts to respond to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in 2009. Additionally, I seek to examine how the local level of the movement negotiates its opposition in relation to the international efforts to achieve decolonization and self-determination. These local efforts include the creation of public education organizations, community engagement in the public hearings and scoping meetings surrounding the U.S. military buildup, joint legal action against the DOD over their proposed firing range at Pāgat Village, and engaging instances of decolonization in schools, villages, web spaces, and beyond.

Chapter 4: We Are Guåhan & *The Grey Papers*

On November 20, 2009, the Department of Defense (DOD) released its Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the U.S. military buildup planned for Guåhan by 2014.³²⁴ The DEIS was a nine volume, 11,000 page document that covered all of the structural changes and environmental effects that would result from the largest U.S. military base relocation in the twenty-first century.³²⁵ The DEIS detailed the impact of the buildup on the region's natural resources including core topics such as: the massive expansion of the Guåhan's population, the expansion of Apra Harbor for nuclear equipped submarines, aircraft carrier berthing, Army Air and Missile Defense, a new military complex, and utilities and roadway projects for the island.³²⁶ The DEIS also revealed the U.S. military's intentions to acquire more land in Guåhan, and create new training facilities on the island of Tinian.³²⁷

The residents of Guåhan were given a ninety-day period to respond to this complex and lengthy DEIS document. With this time constraint, concerned citizens, activists, educators, and community members quickly organized to respond to the DEIS.

324 James P. Karp, "Judicial Review of Environmental Impact Statement Contents," *American Business Law Journal* 16 (1978): 127-156. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is required under U.S. environmental law. The EIS document is required for actions that significantly affect the quality of the human environment, and describes both the positive and negative effects of proposed action on the environment. The EIS document is used as a tool for decision-making and deliberation about certain actions in particular areas.

325 "EIS Documents," Guam Buildup EIS, <http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents>.

326 Some of the environmental impacts included the destruction of an estimated 70 acres of coral reef along Guåhan's western coastline to expand the Apra Harbor for housing nuclear equipped submarines. The Apra Harbor is the largest deep-water port in the Western Pacific; it is vital to unique habitats, has among the highest coral cover, and is home to many species that are not found anywhere else in the archipelago (See also, Gustav Paulay, "Marine Biodiversity of Guam and the Marianas: overview," *Micronesia* 35-36 (2003): 3-25).

327 Tinian is part of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; the Commonwealth islands have a history of colonization that follows a similar trajectory to Guåhan. Once a colony of Spain, then Germany, and Japan before becoming a Commonwealth affiliated with the U.S. For a history of Tinian, see Paul Rainbird, *The Archaeology of Micronesia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Formed around the DEIS review period, the grassroots organization We Are Guåhan (WAG) provided the most effective response to the DEIS and the military buildup plans. Members of WAG divided up the 11,000 page DEIS document and diligently read, reviewed, summarized, and condensed the information for the public. This information was released in *The Grey Papers (Papers)* series, in which WAG broke down DEIS information into short accessible documents for the local population. These *Papers* rhetorically challenged the DEIS and the military buildup, and ultimately influenced the course of the U.S. relocation plans when WAG joined in a lawsuit against the Department of Defense.³²⁸

In this chapter I chart this activism in Guåhan by analyzing the both/neither identities emerging from the social movement organization WAG and their activities from 2009-2011. I describe particular efforts waged at the local level by allied social movement organizations and activists living in Guåhan during the announcement of the military buildup. I argue that the local level efforts of WAG rhetorically function to challenge U.S. militarization and represent a significant force in the contemporary movement against colonization in the Pacific. I also argue that activism in Guåhan is rhetorically characterized by the contradictory complexity of indigenous activists contending with American influence and the overarching discourses of national belonging at the local level. This phenomenon of the complexity of activism is a result of both/neither identities which simultaneously rhetorically claim the U.S. (both) while also struggle to articulate a specific and distinct identity for Guåhan that is not quite separate nor completely tied to the U.S. (neither). In this way, the movement employs a vexing

328 Heather Hauswirth, "Pangelinan Critical of Computability Study," KUAM News, January 18, 2010, <http://www.kuam.com/global/story.asp?s=11838078>. In October 2009, the Government of Guam hired the Matrix Design Group to review the DEIS, under a \$2.9 million contract the company was to provide a comprehensive compatibility study of the DEIS. Instead WAG offered accessible information and insight about the DEIS before the contracted Matrix Design Group provided any concrete analysis for the public.

rhetorical motif where it references the specificity of Guåhan while making rhetorical gestures to constraining and distant U.S. institutions and audiences.

To illustrate these arguments I examine the rhetorical formation of collective identity and local activism and analyze key artifacts from WAG, such as The *Grey Papers* series. These artifacts represent an important array of discourse emerging from the catalyst event of the 2009 DEIS release up through WAG's direct action lawsuit against the Department of Defense in 2011. I utilize the motif of motion as I navigate through the various elements of local activism from 2009-2011. I also strive to address events in chronological fashion to demonstrate shifts, changes, and waves of activism during the tumultuous period of the U.S. military buildup from its initial announcement in 2005 through 2009 and its early stages of organizing in Guåhan.

Social movement rhetoric provides a useful lens for analyzing activism during this time period and the discursive devices employed by We Are Guåhan as they challenged the U.S. military buildup. Sidney Tarrow defines social movements as "collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities."³²⁹ A social movement functions principally through persuasion and "encounters opposition in a moral struggle."³³⁰ Tarrow argues that people join social movements "in response to political opportunities and then, through collective action, create new ones."³³¹ In order to sustain action, movements adopt a "modular repertoire" of contention that utilizes familiar collective action forms

329 Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 3-4.

330 Charles J. Stewart, Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton, *Persuasion and Social Movements*, (Prospect Heights, Ill: Waveland Press, 2001), 22.

331 Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 17.

such as strikes, protests, marches, and demonstrations that translate across various issue areas and sectors of society.³³²

In order to mobilize participants and supporters, movements build connections with established social networks.³³³ This mobilization technique is an influential aspect of WAG's outreach within the local community and the population of indigenous Chamorus living both on and off the island. Movements create legitimacy by asserting political and cultural rights and agency, which often entails "both a critique of hegemony and a possibility of a new form of hegemony."³³⁴ To achieve this end, social movement rhetoric employs identity framing, which assigns meanings and interpretations to events and conditions that are then used to mobilize and garner support while opposing antagonists.³³⁵ By constructing frames of meaning that connect familiar cultural symbols to particular grievances and potential solutions, movements can sustain support and continue to mobilize.³³⁶ The efficacy of social movement frames can be influenced by cycles of protest or activity within a particular movement.³³⁷ Tarrow explains these "waves of collective action" are characterized by intense conflict, widespread mobilization, an expansive repertoire of contention, and transformations in frames of meaning and discourse.³³⁸ From this understanding of social movement rhetoric, it is clear that We Are Guåhan engaged in waves of collective action.

332 Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 38-41.

333 Ibid., 132-133.

334 Beverley, John. "The Impossibility of Politics: Subalternity, Modernity, Hegemony." In *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, ed. Ileana Rodríguez, (Duke University Press, 2001), 41.

335 See discussion of Identity formation in Chapter 2. See also: Snow and Benford, "Ideology, Frame Resonance," 198.

336 Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 144-146.

337 Sidney G. Tarrow, *Struggling to Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest*, (Ithica, N.Y.: Cornell University, Center for International Studies, 1983), 38-39.

338 Ibid., 69.

Additionally, identity framing formed an important part of We Are Guåhan's sustained efforts to critique the hegemonic rule of the U.S. military. Benford and Snow define a frame as "an interpretive schema that simplifies and condenses the world out there by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one's present or past environments."³³⁹ They explain framing as the signifying work that social movements do to "assign meaning to and interpret, relevant events and conditions in ways that are intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists."³⁴⁰ Thus, framing is a rhetorical process that facilitates identity formation by aligning collective and personal identities.³⁴¹ Within social movements, framing serves the function of crafting identity and maintaining solidarity while also provide group members a frame for grievances and a sense of efficacy in addressing such grievances.³⁴² Movement frames can also help understand how a sense of self is articulated as a product of defining oneself against an antagonist.³⁴³ These rhetorical tactics of the social movement also facilitated WAG's formation of a collective identity among the local population in Guåhan, even as this identity construction was riddled with both/neither identities that at once laid claim to and struggled to distance from the U.S.

339 Robert D. Benford and David A. Snow, "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest," in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, ed. Carol McClung Mueller and Aldon D. Morris (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 137.

340 Snow and Benford, "Framing Processes," 613 (see chap. 1, n. 104). Snow and Benford, "Ideology, Frame Resonance," 198.

341 Hunt, Snow, and Benford, "Identity Fields," 191-192.

342 Dana L. Cloud, "Foiling the Intellectuals: Gender, Identity Framing, and the Rhetoric of the Kill in Conservative Hate Mail," *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2 (2009): 459-460.

343 Dawn McCaffrey and Jennifer Keys, "Competitive Framing Processes in the Abortion Debate: Polarization-Vilification, Frame saving, and Frame Debunking," *Sociological Quarterly* 41 (2000): 42-43.

LOCAL ACTIVISM: 2005-2009

In October 2005, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) announced it would be relocating thousands of Marines to Guåhan.³⁴⁴ The U.S.-Japan bilateral agreement proposed a \$10.3 billion military buildup project that included relocating roughly 17,000 Marines and their dependents from Okinawa to Guåhan by 2014.³⁴⁵ The agreement established a sweeping reorganization of U.S. troops and bases, and supported the development of new facilities and infrastructure on Guåhan to facilitate the relocation.³⁴⁶ This proposal meant more than doubling the size of the current U.S. military presence on Guåhan, where the military already controls one-third of the island's land holdings.³⁴⁷ Although the bilateral agreement was drafted in 2006, the DOD had been “orchestrating the build-up for years, they did little to share their plans with the local community, or include local leaders in any of the decisions that were made.”³⁴⁸ During the four-year period between the announcement of the military buildup in 2005 to the release of the DEIS in 2009, there were various organized local protests, events, and petitions in Guåhan.

344 Gene Park, “7,000 Marines: Pentagon Announces Shift to Guam,” *Pacific Daily News*, October 29, 2005, <http://www.guampdn.com/article/20051030/NEWS01/510300302/7-000-Marines>.

345 Condoleeza Rice et al., “United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation,” Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, May 1st, 2006 <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/doc0605.html>. See part 1(b). In a series of meetings and bilateral talks between 2005 and 2007, the United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee (SCC) drafted documents communicating the countries’ efforts to buildup U.S. military forces from Asia to the Pacific.

346 Kan and Niksch, “Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments,” January 19, 2010, <http://openers.com/document/RS22570/>. Importantly, the anti-base movement in Okinawa had a significant impact on the U.S. relocation to Guåhan. Okinawa and Guåhan have a similar relationship with the U.S. military that began during World War II, with a number of important differences; See: Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam,” n. pag.

347 In Okinawa, the U.S.-military economy only accounts for less than 10% of the overall Okinawan economy. This sharply contrasts with the Guåhan economy where the military heavily influences the “local economy, patterns of land-use, political priorities, and perhaps most dangerously, the psyches of the people.” Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam” n. pag.

348 LisaLinda Natividad and Victoria Lola Leon-Guerrero, “The Explosive Growth of U.S. Military Power on Guam Confronts People Power: Experience of an island people under Spanish, Japanese and American colonial rule,” *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, December 6, 2010, http://japanfocus.org/-Victoria_Lola_Leon-Guerrero/3454#sthash.cdEMFGnG.dpuf.

On May 23, 2006, then Governor Felix Camacho met with DOD Undersecretary Richard Lawless to discuss the buildup. This government meeting prompted protest, with community members arguing that “the indigenous people of Guam do not have enough of a voice in what happens” with regard to military buildup.³⁴⁹ The problem of community consultation would continue to incite protests, emerging again at the DOD public scoping meetings in April 2007.³⁵⁰ An estimated 800 people attended the scoping meetings, with 900 comments submitted that communicated deep concern over “international safety, law enforcement, transportation and infrastructure issues, marine resources/ecology, air quality, water quality, and overloading limited resources and services.”³⁵¹ *I Nasion Chamoru* (The Chamoru Nation) also expressed opposition to the scoping meetings with their community-organized protest; spokesperson Debbi Quinata explained:

We're protesting this planned reoccupation of our homeland and we're also protesting the manner of the way these supposed scoping meetings are being conducted. We understand it's a dog and pony show and believe that the intent is to fulfill a federal mandate and not really to gauge or even consider the feelings of the community members of this island.³⁵²

349 Steve Limtiaco, “Residents Protest along Marine Corps Drive,” *Pacific Daily News*, May 24, 2006.; Viernes also explains demonstrators held signs that read: “No more Marines,” and “Yankee go home!” highlighting the local efforts to speak out against the military buildup and the broader problem of colonization (“Won’t You Please,” 112).

350 “Appendix A,” *Federal Register*, vol. 72, no. 44, 2007, p. 10186-10187, http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/archive/SummaryReport/Appendix_A.pdf. Each island was scheduled for a three hour time block for the scoping meeting, meetings happened from 5-8pm on April 3 (Guåhan), April 4 (Tinian), and April 5 (Saipan). A scoping meeting is part of the basic EIS process. It is a public meeting to introduce a particular project to the general public and gather initial comments from the community; it identifies needs and concerns the public might have about the project or its impact on the surrounding environment. According to the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), in any given environmental impact statement process, scoping meetings must be held before the draft EIS is released (See: “A Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA: Having Your Voice Heard,” Council on Environmental Quality Executive Office of the President, December 2007, p. 7-9, http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/Citizens_Guide_Dec07.pdf).

351 Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam,” n. pag.

352 Clint Ridgell, “Chamorro Nation Sounds Off at Scoping Meeting,” KUAM News, April 18, 2007, Spokesperson Debbi Quinata, <http://www.kuam.com/story/11070006/chamorro-nation-sounds-off-at-scoping-meeting>.

Both/neither identities emerge from Quinata's statement as she calls the U.S. military plans a "reoccupation," conveying that the buildup is externally imposed and stands to repeat the history of U.S. occupying Guåhan. In this way, she strives to construct the island's distinctness from the U.S. and create a collective identity by naming "our homeland" as a place contrasted against the U.S. Her statement simultaneously articulates Guåhan's proximity to the U.S. by virtue of its connection through U.S. federal laws and mandates. Quinata then critiques the scoping meetings for disregarding the local community and those who belong to "this island," here she articulates again the contradictory and vexed status for Guåhan as both tied to U.S. federal policy while at once being ignored by it. During the scoping meetings, the DOD explained that following the DEIS release another series of public hearings would offer residents a chance to verbally testify about the buildup.³⁵³ As Quinata's statement foreshadowed, this public testimony process came under sharp criticism from the local community members. The locals voiced strong opposition to this hearing process when they discovered that meetings and buildup proceedings were being convened by U.S. government officials in secret.

In January 2008, local protests erupted over the clandestine nature of a U.S. Congressional Hearing on Guåhan that "resulted in the inclusion of public testimony as an 'addendum' to the official proceedings."³⁵⁴ As the DEIS release date grew near, more protests erupted. In July 15, 2008, a protest opposed U.S. control of Guåhan and argued against U.S. officials turning a deaf ear to the plight of Guåhan's indigenous population.³⁵⁵ This protest demonstrated the lack of support for the military industrial

353 Ibid.

354 Natividad and Kirk, "Fortress Guam," n. pag. Congresswoman Donna Christensen (U.S. Virgin Islands) had convened a U.S. Congressional Hearing on Guåhan on an invitation-only basis.

355 "Residents Hold Protest Fighting for Native Rights," KUAM News, July 15, 2008, <http://www.kuam.com/story/11077005/residents-hold-protest-fighting-for-native-rights>.

complex that imposes control around the world without regard for the indigenous populations within those locales. Then, on November 2009, the same day of the DEIS release, the Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice organized a protest to express community concerns for the insufficient time allotted to respond to the DEIS and voice their concerns about the buildup.³⁵⁶ These moments of protest and petition from 2005-2009 represent early moments in the movement against the U.S. military buildup, such efforts must be understood within the longer historical trajectory of resistance to U.S. colonization on Guåhan. Although the people of Guåhan lacked concrete information on the specifics of the DOD buildup, they still mobilized to have their voices heard; their efforts would quickly culminate in an organized effort to respond to the DEIS.

THE DEIS: 11,000 PAGES IN 90 DAYS

Following the November 2009 release of the DEIS, public hearings were held leading up to the formal “Review and Comment” period for the public. Typically this review timeline is a forty-five day period for public commentary, feedback, and review.³⁵⁷ The Guåhan local government requested to extend the DEIS review to 120 days, but ultimately the Secretary of the Navy only granted a 90 day extension.³⁵⁸ The people were forced to respond to the largest report in the island’s history within three months. This time frame was very limited, forcing rapid public deliberation about one of the most complex changes to the local environment and the “largest transient peacetime

356 A coalition comprised of grassroots organizations and individuals advocating for the “political, cultural, social, environmental and human rights for the people of Guam.” “Guma’Famoksaian,” Famoksaian, November 16, 2009, <http://famoksaian.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2009-12-03T16:30:00-08:00&max-results=7&start=14&by-date=false>.

357 “A Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA,” p. 7-9, http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/Citizens_Guide_Dec07.pdf.

358 Mindy Aguon, “Guam Gets 90 Days to Review EIS,” KUAM News, October 28, 2009, www.kuam.com/global/story.asp?s=11402872. See also: “90 Days to Comment on Guam/NMI buildup EIS,” *Saipan Tribune*, October 30, 2009, <http://www.saipantribune.com/newsstory.aspx?newsID=94692>.

military buildup in U.S. history.”³⁵⁹ Despite the sheer size and complexity of the DEIS, local groups sprung into action to respond to DEIS and comment on the military buildup plans. The 90 day DEIS review period helped create WAG, which provided an informational website about the buildup and released a series of informational factsheets its impacts.³⁶⁰

We Are Guåhan: Organizing the Opposition

We Are Guåhan condensed the DEIS contents and provided information to the public in an accessible way through a series of documents, their website and communication also shared information about the military buildup.³⁶¹ WAG operates within a network of other organization in the movement against U.S. militarization and colonialism.³⁶² Collaborating with these other organizations, WAG brings international attention about the U.S. military buildup to the global peace and justice movement.³⁶³ WAG describes itself as an “advocate for transparency and democratic participation in

359 T.E. Marler and A. Moore, “Military Threats to Terrestrial Resources Not Restricted to Wartime: A Case Study from Guam,” *Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering* 5 (2011): 1198-1214.

360 Anne Perez Hattori, Simeon Palomo, and Michael Lujan Bevacqua, *Minagahet*, vol. 8, no. 2, August 25, 2010, <http://www.minagahetzine.com/fatfatngafuluhugua.htm>.

361 The group maintains a website that provides information about the military buildup issues, events, news, and opportunities to get involved and take action. They also host an open public forum page on Facebook. As of June 2013, the We Are Guåhan Public Forum on Facebook has a total of 2,357 open members. This forum is an actively updated page that informs the Facebook community about the U.S. military buildup and other pertinent issues facing Guåhan.

362 A social movement is usually comprised of various organizations that strive to achieve particular goals by employing specific rhetorical tactics (Stewart, Smith, and Denton, *Persuasion and Social Movements*, 22). Guåhan organizations include: *I Nasion Chamoru*, *Tao'tao' mona* Native Rights, Guåhan Indigenous Collective, Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice, *Fuetsan Famalo'an*, Women for Genuine Security, *Famoksaian* (in California), and the No U.S. Bases Network. For further discussion of organizational efforts and coalition building throughout Asia and the Pacific, see: Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam,” n. pag.

363 Natividad and Leon-Guerrero, “The Explosive Growth,” 13. Local based efforts have also been organized by Fuetsan Famalao'an a prominent women's community group; these efforts include a project called Tinigo' Famalao'an (women's knowledge) focusing on the island's feminist leaders and their knowledge on the military buildup.

decisions regarding the future of the island.”³⁶⁴ This statement illustrates the simultaneity of both/neither identities for Guåhan. WAG’s discourse signals distinctness and agency for Guåhan, and promotes democracy and transparency for the island. However, these values of democracy and transparency are not reciprocated by the U.S. federal government, which has already unilaterally decided to implement the military buildup without any consultation or input from the local government. In a complex and contradictory fashion, WAG employs the trope of democracy in the midst of an undemocratic and closed process of the implementation of US military policy. WAG summarizes its mission in its founding documents:

Our islands and our people are bracing themselves for a massive change in tides. We Are Guåhan is a multi-ethnic collective of individuals, families and grassroots organizations concerned with the future of our islands. We Are Guåhan aims to inform and engage our community on the various issues concerning the impending military build up. We Are Guåhan aims to unite and mobilize our people to protect and defend our resources and our culture. We Are Guåhan promotes peaceful, positive and prosperous change for our island. We envision a sustainable future for all of Guåhan’s people. All are welcome and necessary!³⁶⁵

In this mission statement, WAG deploys both/neither identities as complex rhetorical devices that establish an inclusive community of locals while simultaneously articulating opposition to U.S. imposed changes even as the island remains intricately bound to U.S. policy. WAG registers “both” identities as it alludes to island connections with the U.S., generated by the community’s preparation for a “massive change in tides” caused by the U.S. nation-state. This mission statement also registers “neither” identities by referencing Guåhan as having a unique and distinct collectivity from the U.S., constructed through the discourse of: “all of Guåhan’s people,” “our islands,” “our people,” “our community,” “our resources,” and our culture.” WAG’s attempt to construct a collective “we” among

364 Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam,” n. pag.

365 We Are Guåhan, <http://weareguahan.com/about-weareguahan/>.

the local population is distressed by the fact that the U.S. has *already mandated* the military relocation for the island. The quickly approaching buildup is a U.S. imposition made possible by the “neither” space that Guåhan occupies as an unincorporated territory.

Public Review & Comment

The three-month DEIS review and comment period prompted a tremendous amount of community response and critique. Hundreds of community members attended the DEIS public hearings, providing their verbal testimonies and submitting 9,000 – 10,000 comments to the Joint Guam Program Office (JGPO).³⁶⁶ The meetings were “dominated by people who were either against the buildup or at least suspicious about how this sort of massive movement of people and rapid haphazard period of development could be beneficial for Guam long-term.”³⁶⁷ Additionally, concerns over the impact of the buildup were rooted in the problematic nature of the DEIS for “virtually ignored the social and cultural implications of the plans,” and for lacking an integrated plan that would address the “social and health care needs of non-active duty connected personnel and their families (such as contract workers and the foreign labor force to meet the construction demands of the island).”³⁶⁸ The public comments also incited anger over land control. The DOD planned to “acquire” an additional 2,200 acres of both public and private lands, including 950 acres for a live firing range at Pãgat village, which stirred up deep resentment, as the plans were reminiscent of the history of U.S. land grabbing and “acquisitions” that have isolated the indigenous people of Guåhan.³⁶⁹ This move also

366 Natividad and Leon-Guerrero, “The Explosive Growth,” 9; Hattori, Palomo, and Bevacqua, *Minagahet*, August 25, 2010, <http://www.minagahetzine.com/fatfatngafuluhugua.htm>.

367 Ibid., <http://www.minagahetzine.com/fatfatngafuluhugua.htm>.

368 Natividad and Leon-Guerrero, “The Explosive Growth,” 9.

369 Natividad and Leon-Guerrero, “The Explosive Growth,” 9; Natividad and Kirk, “Fortress Guam,” n. pag.

signaled the lack of DOD attention toward the peoples' concerns voiced at earlier public hearings. JGPO did not have any manner of recording community sentiment at these later meetings, which further complicated matters and perpetuated negative public perception about the buildup process of public engagement.³⁷⁰

These community concerns utilized a discourse of dislocation, with the local level of arguments against the buildup cohering around concerns about further dislocation from the political, physical, and cultural arenas. Political dislocations were expressed in the overwhelming opposition to the buildup based on the lack of consultation with the local population; not having a voice or vote in the buildup process demonstrated the political disenfranchisement at the local level. The land-taking, crowding out the local population due to the foreign workforce, and the environmental impact on the island are all examples of the physical dislocations communicated in public comments. At the cultural level, comments demonstrate a discourse of dislocation from culture by articulating how advancing the buildup will lead to further oppression and marginalization of the Chamoru people and their culture.³⁷¹ Many community members were left frustrated after articulating their concerns and being met with a subsequent lack of acknowledgment or discourse from the DOD.³⁷²

IN THEIR OWN WORDS: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF *THE GREY PAPERS*

Between 2010 and 2011, WAG produced an informational series called *The Grey Papers (Papers)* that primarily utilized information taken directly out of the DEIS. Consisting of six papers that educated the public about the facts and figures emerging

370 Natividad and Kirk, "Fortress Guam," n. pag.

371 Comments from the Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement on the Guam and CNMI Military Relocation. Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice, "Stop the Military Buildup!," April 30, 2010, p. 39, <http://famoksaianwc.files.wordpress.com/2010/05/newsletter-2-1.pdf>.

372 Natividad and Leon-Guerrero, "The Explosive Growth," 9.

from the DEIS, these documents also assessed the impact the buildup would have on the island. The *Papers* compiled what the government agencies were saying, and what the DEIS said about the military buildup. Each of the papers focused on different core issues surrounding the military relocation, providing brief factsheets that addressed the topics of: Tourism, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Education, Housing, Traffic, and Jungle & Wildlife. Analyzing the *Papers* as rhetorical artifacts demonstrates how both/neither identities are made manifest, and discursive dislocations are expressed about the military buildup from local movement efforts. The *Papers* provided a fitting response to counteract the DOD's problematic process of having locals publicly voice concerns and submit comments. These *Papers* intentionally appropriate the DOD's arguments in order to criticize and directly challenge the military buildup. While strategically using the defense establishment's own language, the *Papers* also reflect the in-between or grey status of Guåhan, evincing the both/neither concept for the island and its peoples. The WAG produced documents articulated both/neither identities through a back and forth engagement and attempted break with the U.S. WAG simultaneously communicates how Guåhan is part of the U.S. as they engage with Pentagon reports, yet this engagement is positioned as part of their arguments about how the U.S. military should leave the island alone. This situation complicates the rhetorical strategy for the movement, as it simultaneously must engage the U.S. in order to try to create a separate identity. The grey color choice for the series is also telling, it parallels how WAG and the local population was precariously positioned in-between the local government struggle to respond to the DEIS and the DOD efforts to externally impose the buildup from the U.S. mainland to Guåhan.

These papers examined the formal responses from various Government of Guam agencies and synthesized an array of local responses with key components of the DEIS

into an accessible and easy to read format for the community. By sharing these findings with the community in a concise way, the *Papers* articulated that issues associated with the buildup and advocacy for Guåhan needed to continue beyond the DEIS review period. Each paper articulated its rationale and purpose:

Although the public commenting period has officially ended, many issues contained in the draft environmental impact statement (“DEIS”) are just now becoming known. In furtherance of its goals to (A) educate the public on the impact of the proposed military buildup, (B) provide the people of Guam with a voice in the buildup process; and (C) promote a sustainable future for Guam, We Are Guåhan presents the Grey Papers, which summarize concerns raised by GovGuam agencies, Guam leaders and other entities regarding the DEIS.³⁷³

As WAG organizer Melvin Won Pat Borja further explained, the papers were intended to “*break down* the documents to understand them and deliver [the information] in a way the people can understand, so that they are not only aware of the concerns that they know about but also the concerns that these technical experts know about.”³⁷⁴ The direct attention toward making the *Papers* a series of accessible content ensured that WAG connected with the broader community that felt excluded and largely ignored by the DEIS process.

Breaking Down the Buildup

The DEIS comment period and the *Papers* argue that instead of considering the military relocation as “building up” the island, it should be considered “breaking down” the existing environment, culture, and livelihood in Guåhan. Michael Lujan Bevacqua explains that thinking about the buildup as a process of “breaking down” helps discuss opinions, representations, and political maneuvers about the military relocation.³⁷⁵ By

373 We Are Guahan, “The Grey Papers” series, <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>.

374 Nick Delgado, “We Are Guahan Issue ‘Grey Papers,’” KUAM News, March 2, 2010, <http://www.kuam.com/story/12067153/we-are-guahan-issue-grey-papers>. Emphasis Added.

375 Hattori, Palomo, and Bevacqua, *Minagahet*, August 25, 2010, <http://www.minagahetzine.com/fatfatngafuluhugua.htm>.

breaking down the complex language of the DEIS, the *Papers* series simultaneously function to deconstruct the arguments supporting the buildup in order to refute them. The We Are Guåhan website urged: “Read The Grey Papers. Short. Straight. In Their Own Words.”³⁷⁶ Written in the very language and grounded in the content of the DEIS, the *Papers* rhetorically constructed opposition to the military buildup as well researched and factually accurate. By naming their series “grey,” WAG discursively communicates that the buildup was an extremely complex issue that could not easily be considered black or white, nor cut and dry. Instead, there were many objectives of the U.S. relocation that remained unclear, and generally grey. It is from this in-between position, that the *Papers* articulate opposition to the largest military base realignment of the twenty-first century.

The *Papers* were released for the local Guåhan population as the target audience, they were distributed online and through local media newspapers which have a high rate of readership on the island and among Chamorus in diaspora.³⁷⁷ These *Papers* employed a fact-checking style that positioned the local resistance to the buildup within the logical terrain of the DEIS information, effectively communicating the strength of the local case against the military relocation.³⁷⁸ These rhetorical techniques provided validity for the local knowledge and apprehension toward militarization, and by appropriating the framework of the DEIS the *Papers* inherently problematized the military buildup. The

377 For a discussion of Guåhan print newspaper readership, messages, and opinion expression on local political issues, see: Francis S. Dalisay, “The Spiral of Silence and Conflict Avoidance: Examining Antecedents of Opinion Expression Concerning the U.S. Military Buildup in the Pacific Island of Guam,” *Communication Quarterly* 60 (2012): 481-503; Francis S. Dalisay, “Social Control in an American Pacific Island: Guam's Local Newspaper Reports on Liberation,” *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 33 (2009): 239-257.

378 Michael Dobbs, “The Rise of Political Fact-Checking, How Reagan Inspired a Journalistic Movement: A Reporter’s Eye View,” New America Foundation (Media Policy Initiative Research Paper, February 2012), http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/The_Rise_of_Political_Fact-checking.pdf.pdf. Fact-checking is a movement most linked to political campaigns, it offers a tool for exposing the truth in a landscape of political spin and media manipulation.

existence of the DEIS language within the *Papers* further complicated any establishment response against local activists opposing the buildup; they were now armed with hard-hitting facts taken directly from the military's mouth.

These documents provided analysis about details of the buildup that might not have otherwise been considered. Attorney and WAG member Leevin Camacho explained, "What do we mean in concrete terms of the traffic, tourism is another thing, there's news about the 18,000 workers that are going to be housed near Tamuning you know, what type of impact is that going to have on our tourism industry?"³⁷⁹ This focus on tourism is a primary part of WAG's overall critique of the military buildup. The *Papers* address topics that at first glance could seem tangential to the U.S. military relocation; however, these documents rhetorically constructed the buildup as an imposed plan that would have massive negative impacts for the island. In this way, WAG provided a direct refutation of the buildup through the *Papers* and influenced public discourse about a sizeable spectrum of wrongs. Each of the *Papers* draws a connection between local knowledge and submitted comments about the buildup, placing these specifics alongside/in relation to the complete DEIS. For every issue raised from local authorities, organizations, or even individuals, the *Papers* cite the DEIS to illustrate how these locally fought campaigns directly connect to the buildup information. The *Papers* also revealed the areas where the DEIS lacked information or attention to particular issues about the buildup.³⁸⁰

WAG's *The Grey Papers* evoke the both/neither concept in several ways. By utilizing "Grey" for the series' name, activists encourage the perception of the documents as both and neither: The color grey is *both* black and white together, but in mixture

379 Delgado, "Guahan Issue 'Grey Papers,'" n. pag.

380 Tiffany Sukola, "Guam expects 8,000 additional students by 2014," *Marianas Variety*, April 15, 2010, <http://www.mvariety.com/component/content/article/1/25643>.

becomes neither one. WAG's members were likewise mixed both *in favor of* and *against* the buildup. This space between parallels what James Perez Viernes has discussed about Guåhan, where Chamorus must navigate the space between "their indigenous identity and the experience of living under U.S. colonialism in the twenty-first century."³⁸¹

Released by WAG as an informational strategy and direct response to the buildup, the *Papers* were at once positioned between the DEIS and the buildup process. Educating people about the buildup led to criticism against WAG by those that wanted more direct action against the military relocation instead of engaging the DOD's process and providing the information to the public. Furthermore, WAG was challenged for not demanding deeper decolonization efforts, or organizing in conjunction with broader demilitarization efforts in the Pacific.

To better understand the complexities of *The Grey Papers* and the communicative tactics employed by WAG, I split the series into two parts, addressing the documents by the social and environmental themes. Released in 2010, the first four of the *Papers* addressed tourism, the EPA, education, and housing. The final two *Papers* released in 2011 focused on traffic and the jungle. Part one of the rhetorical analysis addresses social issues, such as tourism, education, and housing. Part two combines the papers focused on environmental issues, EPA, traffic, and the jungle.

The Grey Papers Part One: Tourism, Education, & Housing

After the military, tourism is the second largest private industry on Guåhan.³⁸² The tourism *Papers* condenses the Guam Visitor's Bureau (GVB) response to the DEIS. It first provide four key points from the GVB and proceeds to follow a back and forth

381 Viernes explores "...how Chamorros navigate the space between their indigenous identity and the experience of living under US colonialism in the twenty-first century." Viernes, "Won't You Please," 104.

382 Global Insight, *The Economic Impact & Tourism Satellite Account Perspective: Guam Tourism in 2005 Tourism Reporting, the Next Generation* (Global Insight Inc., 2007).

pattern, providing information from the DEIS. By breaking down information from the GVB in rotation with DEIS facts and figures, the *Papers* provide a direct link between the GVB concerns and the military buildup plans. The predicted impacts of the buildup on the tourism industry spans across several areas, including: market loss due to militarization, ocean tourism, blocked growth of Chinese and Russian markets, and tourism related jobs.

The *Papers* uses the term “militarization” when discussing the buildup. This language choice serves a strategic function by coupling it with negative impacts such as devastating the local economy:

GVB predicts that the militarization of Guam will reduce the number of tourists by 10%, or 80,000 visitors. With each visitor having total expenditures of \$1,471.90, this equates to an approximate economic loss of \$118 million.

Monetary losses are also anticipated effects on ocean tourism. In particular, “Restricted access to cultural landmarks and or the closure of ocean-based tourist sites could lead to a \$4.8 million loss to Guam’s economy.”³⁸³ This example illustrates how the buildup is articulated in terms of physical dislocations, from “restricted access” to “closure” the GVB argues against the plans that will isolate those coming to Guåhan. Focusing again on the economic effects of militarization, the *Papers* highlight how the buildup process will result in overall market. The GVB argued:

Relocating 8,000 Marines[,] their families, and support personnel impact [sic] the island’s tourism landscape and ‘Sense of Place,’ thereby diminishing its attractiveness to those seeking solitude from Japan’s hectic lifestyle.³⁸⁴

Arguing that an effect of the military relocation would disrupt the “Sense of Place,” the GVB reveals a discourse of physical dislocation. This example articulates how the island

383 GVB Impact Perspective, p. 21-22, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GVB on Tourism,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.

384 GVB Response, p. 8, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GVB on Tourism,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.

would be physically disrupted and the viability of the tourism industry would be put in jeopardy. Right alongside this concern of a diminishing sense of place, the *Papers* positions a DEIS quote that “the supplanting of a cultural tourism branding for one that is more militarized appears to be a strong possibility.”³⁸⁵ The DEIS language of “supplanting” signals the replacement of existing cultural tourism with a more “militarized” environment regardless of the costs. In examining cultural tourism, Dean MacCannell considers the movement of indigenous people into the centers of power, and the movement of inhabitants from the centers to ‘primitive’ and remote margins.³⁸⁶ MacCannell argues there is an “emerging dialectic between two ways of being-out-of-place,” that signals the containment and control of creativity through new forms of authority.³⁸⁷ This dialectic helps examine the double displacement of culture that occurs from periphery to center and vice versa.³⁸⁸ Such double displacement is communicated through a discourse of physical dislocations that emerges in the focus on the economic benefits of visitors to the island. By incorporating arguments about the problems the buildup could pose on the tourism industry the *Papers* legitimizes the tourist economy in the first place—an economy created and sustained by Guåhan’s colonial dependency on the U.S.

Since the advent of tourism, the most isolated regions of the world have become havens for modernized peoples and capital; this is a phenomenon that has strong implications for both tourists visiting these foreign areas, and the indigenous inhabitants

385 Department of the Navy, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation,” Department of Defense, Executive Summary, November, 2009, DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p. 4-39, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GVB on Tourism,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.

386 Lucy Lippard, foreword to *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, by Dean MacCannell (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), xi.

387 Dean MacCannell, *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers* (London: Routledge, 1992), 5. The dialectic also represents a release of creativity through the synthetic arrangement of life.

388 Ibid., 8.

of the locales.³⁸⁹ Tourism is dependent upon Otherness as a key component of the industry, because for the majority of people “otherness makes the destination attractive for consumption by establishing its distinctiveness.”³⁹⁰ Complicating the efforts to maintain Guåhan as a distinct tourist destination, are the simultaneous efforts to prevent the U.S. military from influencing the industry. The *Papers* argue that the buildup will continue to block Chinese and Russian markets due to DOD security concerns, yet this restriction on tourist visas hinders the growth of tourism revenues.³⁹¹ Although not challenging the unsustainable nature of the tourism industry writ large, the *Papers* do demonstrate the problems faced by the local economy due to U.S. imposed security measures. Bringing this issue to the forefront is paramount, although it raises the question of whether or not the *Papers* might have instead utilized these rhetorical devices to create a broader critique of the tourist economy as a direct outcome of U.S. colonization and dependency upon the nation-state rather than simply positing that the military buildup poses a threat to tourism and the economy.

Aggregating commercial activities, tourism also represents “an ideological framing of history, nature, and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs.”³⁹² Guåhan exhibits this ideological framing of its tourism industry, and in doing so the island reinvents its dependency upon the U.S. The *Papers* also points out that the DEIS does not address the impact that the predicted loss in tourism revenues would have on tourism related jobs. This imbalance and lack of concern

389 Ibid., 2.

390 C. Michael Hall, “Making the Pacific Globalization, Modernity and Myth,” in *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism*, ed. Greg Ringer (New York: Routledge, 1998), 140.

391 “Without the inclusion of China and Russia...the island’s tourism revenues will shrink from \$1.2 billion to \$810 million annually. Inclusion of these two countries, however, will not replace this -32% loss from attritions in our traditional markets.” GVB DEIS Response, p.9, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GVB on Tourism,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.

392 MacCannell, *Empty Meeting Grounds*, 1.

for the surrounding economy from the DEIS has spill over effects to areas beyond tourism. As the next papers in the series demonstrate, the costs of the buildup were also environmental and educational.

The paper in the series titled, “DOE on Education” begins by simply stating “our children, our future.” This move of identity formation and collectivity of the community around children and the future of the island sends a strong signal as the paper continues to lay out the Department of Education and the GVB’s concerns about the buildup. The opening 4 points of contention relay the primary areas of concern as the “increase in students and demand for teachers” and the “demand for new schools and facilities” as a result of the buildup. Following the same back and forth pattern of engagement, the DOES responses to the DEIS are placed in rotation or alongside the DEIS.

Quotes and tables from the DEIS predictions on student and teacher increases are provided with the *Papers* then pointing out errors with these calculations. For example, the *Papers* states, “The DEIS predicts up to almost 8,000 more students in our public schools at the peak of the buildup.”³⁹³ This number is illustrated with a table of projected increases from 2011-2016. Beneath the DEIS figures on student population growth, the *Papers* explains these numbers do not include students eligible to attend DOD schools.³⁹⁴ This means the overall student population could be dramatically larger than originally indicated once the military schools are consider. Overall, the lack of attention to local concerns for education is expressed through this break down of student increases from the relocation.

393 Department of the Navy, “Military Relocation,” DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p.4-46, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.

394 Specifically, the DEIS vol. 2, ch. 16, p.69 explains the Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary (DDESS) schools would absorb the increases. Quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” *The Grey Papers*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.

Using collective language, the *Papers* explain, “The increases in the students would require up to 532 more teachers in our classrooms.”³⁹⁵ These DEIS “calculations are made based on the assumption that the DOE has 1 teacher for every 14 students in our elementary schools, 1 teacher for every 14 students in our middle schools, and 1 teacher for every 19 students in our high schools.”³⁹⁶ However, the DOE has challenged these figures arguing that “the assumptions made in the DEIS about class sizes are incorrect...the maximum number of students ranges from 18 to 25 in elementary school. The maximum class size in middle and high school is 28.”³⁹⁷ Thus, the *Papers* problematizes the figures, arguing they do not account for all potential student population increases and the incorrect assumption about the teacher-student ratio in Guåhan.

In its initial 4 contention points, the *Papers* creates division between the civilian education system on the island and the DOD school population. Ultimately, the military relocation raises concerns about the pressures of population growth and their affect across all of the education sectors. The DOE also considers the costs, estimating that the amount needed to service the growing student population would be more than 70% of the total DOE expected budget.³⁹⁸ This figure is telling of the exorbitant divide created by the U.S. military relocation, putting a severe strain on local services and potentially jeopardizing the education system as a whole. Such a stark economic impact on the education system is conveyed as overwhelming, and impossible to achieve given the parameters and DOD timeline. Further evidence of the economics are provided on the final page of the *Papers*

395 Department of the Navy, “Military Relocation,” DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p.4-48, The Grey Papers, (See above, n. 393).

396 Department of the Navy, “Military Relocation,” DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p.4-44, The Grey Papers, (See above, n. 393).

397 Governor’s Compilation, p. 47, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.

398 See point 4, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.

where side-by-side black and white boxes present information from both sides about the cost. The box on the right is white and presents the DOE information, explaining the need to create 9 new schools at an estimated cost of \$134,682, 029.³⁹⁹ In contrast, the accompanying black text box on the left simply reads: “The DEIS does not address the need or costs of new schools to support the increase in student population.”⁴⁰⁰ By positioning the lack of information from the DEIS in black, the *Papers* draw attention to the shortcomings of the DOD and simultaneously create a chasm between the supposed benefits of the buildup and the DOE. This visual presentation also aligns with the dislocating discourse from the *Papers*, that positions the DEIS far from valuing anything local and puts the educational future of the island’s children into question from the resulting relocation. Beyond the presentation of facts, the *Papers* were rhetorically complex documents that reached the population through local distribution and online platforms.⁴⁰¹ In reading and discussing these *Papers*, people responded to the buildup in more concrete ways after they had received the facts and figures in a palatable way. The local population recognized and appreciated that the *Papers* gave them an opportunity to read directly what the U.S. and local agencies were saying about the buildup. This had an effect on local conversations about the buildup, leading to more nuanced discussions about the effects besides jumping to conclusions that the relocation would result in “more jobs” and would “help the economy.”

399 Guam Governor’s Compilation, p. 52, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.

400 We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.

401 The We Are Guahan website featured all of the *Papers*, and local newspapers often featured stories and bylines about the events, activities, and efforts of WAG. This included announcing the *Papers* series as they were released and providing the direct web link for readers to access the documents.

The Grey Papers titled, “GHURA on Housing” was the longest in the series at five pages.⁴⁰² While not a lengthy document by any means, the brevity of the *Papers* stands out in comparison to the 11,000 page multi-volume document these papers set out to explain and condense. The paper begins with 8 main GHURA concerns and argues the DEIS is “deafeningly silent” on how to mitigate the “significant impact” of the buildup on the housing market in Guåhan. This tactic reveals the strategic silences of the DEIS about the leading community concerns, especially the civilian housing deficit that will result from the buildup. The GHURA comment states, “It is a major concern that the DOD has no mitigation response or recommendations for this ‘significant impact’ not to be addressed by the proponents of these actions.”⁴⁰³ A government agency of Guåhan, GHURA reprimands the DOD by identifying them as the primary “proponents” of the buildup yet they fail to address the key implications of its plans.

The *Papers* first provide background on the housing situating in Guåhan by explaining the home ownership rate as “one of the lowest in the United States. Based on a 2009 survey, the current homeownership rate is only slightly higher in 2009 (49.5%) than in 2000.”⁴⁰⁴ This statistic sets the tone for the subsequent layout of the DEIS and GHURA information on housing. It also positions Guåhan within the larger terrain of the United States, a move that signals the attempt to be considered part of the U.S. nation-state and held in comparison with other states. This rhetorical maneuver of the *Papers* is a thought-provoking element; the locals used U.S. statistics as a reference point within the documents while simultaneously insisting on particularity as an island and a people. This example demonstrates the complex nature of both/neither identities. Even as WAG

402 GHURA, also known as Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority.

403 GHURA DEIS Comment, p. 1, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GHURA on Housing,” <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>.

404 Guam Comprehensive Housing Study of 2009 (GCHS) p.v, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GHURA on Housing,” <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>

worked to rhetorically establish a local collective identity, this identity formation was often characterized *in relation to* the U.S. nation. Such characterization also influences WAG's discussion of the buildup effects "on-island," versus the impending forces coming from "off-island."

Addressing the civilian housing demand, the DEIS predicts that 33,000 of the total population increase will be "off-island workers and their dependents moving to Guam for reasons not directly related to the buildup, such as non-military related construction projects."⁴⁰⁵ Calling attention to the "off-island" workforce that will need housing subsequently alludes to the physical and political dislocations that could result from the buildup. The foreigners from "off-island" will need housing, disrupting the physical landscape of the island for these temporary workers. An outside workforce will also have the opportunity to remain "on island" beyond the project, meaning they could influence local elections as they become residents of Guåhan. Here the *Papers* employ a discursive tactic of fear appeals by constructing the "off-island" area as foreign, non-local, and problematic. The use of "off-island" as a negative connotation also signals the negative effects of the U.S. military buildup, which is being implemented from afar and will be coming into the shores and island space of Guåhan. Additionally, the *Papers* indicate that DEIS estimates assume "that all military personnel will live on-base, and that H-2B workers will not generate any demand in the private market."⁴⁰⁶ Given the large population of military personnel that resides outside of government housing, the *Papers* calls attention to the problem of assuming the population increase will only affect

405 Reference to DEIS Executive Summary, p. ES-7, We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: "GHURA on Housing," <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>.

406 Department of the Navy, "Military Relocation," DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p. 4-13, 4-21, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: "GHURA on Housing," <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>.

the military housing areas.⁴⁰⁷ References to “on-base” and “off-island” are realities of the dislocating discourse in the *Papers* that subtly constructs Guåhan as a space carved up between the military and foreigners against the local population on the island.

In crafting a local collective identity, WAG relies upon labeling “foreign” and “outside” populations. These rhetorical devices also reveal both/neither identities, such that Chamorus and the local populations are understood by coupling against internal *and* external divisions. Simultaneously criticizing the exterior and the interior as foreign and threatening reflects an identity crisis about where the locals and indigenous population “fit” within their own island terrain. Internally, WAG explains that the island will suffer from military personnel who do not dwell solely “on-base” and from foreign workers who remain on the island and become naturalized citizens. Both of these situations pose threats to locals already “on island.” WAG highlights the problematic nature of citizenship in Guåhan by arguing these foreign workers and military personnel pose a threat to local elections. Because of its political status with the U.S., Guåhan citizens lack federal political power and therefore stake a strong claim to their local elections. Externally, the military buildup will bring a great deal of “off-island” forces to the island shores. These plans will threaten the landscape and also jeopardize what is already on the island. Articulating opposition to “outside” or “off-island” influences simultaneously works to build connections among the local population while also highlighting the dual nature of Guåhan as a U.S. colony. WAG warns of external influence, yet these outside effects are directly from the U.S. nation-state and its policies.

407 GHURA released the Guam Comprehensive Housing Study months before the DEIS, indicating that 20% of active duty and dependents will live off base under a minimum impact model with the figure jumping to 28% for the heavier impact model. See PCR Environmental, Inc., “Guam Comprehensive Housing Study,” p.54, 60, August 31, 2009, http://www.smshawaii.com/pdfs/GCHS_2009_Report.pdf.

The *Papers* also address questions of housing supply. The core housing challenges identified as: financial viability of new contracts, labor and materials scarcity, and permitting bottlenecks. The *Papers* breaks down each of these areas, and includes images from well-recognized abandoned buildings. The *Papers* use discourse from the DEIS in tandem with these images of abandoned buildings to rhetorically articulate opposition to the buildup. Embedding images of dilapidated buildings, such as the Sherwood Resort that has remained an abandoned eyesore since 2002, alongside the DEIS housing information discursively constructs a negative sentiment about the buildup and its effects.⁴⁰⁸ The island imagery discursively articulates arguments about the military relocation even as these photographs do not depict military construction projects.

With these images of destruction and abandonment, the *Papers* provides DEIS facts about an over-supply of housing after the construction period. This over-supply will result in “substantial losses for developers and landlords” and maintenance problems from the “large numbers of unoccupied units,” confirming readers’ fears that the impending buildup will cause damage on par with what is depicted by the accompanying images.⁴⁰⁹ As if ensuring that readers understood the negative impact the buildup would have, the *Papers* goes on to quote the DEIS about the buildup. Explaining that outcomes of “increased crowding, illegal units, and homelessness would occur as responses to substantial increases in housing costs.”⁴¹⁰ Sentence fragment/

408 Clint Ridgell, “Verona Resort and Spa (Formerly Sherwood) Still Working on New Occupancy Permit Application,” *Pacific News Center*, October 31, 2012, http://pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=28609:verona-resort-a-spa-formerly-sheraton-still-working-on-new-occupancy-permit-application&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156. The Sherwood Resort closed in 2002 after Super typhoon Pongsona and came under new ownership in 2012, but has yet to obtain proper permitting. Another abandoned building pictured is the Old Hong Kong Restaurant in Tamuning.

409 Department of the Navy, “Military Relocation,” DEIS vol.9, Appendix F, p.4-17

410 Ibid.

Furthermore, GHURA indicates that construction for the Marine Corps Relocation will take priority over what, leaving shortages of materials for civilian housing and putting an already understaffed permitting system in danger of backlog. These problems will result in the inability to meet construction demands for the buildup. By communicating about the housing impasse in this way, WAG creates division, demonstrating through discursive tactics the disconnect from the military to the civilian sector's needs and concerns about the island. Tourism, education, and housing are closely connected with concern for the broader environment, and the response the DOD received from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency about the DEIS.

The Grey Papers Part Two: Jungle, Traffic, and the EPA

In April 2010, *The Grey Papers* explained that the EPA had handed down the harshest possible rating to the DEIS by deeming it “environmentally unsatisfactory.”⁴¹¹ The EPA also scored the DEIS with “inadequate information” and argued the buildup “should not proceed as proposed.”⁴¹² This “inadequate” ruling commanded the U.S. military to rewrite its environmental impact statement and submit a new draft.⁴¹³ Only two-pages long, the document consists of “10 Reasons Why the DEIS is ‘Unsatisfactory.’” The list covers an array of environmental problems from water and infrastructure to environmental justice deficiencies. Citing the EPA’s ninety-five page response, the *Papers* challenge the DOD’s lack of information on financing improvements to water and wastewater systems, and outdated studies used about aquifer

411 Teri Weaver, “EPA Analysis Finds Military’s Plan for Guam Growth is ‘Inadequate,’” *Stars and Stripes*, February 27, 2010, <http://www.stripes.com/news/epa-analysis-finds-military-s-plan-for-guam-growth-is-inadequate-1.99496>; the EPA submitted its response to the DEIS on February 17, 2010 (the end date of the DEIS review & comment period).

412 Ibid.

413 Following the new EIS, an additional public comment period would be held to assess the revised plans.

safety. The EPA argued that the population living off base could be exposed to “water borne diseases from sewage and run-off water mixing with our drinking water.”⁴¹⁴ This information is printed in a black text box, positioned alongside a bright colorful image of a young child drinking clear water from a water fountain. Coupling the DOD plans that cause water contamination with imagery of clean water for children has a powerful effect of solidifying opposition to the relocation and its negative effects on the environment. The *Paper* also includes a short list of resources that link readers directly to the EPA official statement and provide local and regional news articles about the EPA’s response.

The final two documents in the *Papers* series examined issues of traffic and jungle & wildlife.⁴¹⁵ These were the two shortest papers of the series and condensed information from Guåhan government agency responses to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), which was released in July 2010.⁴¹⁶ The “DPW on Traffic” provides 7 points from the Guam Department of Public Works and the FEIS. The *Papers* demonstrates the primary traffic concerns relate to the effects of the buildup on civilian roadways and infrastructure, stating:

The Final EIS says that more than half of the 43 proposed off-base road ‘improvement’ projects are strengthening pavement for DOD’s heavy trucks.⁴¹⁷

According to the Final EIS, at the peak of the buildup, 24 out of 28 traffic lights in central Guam will have unacceptable wait times.⁴¹⁸

414 EPA report, p. 83 cited in “U.S. EPA Comments on the DEIS,” *The Grey Papers*, weareguahan.com

415 Lannie Walker, “We Are Guahan Publishes Latest Grey Paper,” KUAM News, February 24, 2011, <http://www.kuam.com/story/14139041/2011/02/25/we-are-guahan-publishes-latest-grey-paper>; We Are Guahan Warning Traffic Woes Will Be Worse During Buildup,” Pacific News Center, February 25, 2011, http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=11832:qwe-are-guahanq-warning-traffic-woes-worse-during-buildup&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156

416 Department of the Navy, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation,” Department of Defense, Executive Summary, July, 2010, http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/final/summary/Executive_Summary.pdf

417 Department of the Navy, “Military Relocation,” Final EIS vol.6, chapter 2, p.2-137. Referenced in the “DPW on Traffic,” *The Grey Papers*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/14/us-epa-on-the-deis/>

418 Department of the Navy, “Military Relocation,” Final EIS, vol. 6, Chapter 4, p.74, Referenced in the “DPW on Traffic,” *The Grey Papers*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/14/us-epa-on-the-deis/>.

Both of these examples begin by referencing the FEIS and then create division between the military and civilian sector. By discussing the purpose and outcome of the DOD plans, the first example illustrates road improvements outside the base will be targeted for roads frequented by military vehicles. The second example highlights the direct impact that the buildup will have on civilian traffic. The predicted traffic problems are also supported by the DPW, the *Paper* indicates: “DPW’s 2030 Guam Transportation Plan estimates that there will be a 50% increase in the number of cars on main roads during the buildup.”⁴¹⁹ This increase in vehicles on the roads “will make traffic delays more than 4 times longer than they would be without the buildup.”⁴²⁰ Taken together, this *Paper* provides information about the FEIS and the DPW that local traffic and delays will be exacerbated by the buildup.

The “EIS on Jungle & Wildlife” was released in April 2011, its 5 points about the buildup center around limestone forests and local wildlife. The first three points address the limestone forests, a unique ecological formation in Guåhan. The *Papers* states that 80% of the limestone forests on Guåhan are now located on DOD property.⁴²¹ The buildup plans will destroy “over 2,000 acres of limestone and scrub forest for military housing and operations,” an amount of destruction that is “larger than Hagåtña and Mongmong-Toto-Maite combined.”⁴²² Signaling the location of the limestone forests within DOD land demonstrates the restricted access of these spaces to the broader public. By referencing the villages of Hagåtña and Mongmong-Toto-Maite, the *Papers* relate to

419 Transportation Plan, p.5-7.

420 Transportation Plan, p.4-21

421 Guam Compensatory Mitigation Policy (March 2009) p.17, referenced in “EIS on Jungle & Wildlife,” *The Grey Papers*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/04/13/dod-plans-on-destroying-2000-acres-of-jungle/>.

422 The figure is “the total of forest ‘removed’ based on figures found in Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the EIS. Village sizes from the Census Bureau: Hagåtña: 2,33,830, Mongmong-Toto-Maite: 4,785,756 m² or 1,760 acres. Quoted in the We Are Guahan, *The Grey Papers*: “EIS on Jungle & Wildlife,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/04/13/dod-plans-on-destroying-2000-acres-of-jungle/>.

inhabitants who are familiar with the island geography and the size of these locales. Adding to the impact, the *Papers* explain that DOD plans also call for the “destruction of over 1,300 acres of recovery habitat for the endangered *fanihi*, Mariana crow, and Micronesian kingfisher.”⁴²³ *Fanihi* is the Chamoru term for the Mariana fruit bat, by using the local name the *Papers* creates common ground with the inhabitants of Guåhan who know about the islands wildlife and its endangered status. These statements are accompanied by images of the jungle and the Micronesian kingfisher resting on a branch, visually symbolizing the wildlife that will be lost through jungle destruction and restricted land access.

By employing the terms “destroying,” “at risk” and “endangered” to discuss the impact of the proposed buildup on Guåhan’s jungle and wildlife, WAG communicates the negative effects while simultaneously breaking down the FEIS in a relatable way for the local population. The documents in the series focusing on traffic and the jungle follow the same format used in the EPA paper. They do feature charts or background information on the particular issue, such as the tourism, education, and housing *Papers*. However, these documents that address environmental considerations take a more straightforward approach of simply providing a list of concerns gleaned from government agencies or WAG’s assessment of the DEIS and FEIS documents. This final page of *The Grey Papers* series highlights the importance of the local environment and the land, by pushing for attention and concern about the impact the buildup will have on the local jungle and wildlife.

423 Vol. 10, Chapter 10, p.10-178. Referenced in the We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “EIS on Jungle & Wildlife,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/04/13/dod-plans-on-destroying-2000-acres-of-jungle/>. *Fanihi* refers to the Mariana fruit bat.

ASSESSING THE RHETORICAL POWER OF “GREY”

The Grey Papers series are important artifacts within the repertoire of We Are Guåhan’s activities to respond to the DEIS and educate the local community about the facts of the U.S. military buildup plans. These *Papers* provided a way of resonating with the local population by using discursive devices that broke down the complex DEIS information into a relatable format. The *Papers* crafted a collective identity through the rhetorical devices of imagery from the local landscape and employing the Chamoru language. These mechanisms constructed a sense of local belonging in Guåhan as the *Papers* articulated opposition to the U.S. Employing the DOD’s own words and information to express disagreement with the U.S. military buildup provided an effective means of challenging the common sense of U.S. militarization in Guåhan.

At the same time that the *Papers* resonated with a local collective identity, they also positioned themselves within the terrain of both/neither identities as simultaneously part of and not quite fitting with the U.S. This both/neither construction is evident in the *Papers* use of a “grey” discourse that lies murkily between identifying as part of the U.S. yet making comparisons to the U.S. in terms of national statistics and locales. In this way, the *Papers* demonstrate the complexity of articulating opposition to the military buildup from a grey space. These documents fall within the U.S. framework, especially in their deployment of U.S. discourse directly from the DOD. Residing within this frame makes it difficult to move beyond, to shift to a more critical space of challenging U.S. militarization by opposing the forces of colonization that have justified military buildup in the first place. Additionally, using the U.S. framework also complicates the self-frames employed by We Are Guåhan such that the movement articulates itself through overt definitions and references to the U.S. These rhetorical complexities impact the way that the organization was perceived and also the efficacy of their demands.

In Chapter 5, I chart the next wave of local level activism for We Are Guåhan. I examine social movement activities from 2010 to 2012. This timeline focuses on the efforts of the local community to educate, preserve, and protect the ancient Chamoru village of Pãgat. In this chapter I consider the vexed rhetorical positions of both/neither identities emerging from the local population and WAG's organized activities. I discuss the hikes, bus stop paintings, and the joint lawsuit filed against the Department of Defense.

Chapter 5: Protecting & Defending Pãgat

Since 1974, the ancient village of Pãgat has been registered as an archaeological site in the Guam National Register of Historic Places; this is a designation of historic significance, given by the U.S. National Park Service.⁴²⁴ In 2010, The National Trust for Historic Preservation also identified Pãgat as one the 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.⁴²⁵ The list is comprised of the most endangered places in the United States, described as “architectural, cultural, or natural importance that are at risk of destruction or extreme damage.”⁴²⁶ Located along the northeast coastline of Guåhan, Pãgat is about three miles east of the village of Yigo. The area dates to 700 A.D. and contains “remains of prehistoric structural stone foundations, known as lattes, freshwater caves, medicinal plants, as well as stone mortars, pottery and tools of the Chamorro people.”⁴²⁷ It is one of the “last remaining and best preserved pre-colonial site[s] owned by the Government of Guam,” offering one of the most tangible connections to the island’s ancient past; it is “frequented by educators, traditional healers, fishermen and the public at large.”⁴²⁸ This deep historical connection influences the belief among Chamorus that “Pãgat is a

424 John L. Craib, “Pãgat,” *Guampedia*, last modified October 1, 2012, guampedia.com/pagat. See also: Georg Fritz, *The Chamorro: A History and Ethnography of the Mariana Islands*, 2nd ed. (Saipan: CNMI Division of Historic Preservation, 2001).

425 “11 Most Endangered Places: Pãgat,” *National Trust for Historic Preservation*, 2010, <http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/11-most-endangered/locations/pagat.html#.Ugu8RxYc3CE>.

426 Wire Staff, “The 11 Most Endangered Historic Places,” *CNN*, May 19, 2010, <http://www.cnn.com/2010/TRAVEL/05/19/endangered.historic.places/index.html>.

427 “11 Most Endangered Places: Pãgat,” (see above, n. 425).

428 Stephanie Meeks, “National Trust for Historic Preservation Wins Major Victory in Protecting Guam’s Historic Pãgat Village,” *National Trust*, November 17, 2011, <http://www.preservationnation.org/who-we-are/press-center/press-releases/2011/guam-historic-pagat-village.html>; see also: “Pãgat,” *Not One More Acre*, www.notonemoreacre.com

dwelling place for the souls of their ancestors” and they visit the area often to seek advice and engage in traditional and religious activities.”⁴²⁹

In spite of the history and the present cultural significance of this space, the DOD planned to construct a live firing range complex immediately adjacent to and directed toward Pāgat Village.⁴³⁰ While a number of elements surrounding the buildup were controversial, the one most highly contested element was the DOD’s plans for Pāgat. In November 2010, We Are Guåhan joined the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Guam Preservation Trust to file a lawsuit against the DOD; this joint effort challenged the building of a complex of firing ranges at Pāgat Village.⁴³¹ This legal campaign culminated in the DOD considering alternative locations for the firing range, and completing another environmental impact statement.⁴³²

To better understand this local activism, I consider the aftermath of the release of the DOD’s Record of Decision, which sparked outcry over the plans for Pāgat Village.⁴³³ I focus on November 2010 through January 2012 since this timeline captures the actions organized by We Are Guåhan, including their community rally, heritage hikes, bus stop paintings, and the joint lawsuit against the DOD. I also consider the role of WAG within the broader coalition of local organizations that collaborated to challenge the firing range plans. Considering these events as a set of rhetorical artifacts, I argue that WAG’s tactic

429 Meeks, “National Trust,” (See chap. 5 n.428)

430 Arin Greenwood, “Guam Under Fire. Lawsuit Filed Against Department of Defense,” November 17, 2010, <http://www.preservationnation.org/magazine/story-of-the-week/2010/guam-under-fire.html#.UgwQZpLVAFU>

431 Ibid.

432 Kevin Kerrigan, “JGPO’s Capt Cuff Says Supplemental EIS Was Not Prompted by Pagat Lawsuit,” *PNC*, February 10, 2012, http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=20830:jgpo-says-supplemental-eis-was-not-prompted-by-pagat-lawsuit&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156

433 Joint Guam Program Office, “Navy Releases Record of Decision for Guam/Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Relocation,” *Joint Guam Program Office*, September 20, 2010, www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=56105

relies upon discursive constructions of Pāgat as a village site that is deeply connected to Chamoru history, culture, and the environment. These representations of Pāgat functioned to mobilize the local campaign to respect and restore their surrounding environment, and to challenge the DOD by creating strong opposition to the military buildup.

The rhetoric of WAG's activism corresponds with overlapping cultural, environmental, and historical concerns. Examining the spectrum of artifacts from 2010-2012, I argue that by utilizing historical-cultural-environmental discourse the local activism positioned their actions within the broader cultural framework of *inafa' maolek*. This framework offers a mode of communicating that begins to shift beyond both/neither identities that are dependent upon the U.S. to articulate self. A concept of restoring harmony or order, the cultural values of *inafa' maolek* provided an effective mode of communicating and organizing the community around Pāgat by discursively articulating deep cultural connections and galvanized opposition to the military's plans for the area.⁴³⁴ This concept is not an essential characteristic of the Chamoru people but a rhetorical production and a strategy for articulating collectivity within the movement. This strategic move aligns with Spivak's call for the practice of strategic essentialism as a strategy for moments of representation as well as a conceptual device to address essentialist ideas.⁴³⁵ Using *inafa' maolek* as a cultural framework for analysis illuminates the how activism focused on the local environment, culture, and history in order to assert the need for mutual respect and care for Pāgat and the broader island community. Often weaving interconnections among these concerns, local activism demonstrates resistance through

434 Translated into "to make good," *inafa' maolek* describes the foundation of Chamoru culture (see discussion of the concept in Chapter 3).

435 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Greenberg (Chicago: University of Illinois Press); and, "In a Word: Interview." *Differences 1* (1989): 124-156.

its articulations of “cultural resources” and “environmental stewardship” connecting to a deep “historical framework” for the island. These articulations resonate with the local and indigenous population to craft identity among the inhabitants against the buildup, yet at the same time they must grapple with the U.S. nation-state and characterizations of the island as part and parcel of U.S. militarization without representation.

INAFĀ’ MAOLEK: RESTORING THE CULTURAL, ENVIRONMENTAL, & HISTORICAL BALANCE

Cultural resources are “the symbolic tools that movements wield in their efforts at social change, be they formal ideologies or symbolic-expressive actions.”⁴³⁶ Cultural resources are both contextual and public; they rely on their setting for much of their meaning, often locking political actors into certain strategies or stances. As social level constructions, these public cultural resources also “may be wielded by specific actors but depend on consumption and interpretation by others for their effectiveness.”⁴³⁷ Utilizing cultural resources, WAG had a rhetorically powerful means for challenging the military plans. Pāgat was a symbolic tool for the movement, and also represented a material site for cultural contestation. Apart from social movement analysis, cultural resources are associated with human activities, the natural landscape, and prehistoric and historic archeological sites that have traditional cultural significance.⁴³⁸ In this way, Pāgat functions as a double-layered cultural resource; its existence as a material site with environmental and cultural significance provides further strength for its rhetorical power as a tool of the social movement. Through its discussion of Pāgat, WAG articulates the

436 Rhys S. Williams, “Constructing the Public Good: Social Movements and Cultural Resources,” *Social Problems* 42 (1995): 127.

437 Ibid. Williams, “Constructing the Public Good,” 127.

438 Claire Smith, and H. Martin Wobst, *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice* (Routledge: 2005), 165-169; 178-181.

sacredness of culture and commands individuals to engage on behalf of protecting their own.

Environmental stewardship refers to the protection of the natural environment through sustainable practices, conservation, and responsible use. These principles are employed by WAG throughout their efforts to engage the public, motivating them to rally to save Pãgat from being used as a target of the U.S. military firing ranges. The discursive move toward environmental stewardship manifests in various ways, but overwhelmingly deploys securitizing discourse as it calls for continued activism about Pãgat. In their campaign to save Pãgat, WAG began using the slogan “*prutehi yan difendi*” meaning “protect and defend.” This statement is taken directly from the *inifresi*, or the Chamoru pledge, which offers to protect and defend the beliefs, culture, language, air, water, and the land of the Chamoru:

*Ginen i mäs takhilo’ gi hinasso-ku
I mäs takhalom gi kurason-hu,
Yan i mas figo’ na nina’siña-hu,
Hu ufresen maisa yu’
Para bai prutehi yan hu difende
I HINENGGE,
I KOTTURA,
I LENGGUÅHI,
I AIRE,
I HANOM yan I TANO’ CHAMORU
Ni’ irensiã-ku direchu ginen as Yu’os
Tåta,
Este hu afitma gi hilo’ I Bipblia yan I
Banderå-hu,
-I Banderan Guåhan.*

From the inner-most recesses of my
mind,
From deep within my heart,
And with all my might,
This I offer.
To protect and defend
The Beliefs
The Culture
The Language
The Air
The Water and The Land of the
CHamoru.
My heritage comes directly from God,
This I affirm on the Bible and my Flag
- The Flag of Guahan

The *inifresi* was adopted in 1998 as the “Chamorro Pledge of Allegiance,” to be used in any public or private event where the “American Pledge of Allegiance” might also be recited.⁴⁴⁰ The adoption of the *inifresi* demonstrates the local government’s attempt to preserve a distinct cultural identity even as the American principles and pledges are ingrained within society. Demonstrating the complexity of both/neither identities, the local use of an alternative pledge of allegiance illustrates the difficult tension of life under U.S. colonization. The creation of a Chamoru pledge is troubled by its designation for use *alongside* the American pledge. Additionally, if it were not for the both/neither classification of Guåhan there would be no need to create and adopt an alternative but simultaneous pledge for Chamorus. The *inifresi* contains a strong relationship between the culture and the environment. Environmental stewardship is exemplified in this slogan by calling on individuals to protect the natural environment. The slogan also utilizes securitizing discourse with a call to defend this place of such strong environmental significance. In a community so heavily dominated by military culture, using slogans that urge people to be defenders of the land resonated with a broad audience and galvanized support for the cause. Interestingly, the command to “protect and defend” parallels military slogans, but in this context WAG flipped the military mantra on its head by demanding individuals at the grassroots level to protect and defend against the U.S. military buildup. This call to “protect our land and ocean. Defend our way of life,” makes direct parallels to the principles of the *inifresi* and the goal of appreciating the island homeland.⁴⁴¹

440Ibid.

441 We Are Guahan, www.weareguahan.com.

WAG utilized this slogan to instill pride and value in the efforts to secure a collective identity, to struggle for recovery of something that is “ours.” On February 14, 2011, WAG held a sticker day, to spread awareness about the Pāgat lawsuit. This effort included passing out heart-shaped stickers emblazoned with the *prutehi yan difendi* slogan. The event functioned to spread awareness and also to communicate the importance of having both love for the island and sustaining local efforts to protect and defend our lands.⁴⁴² This move aligns with the cultural concept of *inafa’ maolek* by focusing on restoration and the struggle to make things right within the delicate balance of the environment.

From these examples of environmental stewardship and cultural resources, local activism can be considered as emerging to address them both in tandem. Grounded in the principle of *inafa’ maolek*, WAG coupled environmental resources alongside cultural resources in order to provide the catalyst for direct action. Coupling environmental resources alongside cultural resources provides the catalyst for direct action. These contemporary concerns are also rooted within a broader historical frame that was effective in organizing opposition to the military relocation in the specific area of Pāgat. The interconnectedness of culture and the environment are difficult to argue against, and would force the establishment powers (military/DOD) to align with cultural demise or environmental degradation.

In October 2010, prior to filing the lawsuit, WAG organized an event called the “Realize Our Destiny Rally.” Held at the governor’s complex, this event attempted to “unite our community and send a strong message to the national and international audience that our island is united in opposing the buildup as outlined in the Record of

442 “2011: Year in Review,” *We Are Guahan*, December 31, 2011, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/12/31/we-are-guahan-a-recap-of-2011/>.

Decision—NO land condemnation, NO dredging at Apra Harbor, NO to a firing range at Pãgat.”⁴⁴³ The WAG website announced the rally by stating:

We have testified. We have commented. We have asked politely. It is time to take the next step, together.⁴⁴⁴

With these sentences WAG creates unity by using “we” language that brings people together in a collective against the DOD. The spacing of these statements also calls attention to the number of steps and actions the public has already taken in the process: testifying, commenting, and asking polite questions about the buildup. Ultimately, WAG argues the next step is nigh, and is one that the community must take together in order to challenge the latest round of military relocation plans. Speaking about the rally, Leevin Camacho explains that the grassroots movement began well before WAG’s efforts, but that the magnitude of the buildup did not really sink in until “after the release of the EIS and of course, at that point, all of the decisions that needed to be made had already been made.”⁴⁴⁵ Referring to the military’s lack of consultation and transparency with the people of Guåhan, Camacho argues “we want to make sure the community is going to be united to protect our cultural resources and, broader, to protect our islands from the buildup.”⁴⁴⁶ This quotation discusses the community as united in the effort to “protect” what is “ours,” and directly references the “cultural resources” that must be preserved.

Even in the call for community support and participation in the rally, WAG reiterates its both/neither identity when stating: “WE WANT to have a real, decision making place at the table. American Democracy should fully apply to us!”⁴⁴⁷ Reminding

443 “Realizing Our Destiny Rally,” *We Are Guahan*, September 24, 2010, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/09/24/realiing-our-destiny/>

444 Ibid.

445 Greenwood, “Guam Under Fire,” (see above, n. 430).

446 Ibid.

447 “Realizing Our Destiny Rally,” *We Are Guahan*, September 24, 2010, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/09/24/realiing-our-destiny/>

readers of Guåhan's political disenfranchisement this statement also moves toward voicing desires rather than a concrete demand. By using "want" and "should," WAG articulates a watered down version of a bold demand for political franchisement and democratic inclusion *with the U.S.* Asserting that American Democracy should be completely applied to Guåhan, misses the opportunity to either build a strong case for lasting justice through decolonization or develop concrete demands for alternative procedures for achieving such political engagement and democracy within the current political status parameters. These examples also reveal the operation of both/neither identities even in the organization's attempt to rally and mobilize against the buildup. WAG's articulation of demands functions within a U.S.-centered framework, the primacy of the U.S. nation-state demonstrates that collective identity formation for locals still relies upon fitting with some semblance of "American" national belonging.

Beyond raising awareness about the rally, WAG also explained the event as an opportunity to give voice to the people who had been excluded or cut-off from the DOD comment period. Paralleling the experience of the UN decolonization proceedings, where petitioners have mere minutes to give their testimony, the public comment periods were characterized by restricted time limits for residents to give testimony about the buildup.⁴⁴⁸ By contrast, WAG argued the three-minute comments were overly restricting and did not allow the community to adequately express "how they think that moving 80,000 people to Guam will affect their island."⁴⁴⁹ With this event WAG challenged U.S. imposed processes and strict formatted time periods for locals to discuss and deliberate about the buildup. The rally generated public support for the community-engaged aspects of input and collaboration to discuss the DOD plans for Pãgat. This event connects with

448 Ridgell, "Chamorro Nation," (see above, n. 352)

449 Greenwood, "Guam Under Fire," (see above, n. 430).

both/neither identities as it demonstrates WAG's efforts to establish the local community in opposition to the U.S. for the DEIS process. At the same time, WAG in close proximity to the U.S. as the organization relied upon U.S. domestic laws to build their case against the DOD in its selection of Pāgat.

The Lawsuit: Challenging the DOD

On the heels of the WAG rally, the coalition of Guåhan groups filed their lawsuit against the DOD in November 2010.⁴⁵⁰ The lawsuit argued the U.S. military violated federal historic preservation and environmental laws when selecting Pāgat as the location for a new live firing range. The lawsuit argued that the U.S. Navy failed to adequately consider alternative spaces for the firing range that would have less impact on historic and environmental sites.⁴⁵¹ Guam Historic Preservation Officer Joe Quinata stated, "this action does not challenge the buildup itself, but seeks to compel the Department of Defense to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act by giving adequate consideration to alternative locations for the firing ranges, as mandated by law."⁴⁵² As this quotation makes evident, even within the legal system the efforts of WAG and other local agencies were hindered by their territorial status. Waging both/neither identities leaves the local movement unable to challenge the buildup outright, but instead limits it to attack the U.S. for not going through the proper national legal channels when imposing the buildup on Guåhan. This situation demonstrates the complexity of both/neither identities as they strive to triumph in opposition to the U.S. from within the U.S. domestic legal system. In a similar fashion to

450 Working in connection with one another, the lawsuit was filed by the Guam Preservation Trust, We Are Guåhan, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

451 "Guam Groups Sue Military Over Live Firing Range," *Fox News*, November 18, 2010, www.foxnews.com/us/2010/11/18. The lawsuit was filed in the U.S. District Court in Honolulu.

452 Aguon, "Lawsuit Filed Over Pagat," (see chap.1, n. 4).

Chamoru petitioners at the UN, WAG and the local coalition lacked a distinct “place” within the legal arena. *Neither* international law nor U.S. domestic law adequately protects Guåhan from the U.S. military buildup, despite *both* arenas outwardly offering redress for injustices committed against indigenous peoples, the environment, and political power. It is from this precarious position that both/neither identities sought to challenge U.S. illegal imposition on Guåhan soil, by articulating Pågat’s distinctness and the islands separateness from the U.S. nation-state.

These movement tactics simultaneously reveal an embedded sense of national belonging to the U.S., which results paradoxically in expressions of continued dislocation even as WAG organizes and mobilizes to sue the DOD. As the local activism pushed for recognition of Pågat and attempted to achieve *inafa’ maolek* with the surrounding environment, their arguments about the importance of the site were packaged within U.S. labels of an “endangered historic place.” This classification of Pågat is complicated, because it is preserved for sites in the “U.S.”, and by applying this designation as an argument in favor of saving Pågat, the movement demonstrated its dependency upon the U.S. framework of environmental law and advocacy. This observation is meant to illuminate the deeply embedded both/neither identities that persist even in the environmental aspects of the movement against the buildup. Even in the attempt to articulate the rationale for protecting Pågat, WAG and other organizations had to argue how the space was part of the U.S. nation-state in order to “prove” its significance and to sustain a strong argument against the buildup. Absent these qualifications within U.S. historical and environmental regulatory missions, Pågat may have been further dislocated from the island landscape and designated for incorporation into the growing military land holdings. Even as the territorial designation for Guåhan establishes a precarious relation

to the U.S., by engaging in the environmental discourse of the nation-state the efforts to preserve and protect Pāgat proved to be an effective strategy for the movement.

(Re) Claiming a Village: Pāgat as Sacred Space

Around the time of filing their lawsuit against the DOD, the Guåhan organizations began engaging the public through Internet-based outreach and educational campaigns, keeping them updated about the status of the lawsuit. Efforts also focused on providing information and documentation about other actions of the DOD. The Guam Preservation Trust launched a website called savepagatvillage.org, which explained its vision, mission, goals, and purpose with regard to Pāgat. The website banner states: “*Pāgat Adahi Yan Protehi Sengsong Pāgat. Preserve and Protect Pāgat Village.*”⁴⁵³ By combining the Chamoru language with calls to take care of and protect the area, the site draws on both cultural and environmental claims for Pāgat. Cultural claims are announced through the indigenous language choices, and are sustained throughout the website’s discussion and imagery of the area as a culturally rich locale.

The use of the term “village” also offered an important discursive mechanism to rally support for saving Pāgat. There are 19 villages on Guåhan, each governed by an elected mayor with the local population maintaining strong loyalty and pride in their village. Referring to Pāgat as “Pāgat Village,” tapped into local understandings of the area, emphasized the location, and generated interest among public about the military’s imposed plans for this ancient village. Additionally, Pāgat translates as “to give advice” in English.⁴⁵⁴ This Chamoru reference also conveys the importance of the land and the sacred area that commands reverence.

453 “Hafa Adai from the Guam Preservation Trust,” *Save Pāgat Village*, savepagatvillage.org/onlinepetition.html.

454 “Pāgat,” *Not One More Acre*, www.notonemoreacre.com.

People struggled to protect Guahan's land, particularly Pāgat as sacred land, against unwarranted military expansion. The significance of Pāgat dates back centuries, with Pāgat Village forming part of the Chamoru narrative of the island's history before, during, and after Spanish colonial rule.⁴⁵⁵ Historians and archeologists alike have documented Pāgat Village, their evidence confirms the local belief that the area is a resting place for ancient Chamoru ancestors. Pāgat Village is bound to indigenous beliefs about life and death, and stories about fresh water—the village is situated over the island's aquifer that provides potable water for 85% of Guam's population.⁴⁵⁶ Sharing pictures and information about the ecological structure and composition of Pāgat offered another path to draw environmental connections with the community.

Providing educational tools, an online petition, a photo gallery, and links to files and resources, the website functions as a conduit for information pertaining to Pāgat and the community events that have taken place within the context of the buildup. The organization created an online petition stating:

We, the undersigned residents of Guam, respectfully call on President of the United States, Barack Obama, as Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces, to abandon plans to construct a new firing range complex on the bluff above Pāgat, a traditional cultural property on Guam, and consider alternative locations. Pāgat is an ancient Chamorro village site, which continues to play a meaningful role in the cultural practice of the Chamorro people.

The firing ranges would necessitate significant new limitations in access to the site, bring new security fencing and personnel to the area, and have the potential to cause direct physical harm to the irreplaceable resources at Pāgat. We call on President Obama to respect Guam's unique cultural heritage and reconsider the proposed firing range location.⁴⁵⁷

455 Leevin Camacho and Daniel Broudy, " 'Sweetening' The Pentagon's Deal in the Marianas: From Guam to Pagan," *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 11 (2013): n.pag.

456 Camacho and Broudy, "Sweetening," (see above, n. 455).

457 Online Petition, *Save Pāgat Village*, savepagatvillage.org/onlinepetition.html.

This petition demonstrates both/neither identities highlighting that asking the U.S. to take action on the issue of Guåhan's dependent political status, makes alignment with the U.S. inescapable. The petition argues the physical dislocations that would result from the firing range complex and the construction of fences, creating less direct access, and further blocking the local population from this area. In chorus with physical dislocations, cultural dislocations are conveyed as the petition indicates that the lack of access will result in physical harm because it will prevent people from using the "irreplaceable resources" at Pãgat. This portion of the petition is signaling the importance of the area to traditional healers. The website utilizes a photo gallery, complete with seventy-one photographs of Pãgat that illustrate everything from the coastal waters to the ancient artifacts from the *latte* period.

HERITAGE HIKES: CONNECTING TO OUR LANDS

The Internet campaign generates interest, shares information, and explains the coalitional efforts against the DOD. In conjunction with the lawsuit, these efforts provide a very straightforward type of activism that occurs primarily online. Offering another layer to the local activism, We Are Guåhan launched a campaign called Three C's, which served "to protect and defend our Community, Culture, and Coral."⁴⁵⁸ The focus on community, culture, and coral resonates with *inafa' maolek* by emphasizing balance among people, culture, and the environment. These discourses were crafted for the locals by resonating with their knowledge and understanding of Chamoru traditional practices. This campaign began a few months after the lawsuit was filed, and it included several components to generate public support during the legal proceedings.

458 "WAG Continues Prutehi yan Difendi Campaign," We Are Guahan, May 30, 2011, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/05/30/wag-continues-prutehi-yan-difendi-campaign/>.

From November 2010 through December 2011, WAG organized and hosted a series of Heritage Hikes as part of its continued efforts to educate and engage the community on the impacts of the proposed military relocation.⁴⁵⁹ These hikes were advertised in the local newspapers and on the WAG website, they were primarily intended for an audience of local inhabitants that were interested in learning more about the proposed buildup. Comprised of multiple hikes to various locations, the Heritage Hikes series provided an opportunity for the local public to get to know the land. Each of the hike series had a Chamoru title, which taken together offered a discursive shift toward *inafa' maolek*. These discourses were rhetorically tuned to the local audience for the hikes by making direct ties with cultural resources, environmental stewardship, and the historical frame of the island. These maneuvers also generated greater interest and participation by situating the hikes within the terrain of the local landscape that would be affected by the buildup and its' effects on those locales.

The first Heritage Hike series was called, *Tungo' i Estoriå-ta* [Know Our Story] and focused on sites that would be affected by the proposed buildup, and also included historic sites that had previously been threatened by military expansion. The first hike series first took locals to Pãgat to focus on the contemporary military plans and the proposed affects on the area. Then, hikes to Cetti and Sella Bay, the sites of Ancient Chamorro villages (one pro-Spanish and another anti-Spanish) and featured discussions about the history of the DOD efforts to turn Sella Bay into ammunition wharf during the Vietnam War.⁴⁶⁰ Finally, the series ended with a hike to Mount Lamlam, the highest point on the island that overlooks Fena Lake and Naval Magazine. The site also has strong

459 “‘Heritage Hikes: Tungo’ I Estoria-Ta’ Throughout the Month of November,” *Marianas Variety*, November 4, 2010, mvguam.com.

460 Michael Lujan Bevacqua, “Un Nuebu na Inatan,” *Marianas Variety*, March 9, 2011, <http://mvguam.com/opinion/when-the-moon-waxes/17007--un-nuebu-na-inatan.html>. These efforts were thwarted, in part, because of local opposition and protests.

connections to the Chamoru legend of Chief Gadao.⁴⁶¹ By scheduling hikes to historic locations in between the hikes to areas poised for impact by the contemporary military buildup plans, WAG demonstrated the importance of knowing the history of military influence on the island alongside contemporary militarization of the land. Each hike included several brief lectures about the history of the site. By sharing the historical context and current landscape, these lectures were rhetorically powerful maneuvers to mobilize the hikers against the buildup that was poised to repeat or perpetuate the tragic history of U.S. militarization on the island.

In March 2011, the second set of hikes was called, *Un Nuebu na Inatan* [A New Look].⁴⁶² The delay between the first two Heritage Hikes was a result of WAG efforts to work with the Department of Defense and organize hikes in places within Navy properties, such as Haputo, Spanish Steps, and Tweed's Cave.⁴⁶³ Interestingly, WAG first worked to rhetorically construct identity with the groups as they come together for the hikes and connect to the land, then during the hikes themselves the groups separated even in the physical act of walking around the places. The second series repeated the previous hikes to Pāgat and Cetti/Sella, adding the new location of Tumon. The first two locations are places that people may not know much about, while Tumon is well known as a hub for the tourist industry and has been called the Waikiki of Guåhan. However, this last hike educated those in attendance about the story of Tumon and its history. Tumon was an area burned down by the Spanish during the early colonial period, and later after World War II it served as a crucial site for the U.S. military land grabbing. The Heritage Hikes demonstrated how Tumon signifies far more than tourism, and the importance of taking a fresh look at these locales to understand their historical significance. These

461 Bevacqua, "Un Nuebu na Inatan," n. pag

462 <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/03/04/heritage-hikes-un-nuebu-na-inatan/>.

463 Bevacqua, "Un Nuebu na Inatan," n. pag.

initial series of hikes were a great success, with over 240 people in attendance.⁴⁶⁴ This turnout also demonstrates the efficacy of WAG's rhetorical maneuvers and the movement's move toward establishing a collective identity among the local population in opposition to the U.S. military relocation.

In June 2011, WAG hosted its third series of Heritage Hikes called, *I Kantan I Latte Siha* [The Song of the Latte]. The goal for these hikes was to offer the community an opportunity to learn about the cultural history of the sites, whereas the earlier hikes were focused on "learning about local places that have played a crucial and sometimes tragic role in Guam's history of American militarization."⁴⁶⁵ Arguing that the military buildup discussion includes very little understanding of the island history, WAG utilized these hikes as a means of providing further insight about how militarization has impacted Guåhan over the past century.⁴⁶⁶ In advertising this hike, WAG also made a conscious effort to rhetorically construct these island spaces as continuously devastated by the U.S. militarization. Naming U.S. militarization in this way also discursively set the tone for the hikes and their locations that represent:

1. Land (sort of) returned by the Federal Government,
2. Land currently held by the Federal Government,
3. Land which is being sought after by the Federal Government.⁴⁶⁷

In his discussion of land, Lujan Bevacqua demonstrates both/neither identities within the island. By positioning land (understood as local land) against the Federal Government, he discursively separates these island spaces *from* the U.S. but also couples these lands *to* the Federal Government in various ways. In each articulation, the land is described in a

464 Sabrina Salas Matanane, "Third Series of Heritage Hikes in June," *KUAM News*, June 2, 2011, <http://www.kuam.com/story/14831219/2011/06/02/third-series-of-heritage-hikes-in-june>.

465 Michael Lujan Bevacqua, "I Kantan I Latte Siha," *Marianas Variety*, <http://mvguam.com/opinion/when-the-moon-waxes/18434-i-kantan-i-latte-siha.html>.

466 Ibid.

467 Ibid.

proprietary relationship with the U.S. federal government: “(sort of) returned by” then, “currently held by,” and finally, “being sought after by” the Federal Government. At no point is the land left alone or completely separated from the U.S. claim, or desires.

To achieve the three representational goals of the land, the third set of hikes included the two new sites of Hila’an Village and Haputo, in addition to repeating the hike to Pāgat.⁴⁶⁸ Hila’an Village is a pre-historic village that was returned from the U.S. Federal Government to the Government of Guam in March 2011.⁴⁶⁹ During this hike, participants could see over seventy *latte* throughout the area, *latte* are archaeological remains that are unique to the Mariana Islands.⁴⁷⁰ Ancient Chamorus used *latte* as the foundation for homes and other structures, providing the literal foundation for life on Guåhan. With Spanish colonization, the *latte* became a relic and was no longer foundational to Chamoru society. Today, the *latte* represents the

symbolic foundation of our identities. It is an icon you see everywhere; in business logos, campaign signs, tattoos, in contemporary architecture. The prevalence of the *latte* in popular culture is the way it works as a conduit for connecting ourselves to Guam’s ancient past. We often use the *latte* as a metaphor for the strength and permanence of the stones themselves.⁴⁷¹

This explanation of the *latte* provides a clue of its continued cultural significance today, and draws attention to the connections between the *latte* symbol and Chamoru identity that is rooted in this ancient history. Each of these hikes forged connections to land by

468 “We Are Guåhan. Hosting Heritage Hikes,” *We Are Guåhan.*, June 2011, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/06/02/we-are-guahan-hosting-heritage-hikes-i-kantan-i-latte-siha/>

469 Tom Ashe, “Feds Return Land: Historic Hila’an Village Included,” March 2, 2011, <http://governor.guam.gov/2011/03/02/feds-return-land-historic-hila%E2%80%99an-village-included/>.

470 Archaeologists disagree on the exact date of the *latte*, some argue Chamorus built *latte* as early as B.P. 1200 while others think it was B.P. 800. See: Victoriano N. April, *Latte Quarries of the Mariana Islands* (Hagatña: Department of Parks and Recreation, 2004); Mike T. Carson, “Archaeologica Studies of the Latte Period,” *Micronesica*, 42 (2012): 1-79.

471 Bevacqua, “I Kantan,” (see above, n. 465).

inviting hikers to recognize the presence of *latte* and other ancient artifacts within the locations.

The first hike strengthened these connections by showing participants the dozens of *latte* within the area and creating an experience of history within the space. Walking among the *latte* sets meant walking through an Ancient Chamorro neighborhood and seeing *latte* that have been stationary for centuries. This maneuver enabled the hikers to imagine what the ancient village would have looked like and trace the footsteps that Chamorus would have walked for centuries. WAG used the hike to share the *latte* as a powerful means of experiencing the contemporary landscape with the trajectory of ancient Chamoru history in mind. Through this connection to history and place, the Hila'an hike provided a deeply reflective moment about the land and provoked contemplations on what the future holds for the island and its peoples. For the hikers, who were predominantly Chamorus and other local inhabitants, these reflections were an important aspect of WAG's broader rhetorical construction of the land as a resource for mutual respect and caring, against the buildup that would devastate these places.

Another location in this hike series was Haputo, which provided an "opportunity for people without access to military bases to see Haputo Beach and the artifacts, several *latte* scattered throughout the area."⁴⁷² WAG draws attention to the dislocations resulting in military land control by highlighting that the second hike allows people to access areas closed off by the military. The final hike in the series showed Pãgat Village where the DOD plans to build its firing range complex, it also featured a discussion about the cultural and historic significance of the area. Information was provided on these hikes so

472 "We Are Guåhan. Hosting Heritage Hikes," *We Are Guåhan.*, June 2011, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/06/02/we-are-guahan-hosting-heritage-hikes-i-kantan-i-latte-siha/>.

that community members could learn about the significance of these places within the wider terrain of Guåhan's history.⁴⁷³

The fourth and final Heritage Hikes series took place in October and November 2011.⁴⁷⁴ The series title, Nà'i Tåtte, Chule' Tåtte [Give Back, Take Back] reflected the focus on the Department of Defense and their complex history of land returns and land taking on Guåhan. This series included the new hiking points of Ague Cove and Pãgat Point, and repeated the hike to Hila'an Village.⁴⁷⁵

The Heritage Hikes were a prominent feature of WAG's organizing for a number of reasons. By giving Chamoru titles to the series, WAG called attention to the cultural significance of these hikes and built community among Chamoru language speakers. The titles of these hikes Additionally, the Chamoru language provided a means of generating attention for WAG. Following in the footsteps of using the Chamoru language on their stickers, in their campaigns, and even in their organizational name, We Are Guåhan communicates the depth of their cultural ties to the island.

The hikes also provided a meaningful educational contribution by literally bringing people out to the land and teaching them the history of these places. In this way, WAG created strong connections between the people, the land, and the cultural significance of these sites. These hikes provided a powerful visual opportunity, allowing hikers to experience the locations that would be affected by the military relocation. The hike series also instilled renewed interest in the surrounding environment. By bringing in speakers and experts to tell the stories of the locales, the hikes also conveyed the information about these sites while indicating the potential material damage and loss that

473 Matanane, "Heritage Hikes," (see above, n. 464).

474 "We Are Guåhan Announces 4th Heritage Hike Series," *We Are Guåhan*, June 2011, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/10/14/we-are-guahan-announces-4th-heritage-hike-series-nai-tatte-chule-tatte/>

475 Ibid.

would result from the buildup. This direct connection with the land was also cultivated through WAG's bus stop painting campaign that began in May 2011. As an island beautification project, the bus stop paintings creating community between WAG and other local groups that wanted to make a contribution to support the island. By focusing on island beautification and improvement the *Prutehi yan Defendi* bus stop painting campaign offered another project for mobilizing the community while the Pāgat lawsuit was pending.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL EIS: ENGAGING THE DOD AGAIN

In 2011, one year after the lawsuit was filed against the DOD for breaking the law in its selection of Pāgat Village, the DOD admitted it must prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) and give the public an opportunity to comment on its plans during scoping meetings.⁴⁷⁶ This lawsuit result signaled another round of assessment from the DOD, mirroring the process that began back in 2009, when the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) was released. The outcome of the lawsuit was a victory for WAG and the local organizations that had worked so hard to prevent the destruction of Pāgat. The lawsuit was effective at mobilizing a sustained campaign to challenge the DOD on the procedures and processes with which it tried to take over the local environment. It sent a strong signal that the local population was prepared and willing to protect and defend its lands against impending military encroachment.

As a result of the lawsuit, the DOD faced a significant setback. Yet, the overall military relocation was never challenged. The legal decision functioned to push the DOD back to the starting line rather than disqualify them from participating in the race. The result of this lawsuit was that the DOD had to consider other sites for the firing range

476 Ridge, "Motion to Dismiss Pagat Lawsuit," (see above, n. 28).

complex. This demonstrates a limit to the legal channels and the struggle for justice in a colonized space. The lawsuit was raised through domestic law, even as Guåhan does not fit into most U.S. domestic classifications given its status as an unincorporated territory. Yet, the movement positioned their legal battle within domestic law because a U.S. domestic department was in violation of other U.S. protocols regarding development and environmental impact assessment. This situation signals how both/neither identities create a chasm within the legal arena, where Guåhan is neither fully foreign nor completely domestic and thus is hindered by struggles over how to best fit its demands for legal justice.

At the end of the process, the DOD was not forced to renegotiate the buildup. They carried forward with their plans. While frustrating, this is an expected outcome given the parameters within which WAG and the Guåhan groups were operating. Articulating their demands against the DOD within the U.S. environmental and legal framework, the movement organizations were dependent upon the structural limitations of the U.S. nation-state. Additionally, this move provides a robust example of both/neither identities complicating direct action against the establishment. WAG and its broad based coalition of local groups could at best put forth a challenge to the manner in which the DOD had planned an aspect of the buildup, rather than directly refute and oppose the imposition of the buildup writ large. This situation presents the limits of both/neither-ness for WAG, by not completely incorporating with the U.S. nor rejecting it altogether the organization utilizes an uneasy rhetorical stance that yields mixed results. This complex rhetorical position is also evidenced by the other activities and initiatives created by WAG in the efforts to protect and defend Pågat.

In March 2012, the “Not One More Acre” initiative and website were launched by WAG. The initiative name simultaneously functions as a slogan and is similar to the phrase used by other indigenous groups that are working to protect their people, wildlife and homelands. Such efforts include the collective organizing of Apishapa and Comanche to protect grasslands and Māori Land Marches in Aotearoa (New Zealand) to protect indigenous lands in the 1970s.⁴⁷⁷ This initiative set out to “provide easy access to information released by DOD regarding its plans, updates, and explanation of the supplemental EIS [SEIS] process, and an opportunity for people to engage in the NEPA process.”⁴⁷⁸ The purpose of the initiative was to encourage participation in the upcoming SEIS process, including scoping meetings and the comment period. The renewed round of engagement with DOD and environmental law channels were facilitated from one site. While explaining itself as an information initiative, the Not One More Acre webpage also states: “More than 1/4 of the island is more than enough.” This phrase provides an epigraph for the overall initiative. As WAG member Cara Flores-Mays explained, “In addition to cultural impacts, an increase in traffic, safety concerns and an increase in noise, our community needs to be aware that every single option that DOD has identified requires the acquisition of more land.”⁴⁷⁹ This quotation refers subtly to a number of the points raised in *The Grey Papers*, and also creates common ground when talking to “our

477 See Purgatoire, Apishapa, and Comanche, “Grassland Trust” website on Notonemoreacre.net; see also: R. J. Walker, “The Genesis of Maori Activism,” *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 93 (1984) 267-281.

478 “Not One More Acre,” www.notonemoreacre.com.

479 Cara Flores-Mays quoted in “Not One More Acre,” *Famoksaiyan blog*, March 17, 2012, www.famoksaiyan.blogspot.com. See also: “‘We Are Guahan’ Launch ‘Not One More Acre’ Initiative,” *Pacific News Center*, March 16, 2012, http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=21858:qwe-are-guahanq-launches-not-one-more-acre-initiative&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156.

community” and warning that all of the DOD options point to further loss of local lands to the military.

The DOD is required by law to consider all “reasonable alternatives,” to their buildup plans. However, it seems that Fena (also known as “Naval Magazine”) was just added to the list with Pāgat. Not One More Acre’s website provided maps of the DOD’s five alternatives at Pāgat and Fena that are under consideration for the firing range. This collection of images helped the public visualize the areas being considered for the firing range. WAG also created a petition that opposed the military acquisition of any additional land on Guåhan. Their petition was launched on the Not One More Acre website and argued the current footprint of DOD land is “bigger than Umatac, Merizo, Inarajan and Talofofo *combined*...whether it is 100 acres or 2,000 acres, DOD does not need any more land.”⁴⁸⁰ This move of naming villages on Guåhan to put the military footprint into perspective also parallels the discussion of land in the WAG *Grey Papers*. This petition was launched in April 2012, months before the public scoping comment period began in October. The process of scoping meetings and public comments continued until December 10, 2012. The cultural, historical, and environmental efforts bound up in this initiative demonstrate the direct organizing efforts of WAG. Responding once again to the DOD and the environmental impact statement process, WAG utilized the framework of *inafa’ maolek* to position its arguments against the buildup. WAG articulated concerns about the land and the sacred spaces like Pāgat, by pushing for the protection and defense of the island. This involved rhetorically positioning cultural resources and environmental stewardship as intersecting principles that must relate to an appreciation for and

480 Cara Flores-Mays quoted in “Not One More Acre,” *Famoksaiyan blog*, March 17, 2012, www.famoksaiyan.blogspot.com. See also: Nick Delgado, “We Are Guåhan Launches ‘Not One More Acre,’” *KUAM News*, March 16, 2012, <http://www.kuam.com/story/17179751/2012/03/16/we-are-guahan-launches-not-one-more-acre>.

understanding of local history. In this manner, WAG played a key role in opposing the military buildup that failed to consider alternative options and adopted a disturbing approach to the local environment. In another effort to challenge this mentality, WAG created a documentary film short that told the story of Pāgat through the eyes of the movement that struggled to stop the military from taking it over.

WE ARE PĀGAT: DOCUMENTING THE DOD

We Are Pāgat is a documentary short production by WAG. The film was released in 2012 and screened during the Guam International Film Festival and the *Prutehi yan Difendi* workshop, and PBS Guam.⁴⁸¹ The film was created by WAG in collaboration with the Guam Preservation Trust to educate “about the community efforts to save Pāgat Village, an indigenous village and burial site, from being turned into part of a military firing range complex.”⁴⁸² The audience for the film was the local population, tourists, and others who attended the screenings in Guåhan. The film also reached a broader audience by virtue of it being broadcast on YouTube and the We Are Guåhan website. This media production evinces both/neither identities as WAG situates and explains the importance of Guåhan and Pāgat while simultaneously addressing a U.S. continental audience that holds control over the island. In this way, the film also illustrates a sort of ingrained and unconscious use of both/neither identities as a rhetorical strategy, such that articulating oneself as part of Guåhan cannot be divorced from referencing and addressing the U.S.

481 The Film aired on PBS GUAM, KGTF Channel 12; See also: “2nd Annual Guam International Film Festival September 27-September 30,” *Pacific News Center*, September 11, 2012, http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=27117:2nd-annual-guam-international-film-festival-september-27-september-30-&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156. See also: “Two Opportunities to Watch,” *We Are Guåhan*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2012/09/24/two-opportunities-to-watch-we-are-pagat/>

482 www.weareguahan.com/prutehi

The title of the film discursively creates collective identity by positioning Pāgat as part of who “we are.” The film title names the land and space of Pāgat Village as an inclusive part of the local identity. The film title also mirrors the organizational name, We Are Guåhan. This discursive maneuver brings the organization and its goals in line with the efforts to challenge the buildup plans for Pāgat. While WAG utilizes rhetorical devices to situate Pāgat within a broader cultural terrain of the island, it simultaneously situates Guåhan within the national terrain of the U.S. The film achieves this by focusing on the geographical, historical, and contemporary authenticity of Pāgat Village. Through this emphasis, WAG created a film that articulates the actions to protect and defend Pāgat while rooting these events in the Chamoru cultural principles of *inafa’ maolek*. On the one hand, the movement explains its efforts to restore balance and protect Pāgat; on the other hand, WAG discusses its work with other local organizations to struggle against the U.S. Department of Defense.

The film begins by articulating the importance of understanding the island’s culture, people, and history. This discursive move at the outset of the film directly relates to the cultural concept of *inafa’ maolek*, and signals the interconnectedness of the issues surrounding Pāgat. The opening scene of the film is filled with images of people in the jungle, both young and old. It also includes close up shots of the local wildlife, while Chamoru chants are being continuously sung in the background. Through the images of elders and youth, the film resonates with the *inafa’ maolek* values of *respetu* (offering respect to elders within the community) and *pātgon* (valuing children and considering child rearing as a collective responsibility). These images and sounds create a rhetorically powerful mosaic of messages about the local environment, the people, and the culture.

The film then shifts to geographically situate Pāgat. The screen pans away from the jungle to images of the Guåhan flag waving in the wind. This imagery in the film is

striking because the Guåhan flag is pictured alone, whereas on the island the Guåhan flag is only raised alongside or beneath the U.S. flag. Thus, the film uses the single Guåhan flag to convey independence and distinctness just before the voice over begins situating the island by using a series of highlighted maps to explain: “Guam, a United States’ territory, located in the western Pacific approximately 3,800 miles southwest of Hawai’i.” In one fell swoop, the Guåhan flag as a symbol of independence is discursively overwhelmed by the message that the island is a “United States’ territory.” This imagery contrasted with the voice over provides a strong example of both/neither identities within the film. To continue situating Guåhan, the film explains its location in relation to Hawai’i the closest of the U.S. states. Despite the overwhelming distance between Hawai’i and Guåhan, the film sends a clear message that to situate Guåhan geographically requires relating it to the U.S. At the same time the film conveys the “both” identities of Guåhan as a U.S. territory, it also strives to establish the island as a distinct entity that is “neither” part of the U.S. This separateness from the U.S. is rhetorically constructed through a sense of local belonging to the island conveyed by the images of the island’s jungles, sounds from the Chamoru language chants, and even the singular Guåhan flag.

The film continues to geographically situate the island by describing the size of the Guåhan in relation to the U.S. state of Rhode Island. This comparison includes imagery of six map outlines of Guåhan against a single map outline of Rhode Island. This rhetorical tactic parallels WAG’s earlier use of U.S. housing statistics to make the case against the buildup in Guåhan. Both moves communicate Guåhan as simultaneously aligned with the U.S. terrain while also warranting comparison against the U.S. nation. By depicting Guåhan as an extremely small geographic landscape, the film falls in line with overarching Western discourse that diminishes the Pacific Region and its tiny chain

of islands.⁴⁸³ This attempt to provide a clear picture of the island's geographical location simultaneously educates viewers who may be unfamiliar with Guåhan. Yet, these depictions are all expressions of location both within (U.S. territory), against (3,800 miles from the closest U.S. state), and in comparison to (1/6 of Rhode Island) the U.S. nation-state. Taken together, these examples demonstrate the habituated sense of both/neither identities that routinizes discussions of Guåhan even from within the social movement. This discourse also reveals an underlying rhetorical thread that is vexed by the complicated political status and colonized relationship with the U.S.

With the island now firmly situated on the map, the film shifts to describe the history and demographics of Guåhan. The film's voice over notes composition of the island, expressing the percentage of indigenous peoples that comprise the population. This reference is also rooted in history, as the voice shares the story of the indigenous people whom have called Guåhan their home for more than 4,000 years. Tracing the indigenous history forward to Spanish and U.S. colonial rule, the film explains the period of U.S. Naval governance that denied native inhabitants "U.S. citizenship and any semblance of government."⁴⁸⁴ Here, WAG provides a direct critique of the U.S. for its history of rejecting citizenship rights to indigenous Chamorus. Chamorus have also historically been encouraged to be content with the limited freedoms they were provided under the U.S. Navy government. This is a move that has left its mark on the island's residents and contributes to the wariness and reluctance to trust the federal government.⁴⁸⁵ This discourse demonstrates the paradoxical situation for the movement. Even in producing documents that convey lack of trust and opposition to the U.S. federal

483 See my previous discussion of Epeli Hau'ofa's work on the Pacific (chapter 3, pages 28 & 37).

484 *We Are Pāgat* documentary film short.

485 Pacific Daily News 23 February 2006; Marsh "Guam," 184.

government, the means of articulating this opposition is still tied to an understanding of the island as part of, but not totally beholden to the U.S.

Connecting this history of military and colonial influence to the issue of politics and land, the documentary incorporates vintage footage from the Navy. This footage is included in its original form, and explains the U.S. Navy Seabees worked diligently during World War II and the subsequent years to turn the “devastated Guam into a gigantic advanced base. They began to remake the face of Guam, moving mountains, tearing the ground in one of the greatest construction jobs the world has ever seen.”⁴⁸⁶ These words from the vintage film clip communicate the historical remnants of military policymaking. The film communicates that Guåhan was devastated until it was turned “into a gigantic advanced base,” this couples prosperity to sizable military power. Then, the clip uses the language of environmental destruction as it describes how the Navy began to “remake the face of Guam, moving mountains, tearing the ground;” these words coincide with the imagery of heavy machines that tore up the land for the military with no regard or respect for the local inhabitants and no respect for the environment. The clip articulates transformation through U.S. military destruction, which sharply opposes the local understanding of *inafa’ maolek* and orientation to the land.

Although taken from footage decades before, this clip makes a profound statement about the island’s relationship to the military and the legacy of “building up” Guåhan. The footage also functions as a discursive parallel to the contemporary military relocation that stands to destroy Pãgat in its attempts to “build up” more of the island. By using this clip in the film, WAG parallels its other efforts to break down the buildup for the public and expose these military projects as destroying rather than sustaining the island. Just after the vintage clip ends the *We Are Pãgat* voiceover explains, “It is

⁴⁸⁶ *We Are Pãgat* documentary short film.

reported that the U.S. military took over 58% of the island when it repossessed Guam in July of 1944.” This information about land grabbing offers a simultaneous critique of the U.S. “repossession” of the island along with warning of the military actions within the land and historical terrain of Guåhan. The film provides stark contrast between the vintage images of military construction and the narrative of militarization as a means of prosperity for the island, and the contemporary images of Guåhan that is still predominantly controlled by the U.S. military.

Finally, the film provides a contemporary focus on Pågat. Having explained the geographic location and historical foundation, the film quickly moves to a black screen with white letters explaining, “In November of 2010, Guam became the site of a major lawsuit to stop the United States military from building a series of firing ranges over an ancient Chamorro village.” This short introductory statement about WAG and other local organizations’ efforts illustrates several connections with place and space. It communicates that Guåhan is the battleground site where local efforts prevailed to protect and defend Pågat. It also establishes division between the locals and the U.S. military, arguing that the lawsuit was meant to halt DOD plans that would include building “over” the village of Pågat. Taken together, this statement creates local connections to the island and the historical importance of the land in opposition to the U.S. military’s contemporary plans that lack respect for the local collective land values.

Continuing to communicate the importance of Pågat, the next screen appears with the message: “Since 1974, this village has been listed as an archaeological site in the U.S. Guam and the National Register of Historic Places.” These screens segue into an explanation that the joint lawsuit was filed in November 2010, while images of the lawsuit documents, and members of each of the lawsuit groups are shown. These images function to create identity by depicting the hard work and efforts of the local

organizations to protect the land, and by putting faces with the various groups that engaged the lawsuit against the DOD. Both sets of images allow local audience members to find common ground with these individuals who are well-dressed, educated, and highly organized in their direct action for justice over Pāgat. The film's voicover then articulates the rationale for their actions, stating: "The goal of the lawsuit was to force DOD to comply with federal law and ultimately to save Pāgat village." Coupled with the previous images, the information here explains the rational and reasonable argument for the lawsuit. It identifies the double standard of the DOD failing to comply with "federal law," of which it is beholden. By also focusing on the goal to "save Pāgat village," WAG discursively resonates with local understandings of the island's ancient history and environment. This tactic makes it extremely difficult to argue against the importance of the lawsuit that stands to defend these ancestral lands from the DOD. This documentary short condenses the actions of We Are Guåhan in the lead up to the lawsuit. As an artifact of importance to WAG, it illustrates the strong connections to the land, the culture, and the history of Guåhan.

We Are Pāgat rhetorically constructs local connections with the land by geographically situating the island and its people from Guåhan. This situatedness and connectivity to the land occurs simultaneously with the both/neither identities operating in the film. These identities also help illuminate the subtle and direct ways that the film establishes common values and respect for the land while opposing the history of U.S. land grabbing, repossession, destruction, and take-over. Additionally, the film tells stories through images and sound that help the audience make deeper connections to the history of the island. *We Are Pāgat* offers for viewers a sense of place within the contemporary terrain of the island, but in order to situate that place it relies upon discursively orienting the island in relation to and in comparison with the U.S. Thus, the film establishes

collective identity with Pāgat and mobilizes the local peoples' support but this identity still remains wedded to the U.S. nation even as WAG strives to oppose it. Ultimately, this discursive move facilitates the local recognition of the Pāgat lawsuit as a necessary step to protect and defend a sacred place.

The spectrum of artifacts spanning from We Are Guåhan's beginnings in 2009 through their activities in 2012 demonstrates the importance of WAG as an organizational force in the movement against the U.S. military buildup. The local activism grappled with complex and often contradictory roadblocks associated with American influence and simultaneous disregard for the island. However, the interweaving of Chamoru cultural beliefs and practices from *inafa' maolek* to the *inifresi* provide evidence of the indigenous element generated by WAG. By rhetorically positioning the local demands within the cultural framework of the people, their efforts prevailed to organize communities in opposition to the buildup and in preservation of the sacred site of Pāgat. At the same time, WAG's activities also reveal the limits of both/neither identities. These contradictory identities partially compromise the media frame about the organization and the public discourse about the U.S. military buildup.

MEDIA FRAMING: SILENCE FROM THE "MAINLAND"

Reflecting back on the movement efforts, it is unmistakable that local reporting about the issues and the lack of attention to the military buildup from U.S. media sources created a storm of misinformation on the island. The mass media is the symbolic arena where the legitimacy of social actions and their proponents are determined. Mass media and social movements are considered to be central to contemporary politics.⁴⁸⁷ This phenomenon illustrates the paradox of Guåhan, as a U.S. territory the national media

487 Brian McNair, *Journalism and Democracy: Evaluation of Political Public Sphere* (London: Routledge, 1999); Tarrow, *Power in Movement*.

should report about the island and the buildup should be a national news headline. However, U.S. media outlets do not cover Guåhan, and the mainstream media remained silent about the unprecedented military influx to the 212-square mile island. During the tumultuous DEIS review and comment on Guåhan, millions of Americans on the U.S. “mainland” were unaware and uninformed about the U.S. military plans. Nearly 8,000 miles away from Washington, D.C. the members of WAG and local residents rushed to respond to the DOD plans while U.S. Senators and Representatives remained quiet about the buildup to their constituents. This phenomenon is not new. The American public residing in the continental states generally has no idea what occurs within the U.S. territories, despite the fact that Guåhan is a primary hub of U.S. military strategy and operations. This scenario of being ignored and neglected by the U.S. media is all too familiar for those who have lived under the weight of colonialism and experienced first hand its cloak of silence.

Covert Coverage in U.S. News

Stories from mainstream U.S. news outlets and Internet sources did feature meaningful cover of the buildup from the U.S.-Japan alliance perspective, but a very small portion of the media attention was directed at how the U.S. base realignment would affect Guåhan.⁴⁸⁸ When there was U.S. news coverage about the military relocation, the stories remained trapped in a discourse of security and alliance building between the U.S. and Japan while continuing to ignore Guåhan.⁴⁸⁹ The coverage would focus on the status of U.S.-Japan international relations while make passing references to Guåhan as merely

488 Catherine Lutz, “Obama’s Empire,” *New Statesman*, July 30, 2009, <http://www.newstatesman.com/asia/2009/07/military-bases-world-war-iraq>

489 Helene Cooper and Marin Fackler, “Obama, In Japan, Says U.S. Will Study Status of a Marine Base on Okinawa,” *The New York Times*, November 13, 2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/14/world/asia/14japan.html>.

the physical site for the relocation. The news would not address the affect the buildup would have on Guåhan, or make reference to the ongoing local discussions about the relocation and the DEIS process. This situation highlights the both/neither identities of Guåhan, where the U.S. federal government has an extremely heavy hand in dictating policy for “its” unincorporated territory while simultaneously DOD military basing policy imposed on the island remains far from the headlines.

Although the general news coverage of the buildup was lacking, independent television and film outlets made several productions focusing in on the situation and its outcome. The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) released investigative journalism and documentary film pieces that reported about the Pacific, Guåhan, and the impending military buildup. Additionally, *Democracy Now!* covered the buildup in a couple of their broadcasts between 2009-2010 and featured interviews with Chamoru activists from Guåhan. On October 9, 2009, Julian Aguon a Chamoru civil rights attorney spoke with *Democracy Now!* about the U.S. plans for a \$15 billion military buildup.⁴⁹⁰ Aguon explained that Guåhan is one of the longest colonized islands in the Pacific, he shared the history of military control in Guåhan, and the U.S. political status that leaves locals with citizenship no rights to vote in federal elections.⁴⁹¹ Aguon drew attention to Guåhan’s political disenfranchisement from the U.S., even while he explained the island as a part of the U.S. citizenry. In speaking about U.S. colonization, Aguon detailed the continued U.S. efforts to control Guåhan through military policymaking. This media segment illuminates the both/neither identities that characterize local discourse about Guåhan,

490 The segment aired one month prior to the DOD’s release of the DEIS. The full interview recording and transcript are available on the *Democracy Now!* webpage, see “Guam Residents Organize Against U.S. Plans for \$15B Military Buildup on Pacific Island,” accessed February 18, 2013, http://www.democracynow.org/2009/10/9/guam_residents_organize_against_us_plans

491 A point argued by many, the continued colonial legacy of Guåhan is explained by Souder-Jaffery and Robert F. Rogers, *Destiny’s Landfall: A History of Guam* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press. 1995).

positioning at once with the U.S. as citizens and not quite the U.S. as a colonized space that suffers from disenfranchisement.

Two PBS productions released in 2009 formed another component of the repertoire of independent media.⁴⁹² A one-hour PBS documentary, *The Insular Empire: America in the Mariana Islands*, argued the “insular areas” in the western Pacific are in fact American colonies although most Americans know nothing about them. This film asks, “What is it like to be a colonial subject of the greatest democracy on Earth?”⁴⁹³ This question resonates with both/neither identities as it points to the contradictory nature of Guåhan as a colony of the U.S. *The Marines Are Landing* was another production, it asked, “How will this multi-billion dollar move impact the lives and lifestyle of Guam's nearly 180,000 residents?”⁴⁹⁴ The title of this film and its focus depict the both/neither identities in Guåhan where the locals must prepare for the external “landing” of Marines on their island. The filmmakers traveled to the island to inquire about “whether their environment and infrastructure can support such a large and quick infusion of people, and why the buildup is vital to our national security.”⁴⁹⁵ This statement refers to the hasty “infusion” of the island conveying the rushed imposition of the DOD buildup plans. At the same time, it asks about why the buildup is “vital to *our national* security” that conveys a sense of belonging and collective identity among the U.S. and Guåhan. Overall, these independent news outlets provided crucial information about the buildup, demonstrating its intensity and importance of the issue, while educating a wider audience about the military realignment that was all but unknown to the American public living in

492 Vanessa Warheit, “The Insular Empire: America in the Mariana Islands,” directed by Vanessa Warheit, aired 2009, (San Jose, CA : Horse Opera Productions 2009), DVD.; and, John Siceloff, “The Marines Are Landing,” Now on PBS Shows, December 11, 2009, <http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/550/>.

493 Vanessa Warheit “The Insular Empire,” (see above, n. 492).

494 John Siceloff, “The Marines Are Laning,” (see above, n. 492).

495 Ibid.

the contiguous U.S. states. The lack of knowledge from the American public reveals how the phenomenon of both/neither identities functions to simultaneously hold Chamorus within a precarious political position while leaving the U.S. citizens, who hold full political power, completely unaware of these injustices.

Local News In Guåhan

Examining the local news media in Guåhan, also revealed that the island's local news media influenced perceived public support for the controversial buildup issue.⁴⁹⁶ Guåhan local news tends to downplay anti-American sentiments (such as the push for self-determination) while reinforcing pro-American ideological stances.⁴⁹⁷ Guåhan media outlets facilitate the spiral of silence phenomenon where “dominant viewpoints flourish and unpopular perspectives become marginalized.”⁴⁹⁸ Additionally, groups challenging the status quo are most likely to experience marginalization from the mass media.⁴⁹⁹ This phenomenon pertains to Guåhan where opposition to the military buildup was expressed by a variety of groups even as dominant media discourse conveyed overwhelming majority support for the buildup.⁵⁰⁰ As Viernes argues “critiques against military expansion have for the most part been marginalized—usually appearing at the tail end of articles or tucked away in the *PDN* [Pacific Daily News] opinion section—yet, they have

496 Francis S. Dalisay, “The Spiral of Silence and Conflict Avoidance: Examining Antecedents of Opinion Expression Concerning the U.S. Military Buildup in the Pacific Island of Guam,” *Communication Quarterly* 60 (2012): 484. Dalisay explains that people with more collective values tend to avoid expressing opinions that are not favored by the majority. In Guåhan, reciprocity, interdependence, family obligation, respect for elders, and social consensus are among the traditional collective values that influence opinion expression..

497 Francis S. Dalisay, “Social Control In An American Pacific Island: Guam’s Local Newspaper Reports On Liberation,” *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 33(2009): 239–257.

498 Dalisay “The Spiral of Silence,” 482. Dalisay explains that the media of homogeneous and small communities emphasizes consensus and conflict avoidance when it comes to reporting about controversial issues.

499 Michael Barker, “Conform or Reform? Social Movements and the Mass Media,” www.fifth-estate-online.co.uk/criticism/conformorreformsocialmovements.html

500 Viernes, “Won’t You Please,” 109-110 (see chap. 1, n. 148).

nevertheless been a significant force in challenging the assumption that the military is a 'good thing' for Guam."⁵⁰¹ This situation is exacerbated by U.S. saturation of local media where U.S. based companies and their interests dominate and influence local media coverage.⁵⁰²

In response to the belief that a traditional media elite dominates the local public media space that pushes their agendas and viewpoints, the alternative media in Guåhan has grown over the last few years.⁵⁰³ Local organizers created educational spaces for getting information to the public, these efforts included public forums for community discussion and education about the proposed buildup.⁵⁰⁴ The effect of both U.S. media and local media silence surrounding the military buildup, rendered the social movement organization invisible at a time when We Are Guåhan was highly visible in the local discourse about the DEIS and was employing key rhetorical tactics to respond to the DEIS and the military buildup.

As WAG became more established, it infiltrated local news outlets. This coverage can be attributed to the fact that WAG was providing the most sustained and organized response to the DEIS and buildup overall. As an information source, WAG provided a sort of independent coverage for key facts about the buildup. For example, the WAG website was among the first places to notify the public about the Wikileaks documents. In May 2011, Wikileaks released a series of cables from the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo regarding the buildup proposed for Guåhan.⁵⁰⁵ WAG also provided web links to the local

⁵⁰¹ Ibid.

⁵⁰² Aguon, *The Fire*, 9 (see chap. 1, n. 183).

⁵⁰³ Kelly Marsh, "Guam," *The Contemporary Pacific* 19 (2007): 183.

⁵⁰⁴ Natividad and Kirk, "Fortress Guam," n.p. These efforts included collaboration with activists and educators in Okinawa, Australia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of Belau, Marshall Islands, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Hawai'i, and the continental U.S.

⁵⁰⁵ For a discussion of Wikileaks see: Mark Fenster. "Disclosure's Effects: WikiLeaks and Transparency" *Iowa Law Review* 97.3 (2012): 753-807.

news story and offered to post additional details about the released government documents.⁵⁰⁶ The *Pacific News Center* also reported that these U.S. documents indicate various numbers about the military buildup were “doctored,” including the amount of contributions made by the U.S. and the number of Marines being relocated.⁵⁰⁷

Media framing reveals the paradoxical situation for Guåhan, where local issues that should receive U.S. media coverage but do not get considered in the spectrum of domestic or even international news. This situation reflects limitations of both/neither identities that restrict public opinion and discourse about U.S. militarization in Guåhan, failing to find a proper place within public information outlets effectively silences the discussion. Most of WAG’s documents and information was disseminated online. From *The Grey Papers* series, to the announcement of the Heritage Hikes, and the *Prutehi yan Difendi* campaign for Pågat—WAG overwhelmingly used electronic media to communicate about this repertoire of movement activities and organizing. Some scholars have argued that electronic media has the capacity to create democratic, participatory realms dedicated to providing information in cyberspace.⁵⁰⁸ Additionally, electronically mediated participation can create fluid networks that are articulated across a broad spectrum of issues.⁵⁰⁹ This type of media has the potential to lead in the framing of issues when media elites do not appear to be acting responsibly, it also can mobilize those who are not already involved in political activism. However, there are limits to vernacular social media. The connection between technology diffusion, the use of digital media, and

506 We Are Guahan, May 5, 2011, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2011/05/05/wikileaks-reveal-new-details-about-buildup/>.

507 Clint Ridgell, “Asahi-Wikileak Docs Reveal Buildup Numbers Doctored to Make Marine Move to Guam Politically Palatable,” *Pacific News Center*, May 5, 2011, www.pacificnewscenter.com.

508 Lauren Langman, “From Virtual Public Spheres to Global Justice: A Critical Theory of Internetnetworked Social Movements,” *Sociological Theory* 23 (2005): 44.

509 Ibid

political change is complex and contingent.⁵¹⁰ The structure of social media such as YouTube can limit civic discourse and discourage social movements. Therefore, we cannot “assume that social media are automatically democratizing or that the political discussion they engender is necessarily in line with idealized conceptions of civic discourse.”⁵¹¹ Where anyone can write a blog, or publish a video on YouTube, and even get picked up on *Democracy Now!* It is the difficult for organizations such as WAG to translate this media messaging into actions on the ground that provide viable alternatives to the injustices of the U.S. military buildup. The media efficacy is also complicated by the both/neither identities operating within the movement, where the strategies from WAG are adapted to U.S. institutions and audiences even as this discursive move contradicts their efforts to construct an indigenous autonomous identity and control over their island.

In the chapter that follows, I move further inward from the local level to consider how local residents communicate about their organizing and activism. I use the method of both/neither identities to analyze the characteristics emerging from activists in Guåhan. I mobilize resources from interviews with social movement members during my fieldwork in Guåhan. When considering the movement group We Are Guåhan and other interviews, I examine the complexity of activism in Guåhan and how it has to contend with “American” influence and overarching discourses of national belonging. Additionally, I examine the rhetorical formation of a collective identity of activism from within a colonized territorial space.

510 Philip N. Howard and Malcolm R. Parks, “Social Media and Political Change: Capacity, Constraint, and Consequence,” *Journal of Communication* 62 (2012): 360.

511 Ibid., 361

Chapter 6: Articulating Activism Through Both/Neither Identities

In the summer of 2011, I returned to Guåhan for the first time in twenty-one years. My last trip was in the summer of 1990, on a trip with my father and sister to visit my extended family—the majority of who were born and raised in Guåhan. Over two decades later, I would return to my island with a particular mission: reunite with my extended family members, visit my family’s land, reacquaint myself with the island, and get involved with the local organizing against the U.S. military buildup. I spent the summer of 2011 discussing the buildup and its effects with a wide range of people, and I got involved with WAG’s *Prutehi yan Difendi* campaign efforts focused on bus stop paintings. In 2012, I returned again to Guåhan and got involved with the Independence Task Force meetings and activities. These efforts formed part of the Guam Decolonization Commission’s preparations for a self-determination plebiscite. During these trips in the summers of 2011 and 2012, I completed fieldwork and conducted a total of 30 interviews with local residents. The interviewees were almost exclusively members of We Are Guåhan and other local organizations involved in challenging the U.S. military buildup and working towards decolonization for Guåhan.⁵¹²

In this chapter I argue that activism is riddled with complex discourses of national belonging, such that activists must contend with American influence within their homeland even as they articulate injustice caused by the U.S. and seek to establish a collective identity against the U.S. nation-state. Rhetorically shaping a group identity among the locals within a colony requires a simultaneous reliance upon and opposition to

512 My fieldwork trips were supported by The Social Justice Institute (SJI), the Native American & Indigenous Studies (NAIS) program, and the Jesse H. Jones Fellowship from the College of Communication at UT-Austin. These funds provided support for the cost of travel, supplies, and preparation materials necessary for my fieldwork in Guåhan. With the support of these funds, I was also able to work directly with the local organizations’ efforts and take part in their activities in Guåhan.

the U.S.; this phenomenon lies at the heart of both/neither identities. To understand the discursive mechanisms with which these both/neither identities are articulated, I conduct a rhetorical analysis of the interviews from my fieldwork in Guåhan in 2011 and 2012. I analyze the nuances of both/neither identities emerging from the interview transcripts taken from local people of Guåhan who are members of the social movement organizations.⁵¹³

FROM OUR LOCAL WORDS: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS IN GUÅHAN

In chapters 3-5, I explained the political, physical, and cultural dislocations being expressed alongside both/neither identities within UN testimonies and the movement activities. In this chapter, I explore the *externalization of the U.S.* that occurs as locals discuss activism, the military buildup, We Are Guåhan, and the United Nations. This *externalization* entails negative constructions of the U.S. as obstructing, disrupting, and lacking, even though the U.S. outwardly proclaims to support human rights and equality for everyone. Alongside this issue of externalization, Chamorus express *internalization* of U.S., American, and Chamoru cultural values. I refer to this situation as “embedded externalization” to demonstrate the contradictory elements of discourse about the U.S. nation-state in relation to, and opposition with, the island.

Interview transcripts reveal the tension of simultaneously pushing *away from* the U.S. while also drawing *proximity to* the U.S. through an American identity. Interviewees also reproduce a range of evaluative discourses of self, often relating to U.S. nationalist sentiment in complex ways. My analysis of the transcripts reveals the rhetorical modalities of activism and resistance that are couched in both/neither identities.

⁵¹³ See p. 16 n. 36

Both/neither identities are also articulated as interviewees discuss externalization of the U.S. simultaneously with embeddedness within the U.S. landscape.

Embedded Externalization of “America”

Interviewees discuss the U.S. in dual, often conflicting ways. On the one hand, they express the embedded elements of the U.S. values and political principles within Guåhan. On the other hand, they describe the U.S. as a distant place that uses the island for its own political purposes at the expense of the local population. These discursive elements of both/neither identities reveal the complexity of U.S. national belonging.

Interviewee 3 communicates a critical and troubled position of Guåhan as externalized from the U.S. political landscape:

And then to the American public, I really feel like if they knew the truth behind the secret, they're not told about what goes on here in Guam for a reason. And if they knew the secret, I think that the American public would be outraged as to what goes on here and how it's – how we've been used for their freedoms. We are a political sweatshop over here for all of the freedoms that Americans enjoy over there. We are this way because America needs to uphold itself, its stronghold in this world. It's power in this world. And that is why Guam is in the political situation that it is now. (Interview 3, Summer 2011)

This excerpt provides a robust example of how both/neither identities characterize local expressions of contradictory belonging with the U.S. Each time the Interviewee talks about “America” they are externalizing it beyond Guåhan. This discursive move is completed when the interviewee contrasts the “American public” as being uninformed about what happens “*here* in Guam.” By using the language of “here” to refer to Guåhan, the island is expressed as not part of the U.S. but very much outside of what is happening “over there” in America. This interviewee also uses divisive language when referring to Guåhan as a “political sweatshop.” This language describes the island as a place that is abused by poor conditions in order to create “freedoms that Americans enjoy over there.”

These freedoms are expressed as luxuries for others, but not for those who live in Guåhan. Another interviewee provides a similar framing of “American” principles, stating:

We want the liberties and everything that America prides and esteems itself on: freedom, liberty, all these rights that we do not have. So it’s very clear to see that that’s an illusion then. It’s people who choose to frame it solely that way, and live in illusion. You can’t sell it. You can’t sell it to someone who is *thinking*.
(Interview 8, Summer 2011)

Interviewee 8 also uses “we” language to differentiate the population in Guåhan from America. The externalization of the U.S. from Guåhan is articulated along with collective language that communicates local desires for “freedom, liberty, [and] all these rights that we don’t have.” The interviewee then uses the term “illusion” to critique the idea of Guåhan as “Americanized.” In this manner, the interviewee challenges the normalizing logic that frames island as part of the U.S. while failing to afford its peoples freedom and liberty.

Interviewee 3 also expresses the contradictions of the U.S. rule over Guåhan by articulating that:

It’s incredible, the more that you – the more that people understand about Guam’s political status and what it means for our people, the more I think they are, like, “What? Wait a second. This really is happening in the world?” Not only in a country that prides themselves on equity for people – I’m not just talking about equality. But here we have this “benevolent” country who reaches their arms out to third-world countries to help them, empower them, but on their own soil they do this to people. (Interview 3, Summer 2011)

The interviewee discursively positions the U.S. as an external country, a move that articulates the U.S. as separate and completely distinct from Guåhan. By using the term “benevolent” and referencing U.S. efforts to support and “empower” other countries, the interviewee frames the U.S. as a country of good will for others. Yet, this goodwill does not extend to Guåhan as Interviewee 3 criticizes the U.S. for its actions “on their own

soil.” This statement at once alludes to Guåhan as forming part of America’s “soil” while also using “their” to imply U.S. ownership and proprietary relationship over the island. This Interviewee provides a strong example of both/neither identities in which the U.S. is simultaneously characterized as a “benevolent” external country that prides itself on “equality,” while denying these rights to the people of Guåhan even though the island is supposedly part of the American political landscape. Another example externalizing “America” occurs when one interviewee discusses the military buildup. In critiquing the U.S. military buildup, they argue: “This is not an American thing to do. It’s not an American way to come into a community and this is not what the American dream is about.”⁵¹⁴

The U.S. & Guåhan: A Broken “American” Family

Interviews discussed the relationship between Guåhan and the U.S. using family metaphors. These references often described the island of Guåhan as being trapped within an unequal familial situation. Interviewees spoke about this relationship by labeling Guåhan as the “forgotten child,” “foster child,” “family dog,” or even by explaining that the island is altogether “not part of the family.” Another interviewee explains the effect that colonization has on the psyche, arguing it is comparable “to domestic violence” and arguing that on average in a domestically violent relationship the victim will leave 7 to 11 times before leaving their abuser for good.⁵¹⁵ These examples illuminate articulations of an abusive relationship that Guåhan suffers under the U.S.

A vexed sort of U.S. national belonging is expressed in these interviews as they articulate the island’s precarious political relationship:

⁵¹⁴ Interview 1, Summer 2011.

⁵¹⁵ Interview 10, Summer 2011.

The Supreme Court has created unincorporated territory status to say that the *citizens of the territory belong to the United States but are not apart of the political family*. And it gave a power unto Congress, which really doesn't exist under the U.S. Constitution, which says that Congress has preliminary power over the inhabitants in these territories. (Interview 20, emphasis added)

So if we're going to say that "*you belong to us but you're not apart of us*," then the only analogy that I can think of is that "you're the family dog," right? So when do we really become part of the family? You have given us a statutory citizenship; it's not based on the Constitution, which means Congress and the government can take it away anytime they want. (Interview 20, emphasis added)

In the above examples the interviewee twice constructs U.S. citizenship for Guåhan as incomplete. First, by stating citizens simultaneously belong to the U.S. and yet are not part of the U.S. Second, by pointing out the contradictions of U.S. law where Congress has "power over" the territories even as the inhabitants are outwardly labeled to be citizens. Also, these excerpts both highlight the familial metaphors. Asking, "So when do we really become part of the family?" the interviewee illuminates the problem of unincorporated status as not quite belonging to the U.S., while simultaneously being afforded a "statutory citizenship" that can be revoked at the convenience of the U.S. government.

Framing the history of Chamorus is an important rhetorical strategy that situates the indigenous people with a trajectory of thousands of years while comparing this ancient history to the inexperience of the U.S.:

This common faith in the American market or free market were just such a joke. Because the fact that ancient people who have been here for 4,000 years are listening to that dictates the political and sort of doctrines of a country that's a toddler. A country that's not, what, 500 years old? It's sort of cosmically, absurd for our people to be so imaginatively captured by the promise of America or the promise of capitalism. (Interview 8, Summer 2011)

In this excerpt the interviewee separates the "American market" from the island of ancient Chamorus. They also label the U.S. a "country that's a toddler," this discursive

move flips the dependency relationship by alluding to the U.S. as inexperienced and incapable of controlling Guåhan, which has a rich history of several thousands of years. This same interviewee went on to criticize the U.S. for treating Guåhan as a “child.” By using the term “child,” interviewees describe the unequal power relationship the U.S. has over Guåhan. This discursive move also fits within the family metaphors that depict the Guåhan as the problem child within the United States’ family. The term child signals the “both” relationship of the island to the U.S. while also highlighting that the situation is one of unequal inclusion. Interviewee 15 uses a the metaphor of a “foster father” and “foster child” to articulate the situation between the U.S. and Guåhan:

I’m looking at the data [of the U.S. military buildup] and I’m saying, “Gosh, if the U.S. has the judiciary responsibility to protect my rights, I can consider the U.S. my foster father, and I am a foster child. Why did my foster father grab all my land? Why did my foster father put a fence around my house and throw me out? And, now I am no longer welcome into it?” (Interview 15, Summer 2011)

The use of the term “foster” implies a nurturing or even adoptive relationship from the U.S., which bears the “judiciary responsibility” to protect rights of the people. In describing this political relationship, the Interviewee frames themselves as a “child” that depends upon their U.S. “father” to guarantee their rights. This U.S. “father”- Guåhan “child” relationship is rendered problematic when the Interviewee raises questions about the exclusionary actions of the U.S. The Interviewee asks: why did my foster father “grab all my land” and “put a fence around my house and throw me out?” Here, they reveal that the “foster child” is more of an unwanted child—only worthy of stealing from and discarding. Interviewee 15 articulates that the U.S. “foster father” has divided up Guåhan’s “land” and “house,” rendering its people a stranger within their own valued spaces. The Interviewee goes on to describe how the military controls “Our fresh water, our ocean water for navigation, our air for military purposes, and our land for military

purposes. And, yet they pay us not even a penny for compensation for the rights of usage.”⁵¹⁶ This U.S. control of natural resources creates a problematic relationship within the foster family metaphor: “You just don’t take away things from your foster child and say here are a few pennies, take it or leave it, but it’s ours now.”⁵¹⁷ These statements at once articulate Guåhan as a place with natural resources that belong to a collective group of people who are distinct from the U.S. military, and also express the need for connection with the U.S. in order to be compensated for those resources. They also communicate the both/neither identities operating within family metaphors. The Interviewee maintains the characterization of Guåhan as part of a dependent relationship when they describe it as a child that belongs to the U.S.; at the same time, by using “foster family” language the Interviewee expresses the possible impermanence of this father-child duo.

Another interviewee expresses the contradiction of Guåhan’s infantilization, where the island’s citizens are treated like “the forgotten child” of the U.S while simultaneously representing the U.S. military in wartime:

But at the same time, you [U.S.] call our citizens to war. We serve this country, and we served it quite well in every single war since WW2. So the patriotism on Guam is extremely high and unquestioned but because of our distance from Washington, we are the forgotten child. They don’t even know that we are a part of the United States. (Interview 20, Summer 2011)

In the first sentence, the use of “you” represents the U.S. and is discursively separated from “our citizens” of Guåhan. This move signals the distance between, even as the U.S. asserts its proximity by calling the people of Guåhan to military service. The second sentence then moves back toward belonging with the U.S. as the interviewee describes the long history of the people of Guåhan’s collectively serving “this country.” Then,

⁵¹⁶ Interview 15, Summer 2011.

⁵¹⁷ Interview 15, Summer 2011.

shifting away from the U.S. again, the interviewee criticizes the high levels of patriotism on Guåhan for being “unquestioned” and problematizes “our distance from Washington.” Moving back and forth through this excerpt, the discourse of national belonging with the U.S. is expressed simultaneously with attempts to separate from the U.S. by employing “our” and “we” language to distinguish Guåhan. In a final sweeping move of both/neither identities, the interviewee states: “They don’t even know that we are a part of the United States.” This discourse externalizes the U.S. through the language of “they” and criticizes its people for lacking knowledge about Guåhan. At the same time the interviewee also frames Guåhan as a collective “we,” articulating its belonging to the United States. This excerpt also illustrates the paradoxical situation for patriotism on the island, where the residents are very patriotic despite lacking full citizens, rights, or even recognition.

Home: Where U.S. Colonization Lives

Metaphors of family are also used alongside discussions of **house and home**. Interviewees identify their “island home” in relation to U.S. colonization, revealing the both/neither identities that influence local understandings and connections to space and place. As one interviewee put it, colonization is a disruptive force that dislocates people from within their homelands:

We’re looking at Chamorro people here in their home, who are having problems. There’s something to be said about a people living in their house that are having a hard time living in their house, and that gives me goose bumps just saying it because there’s something wrong with that. There’s something wrong with that. We shouldn’t – we should be *thriving* in our home because it’s our home. It’s someplace that we should feel safe and protected. A home should be where we go to be who we are. That’s our space. That’s our place. But yet the Chamorros don’t have that. (Interview 3)

In this excerpt, the interviewee discusses the collective “we” of Chamorus who struggle to find themselves in their homes, to feel safe and comfortable within their own house. These metaphors of house and home demonstrate the deeply embedded effects of colonization, such that Chamorus today do not yet have a space or place to call their own. This out-of-placeness expressed by the interviewee relates to the discourse of dislocation from UN testimonies and the importance of connecting to sacred spaces that were evinced in the struggle to preserve and protect Pãgat.

Colonial Debt: A Cycle of Poverty in the Pacific

“Colonial debt” often develops as a deferential attitude toward Western culture and a perception of indebtedness to the colonizers. As Nilda Rimonte explains, “colonial debt” may still be a perception held widely among modern-day individuals, this is characterized by an acceptance of colonization as natural.⁵¹⁸ This colonial mentality becomes ingrained, and has a profound influence on constructions of self and Other.⁵¹⁹ This often translates into negatively situating oneself in relation to the Western Other.⁵²⁰ Interviewees reflect Rimonte’s observation by communicating about themselves and Guåhan in a negative relationship with the U.S. This relationship is articulated as lacking, as an impoverished situation that continues to contradict itself. Interviewee 8 communicates Guåhan as damaging itself through actions that perpetuate dependency on the U.S.:

Instead, we apply for grants and *get more dependent* and we get a little money to deal with this. You can’t have FEMA to come to your rescue and then still sort of yell at the man. (Interview 8, Summer 2011, emphasis added)

518 Nilda Rimonte, “Colonialism’s Legacy: The Inferiorizing of the Filipino,” In *Filipino Americans: Transformation and Identity*, eds M. P. P. Root (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1997), 59.

519 The term “colonial mentality” is a term used throughout the Philippines and among Filipino Americans, yet the term applies to the case of Guahan.

520 Hannah C M Bulloch, “Concerning Constructions of Self and Other: Auto-Racism and Imagining *Amerika* in the Christian Philippines,” *Anthropological Forum* (2013): 3.

The above excerpt also explains the contradiction and vexed rhetorical position for Guåhan in relation to the U.S. federal government. On the one hand, the island applies for federal grants that perpetuate its dependency on the U.S. through financial support. On the other hand, when federal agencies provide funding it becomes difficult for the island's residents to articulate opposition to the U.S.

Sentiments of debt are connected to the historical construction of the U.S. as the "liberator" of Guåhan during World War II.⁵²¹ This debt is expressed as requiring Guåhan's loyalty to the U.S. As Interviewee 1 explained:

There is no other community where that would happen. If you're *really* a part of the U.S. is somebody going to say to you, "we liberated you, so you owe this to us?" So that's a division. It's *not* like we're a part of you. (Interview 1, Summer 2011)

First, they argue that Guåhan is not "really a part of the U.S." and argue that if the island was truly part of the U.S. then there would be no need to "owe" anything. The Interviewee also criticizes the mindset of the U.S. liberating Guåhan for creating "a division." This division is further expressed as the Interviewee states, "It's not like we're a part of you." This excerpt clearly identifies the construction of both/neither identities as captured within the U.S. but remaining perpetually divisible from the nation-state. The liberation mentality for divides Guåhan *from the* U.S. while holding Guåhan *close to* the U.S. through a system of colonial debt and expectations of national loyalty. Interviewee 1 explains that "there's no talking about the blood that Chamorros shed, or how much Chamorros suffered in order to protect the Americans that were here on the island during the war;" this points to the contradictory nature of the U.S liberation trope for Guåhan.⁵²²

521 Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 157-158; Viernes, "Won't You Please," 105.

522 Interview 1, Summer 2011.

Another Interviewee discusses how these debts characterize the collective identity of Chamorus:

I feel like it's just different because we still have that sense of, I feel like Chamorros feel like they're indebted. Chamorros are going to continue, that's the mentality. It's our people. They're going to keep paying this debt until it's done, but we don't really ever know when it's done and that's the hard part. (Interview 26, Summer 2011)

By explaining the feeling of indebtedness to the U.S. as a deeply ingrained aspect of Chamoru identity, the interviewee also highlights the cyclical and ongoing nature of this debt to the U.S. that can never be repaid.

These sentiments of debt are a byproduct of colonization that holds Chamorus in a state of captivity within their own lands. One interviewee likened the situation on Guåhan to chickens in a coop:

Because, if we want to be chickens in the coop and with "liberty" as more matter of a pellet here or a pellet there, then stop talking about "independence" and "freedom" because that's not what you want. You want to be a chicken, and you want to be kept. You know what I mean? So, there are two choices. Do you want to be free in the deep sense of the word or do you want to be kept? (Interview 8, Summer 2011)

This analogy of being cooped up while being fed small amounts of "liberty," "independence," and "freedom" demonstrates how the tropes of American identity fail to adequately translate in the colonized space of Guåhan.

EMBEDDED EXTERNALIZATION OF POLITICS

Interviewees also use a discourse of embedded externalization when discussing political issues. These discursive elements depict the both/neither political identities for the island. These interviews situate Guåhan within the U.S. political terrain to express the connections, overlap, and applications of U.S. domestic law to the island (both).

Interviews also compare Guåhan to areas of U.S. politics, which distances the island and places it outside the protections of U.S. domestic laws (neither).

Political Disenfranchisement Within “Domestic” Law

Providing a rich example of both/neither identities in the context of the U.S., one interviewee critiques the values of America that do not fit or even apply to Guåhan:

The U.S. Constitution doesn’t even fully apply. It only applies to the extent that the U.S. Congress wants it to apply, and only so-called fundamental rights apply in Guam. But they’ve [U.S.] never adequately defined what those rights are. Now, we know at least that a jury trial is not one of them. So people are constantly like “oh, we’re so Americanized,” but we are not. We’re still so disenfranchised. We’re not part of the American polity in opinion and that’s what self-determination is all about, choosing whether or not you want to be part of that polity because *we still have the choice*. We can be *altogether* or *not* part of that [American polity]. (Interview 8, Summer 2011)

The Interviewee points out the shortfalls in the U.S. Constitution, as only applying to Guåhan “to the extent that the U.S. Congress wants it to apply;” and, characterizes U.S. rights as “so-called fundamental rights” that have never completely been defined by the U.S. The testimony also reveals the paradox of considering Guåhan as “Americanized,” when it is a place that is so politically “disenfranchised.” Interviewee 8 then articulates the need to choose as an inherent right to self-determination that the people still have yet to exercise. This interviewee goes on to describe the double standard of U.S. domestic law that does not fully apply to Guåhan. Interviewee 8 points out that because the island is not “technically a state” it is not protected by the U.S. Constitution. As a result, “We are this constitutional ‘twilight zone’ as a non-state entity” that is constitutionally impermissible.⁵²³ Another Interviewee argued, “We just need to be seen and treated as equals. We need equity. That can never exist in the US government.”⁵²⁴ Taken together,

⁵²³ Interviewee 8, Summer 2011.

⁵²⁴ Interviewee 2, Summer 2011

these Interviewees demonstrate how both/neither identities operate as locals discuss the political disenfranchisement from the U.S. while also explaining the island as part of U.S. domestic politics and laws.

Chamoru “Citizenship”: A Partial Political Status

In discussing political status, Interviewees often invoke descriptions of citizenship as a “statutory,” “quasi,” or even dual phenomenon in Guåhan. These local discussions are complicated by two distinct positions toward citizenship. One side presents critiques of U.S. citizenship for Guåhan, arguing it denies current residents full political participation in U.S. politics. Another side focuses on the citizenship of the future population, opposing the military buildup because it will afford citizenship status to the relocating population. Interviewee 2 provides a response that condenses these positions:

They’re not looking at us. They’re not looking at the indigenous struggle. They’re looking at citizenship. And, if that’s what they’re looking at, whatever might threaten keeping that citizenship, they won’t want to be a part of that. So, if rocking the military buildup boat is going to threaten citizenship, threaten job security, then of course there will be many people who probably won’t view that worldview. (Interview 2, Summer 2011)

Speaking about political status, Interviewee 20 explains the contradiction of unincorporated territory and free association as political status options:

Well we can’t be free if you have to follow somebody else’s rules. Either you have to be fully independent and then go back and negotiate that final status in association with whoever you want. But you have to be truly sovereign to do that, right? That’s true independence. (Interview 20, Summer 2011)

This excerpt articulates the contradiction of both/neither identities as irreconcilable positions between freedom and dependency. Explaining independence and freedom as emerging from true sovereignty, the interviewee expresses that Guåhan enjoys none of these values. By arguing “we can’t be free” when forced “to follow somebody else’s

rules,” the duality of both/neither identities is articulated as a contradiction in political positions that lacks freedom and independence as a result of U.S. control.

Interviewee 20 goes on to explain this situation by saying, “So it makes them like quasi-US citizens, but that is not truly what America was built on.” This quotation makes evident the partiality of U.S. citizenship, and the contradiction of this political status upon the principles of America. It also demonstrates how interviewees externalize the U.S. from Guåhan. The externalization of the U.S. occurs simultaneously with the Interviewees alluding to the U.S. as an embedded part of the island’s landscape. The U.S. military presence on Guåhan represents the nation-state embedding itself within the island. This implant creates a duality in terms of citizenship where there are “two types of citizens: one living inside the fence in the military base, and one living outside.”⁵²⁵ This language of “inside” and “outside” demonstrates the problems of citizenship for the local community where civilian residents are transformed into second-class citizens within their own homeland. Lack of political power also connects to criticisms of the U.S. military:

I think the implications for us, particularly here in Micronesia, are many fold. When you’ve got a militarist agenda of the U.S. and you’ve got a colonized jurisdiction with very poor economics it’s the natural right place to recruit. And, what has that meant for us? You know it means a very hyper-militarized environment where our kids join [the U.S. military] at incredible rates. I mean the highest rates in the country! And, what has it meant? I mean the vets here, you often hear them when they present testimonies share how they picked up the rifle. They went and killed, and came back very sick, and they can’t even vote for their commander in chief. You know there is something very flawed about that! (Interview 10, Summer 2011)

Both/neither identities are revealed as the interviewee argues, “U.S. bases and U.S. military should be *in the U.S.*”⁵²⁶ while contrasting the effects U.S. bases have “here

⁵²⁵ Interview 20, Summer 2011.

⁵²⁶ Interview 10, Summer 2011. Emphasis added.

in Micronesia” as a separate and distinct entity from the U.S. Additionally, Interviewee 10 positions the U.S. “militarist agenda” against Guåhan as “a colonized jurisdiction” that creates the perfect storm for U.S. military recruiters. Comparing the high rates of military enlistment on Guåhan, the interviewee references the U.S. as a comparison—saying the enlistment rates are “the highest in the country.” This discursive move couples Guåhan to the U.S. nation-state, using it as a frame of reference and comparison in the national terrain even as the military service members from Guåhan cannot cast a vote for “their commander in chief.”

Paradox of Patriotism

Interviewees express patriotism as both a positive and negative element of life in Guåhan. On the positive side, interviewees characterize Guåhan residents as people who are loyal to the U.S. and unwavering in their military service. Simultaneously, this patriotism is discussed as a negative influence for the local population. The discourse about patriotism represents a strength and weakness. The locals are overwhelmingly supportive of the U.S. through their military representation, yet the U.S. does not reciprocate such representation for Guåhan since the island does not have political representation in Congress or even full protections from the U.S. Constitution. Thus, the term “patriotism” for Guåhan is itself paradoxical. It is a term that connotes love or devotion for one’s country and *national* loyalty, yet to express this sentiment in Guåhan means denying self-love and externalizing support for another nation that is not quite one’s own.⁵²⁷

527 Anthony D. Smith, *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995), 57; Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity*, (London: Penguin Books, 1991), 73-74.

The discursive formations of the nation, creates an intimate feeling “of being a people coming from the same places and heading in the same direction.”⁵²⁸ However, this constructed, imagined community faces a problematic scenario as its formation and identification with the U.S. nation creates a false sense of belonging. The patriotism paradox also complicates critical inquiry about other issues on Guåhan, such as the military buildup. One interviewee discusses how the local population that supports the buildup does so out of an ingrained sense of support for the U.S.:

It’s that blind patriotism again that really is what we’re up against. And it’s colonization in every shape and form. (Interview 10, Summer 11)

This paradox of patriotism is historically rooted in the push to establish a Naval government on Guåhan following World War II. As Anne Perez Hattori explains, part of the efforts to carry out President William McKinley’s order of “benevolent assimilation” for Guåhan’s indigenous population meant assuming the responsibility of transforming “the Chamorro populace into an ‘American’ society.”⁵²⁹ In turn, the U.S. employed “frequent and unequivocal representations of Chamorros as peace-loving and generous quite naturally (de)generated into conceptualizations of loyal, grateful, patriotic Chamorros who were proud to be American, friendly to American rule, and satisfied with Naval rule on the Island.”⁵³⁰

EMBEDDED EXTERNALIZATION OF DECOLONIZATION

Interviews communicate about their indigenous identity as Chamorus, their language, and their inherent right to self-determination. These topics offer ways to

528 Michael Lujan Bevacqua, “The Gift of Imagination: Solidarity Against U.S. Militarism in the Asia-Pacific Region,” *Pacific Asia Inquiry* 2 (2011): 148-149.

529 Anne Perez Hattori, “The Navy Blues: US Navy Policies on Guam, 1899–1941,” Unpublished manuscript. Pacific Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, 1995, 1.

530 Ibid., 13

articulate an external Chamoru identity that is distinct from the U.S. nation-state and other cultures within the island. At the same time, Chamorus communicate an embeddedness to the U.S. as they articulate desires within U.S. institutions and frameworks such as the UN. Interviewee 3, and former UN petitioner, discusses the UN forum:

The United Nations itself is a biased forum because the U.S. puts in – they pay for 25% of everything that goes on in the UN. So the United Nations ideologically as a – they are – how do I say it? They are an ideal that we hold this world to. They don't have much practical pull in the world. They really try hard. But you know what, I go to the UN still to uphold those ideals, the ideals of the world. I still think that the moral is going to win out over the money and the power in this world, and it has to. And, that's my, that's what keeps me going. That's what keeps me in this. That's what keeps me believing in the United Nations given all of the downfalls about that. (Interview 3, Summer 2011)

This excerpt demonstrates how the U.S. is embedded within the UN and has a strong influence over the UN proceedings. This influence is predominantly monetary in nature, as the U.S. pays “for 25% of everything that goes on in the UN.” As Interviewee 3 explains, these monetary contributions produce a “biased forum” that does not “have much practical pull in the world.” In spite of this obvious U.S. bias, the Interviewee quickly shifts to discursively support the UN for upholding the “ideals of world.” Throughout their statement, Interviewee 3 uses discourse of embedded externalization that focuses exclusively on the U.S. and its relationship to the UN. This discussion also reveals both/neither identities as it signals the problems of the UN, as a forum dominated and biased by the U.S. while still advocating for the productive potential of the UN. Perhaps, as a result of Guåhan not quite fitting into the U.S. domestic arena, the UN continues to remain a site for articulating demands. Petitioners recognize their inability to consider the UN forum as completely separate from the U.S., or free from U.S.

ideological control. This demonstrates a layered complexity for petitioners as they recognize their own colonizer biases the UN forum.

Interviewee 8, and repeat petitioner at the UN, uses “we” language to construct a collective identity of Chamoru petitioners while simultaneously criticizing Chamorus for using stale and unimaginative discourse at the UN. They explain how Chamours are going to the UN all the time, making trips every year and “We’re going to *say the exact same thing*. We cut and paste our testimony, for the last two decades and counting. And, we’re still going to quote Resolution 1514.”⁵³¹ This Interviewee goes on to state that testimonies need to bring something more, and “need to up the logic and up this sort of grace – whatever you want to up – up everything.” They argue that testimonies need to raise the level of discourse in order to have a meaningful impact. This call for creativity also reflects the paradox of Chamoru testimonies appealing to UN Resolutions and international law as they articulate their inherent right to self-determination.⁵³² Finally, the Interviewee argues that Chamoru engagement with the UN can lead “to a sort of fatalism, even among activists. I’ve seen people who delight in calling themselves activists or it gives them a sense of purpose or pride. Personally, they wear it like a garment – their activist pride.”⁵³³ Here, the interviewee connects the Chamoru delegation to the UN with a sort of stylish element of activism, which is temporary, fleeting, and risks becoming another fad.

Later, the same Interviewee argues that “we” is among the most deadly words on Guåhan because it conflates and confuses who has the right to self-determination:

The right to self-determination for example, everyone says: “we’re all part of the ‘we. We’re all Americans. Or, we all live on Guam. It doesn’t matter about race.

⁵³¹ Interview 8, Summer 2011.

⁵³² See Chapter 3, especially the subsection Speaking of Self-Determination.

⁵³³ Interview 8, Summer 2011.

It doesn't matter about ethnicity. We're all part of the 'we.'" So, the Texan, I just give that example, [*Interviewee address me specifically:*] not the Chamorro Texan. You have rights based on indigeneity and ancestry.

But the person on mind is actually from... So he came, and he said, "If I've been here for 5 years, I should be able to vote." International law says no. It's a very specific right to self-determination.⁵³⁴

In this way, the Interviewee expresses that the shift to include the island in the "both" category obfuscates the recognition of Guåhan as a place with a people whom have yet to express their inherent right to self-determination. Instead, the "neither" classification for Guåhan provides an opportunity to position the Chamoru right of self-determination. As the Interviewee argues, this right is not for "Americans" or "Texans" but instead is grounded in international law as a right based in indigeneity and ancestry. In this excerpt by criticizing the language of "we," the interviewee challenges the "both" side of both/neither identities that seek to lump Chamorus into the U.S. nation-state and deny them the exercise of self-determination.

Local interviews express opposition to the military buildup because of the citizenship status it will afford to the relocating population.⁵³⁵ These citizenship rights are constructed as having a negative impact on Chamorus inherent right to self-determination:

Everybody is allowed to vote as soon as you arrive on Guam, thirty days later, you've established residency and you can vote here if you are a U.S. citizen. And that is why this disenfranchisement is being promoted as if it's a "U.S. citizen" kind of a right to determine the political destiny of this island. NO NO NO. This is, we're talking about a *human right*. The unalienable human right of the Chamorro people to determine their political destiny. It is a political right. It is a peoples' right collectively, you know. And, it has to be exercised by those who have been colonized and that came as a result of World War II. This recognition

⁵³⁴ Interview 8, Summer 2011.

⁵³⁵ See Chapter 3, for a discussion of UN testimonies and the arguments articulated about U.S. citizenship. There are number of similarities between testimonies and the interview discussions.

of this human right to self determine political destiny and that's still there until the UN gets rid of it. (Interview 4, Summer 2011).

This discussion of citizenship links U.S. political enfranchisement to Guåhan, where residents are allowed to vote in local elections after a one-month period. This local "citizen" status is simultaneously juxtaposed against the inherent right of self-determination for Chamorus.

EMBEDDED EXTERNALIZATION OF THE BUILDUP

An excerpt from Interviewee 2 demonstrates this phenomenon of place. They stated, "There are all types of ways that we are being destructed by outside forces" and then went on to call the U.S. military a "forced destructive."⁵³⁶ In this example, the interviewee discursively externalizes the U.S. as something that comes from afar; a force that travels to the shores of Guåhan rather than something located within the island. With this distancing discourse the interviewee constructs the U.S. as external to Guåhan just moments before describing the island as totally embedded with the U.S. by saying, "Our island is so entangled in the military industrial complex."⁵³⁷ This statement positions Guåhan as extremely close and "entangled" with the U.S. as a constant presence. Together the interviewee's statements position Guåhan as at once separated from the U.S. by calling it an "outside force," while also linking the island to the U.S. through its "entangled" military relationship. The terms "outside" and "forced" convey the U.S. as an external imposition that contrasts against the collective island identity constructed through the language of "we" and "our." In the latter examples, "we" language is used to create common ground among the local population while voicing discontent about the ongoing U.S. military entrapment. The interviewee also highlights a temporal discursive move by simultaneously discussing the future and the status quo. *Externalization* is used

⁵³⁶ Interview 2, Summer 2011

⁵³⁷ Interview 2, Summer 2011

to discuss and frame the upcoming U.S. military buildup that poses threats for the future of the island, while *embeddedness* is used to express the ongoing situation of U.S. military presence on the island that currently traps the population from within its own lands. Embedded externalization and its accompanying temporal elements was a tactic often used by interviewees when discussing U.S. militarization.

The buildup is also articulated in a back and forth relationship with the U.S. where Interviewees shift between embedding and externalizing the nation-state. One Interviewee's statement reveals this sharply embedded externalization:

Because it's huge for the U.S. interests that this buildup will be protecting the U.S. mainland, and protecting its allies. And, all that is coming into U.S. soil, whose people have not had a chance to vote for the President of the United States, or members of Congress, or anybody else who is making these decisions... a forgotten people.⁵³⁸

This excerpt first labels and identifies everything about the buildup as important for the U.S. nation-state. By referring to the buildup as huge "for U.S. interests," protection of the "U.S. mainland," and "its allies" the speaker positions the buildup policy in the service of a distant U.S. government. Then, in one continuous motion, they argue that the buildup "is coming into U.S. soil," which discursively brings Guåhan into the U.S. by articulating that it forms part of the same soil.

Connecting Colonization & Militarization

Interviewees connect elements of militarization to colonization in various ways. Many interviewees forge these connections by discussing the long-term effects of colonization, and the destruction that militarization will add to an already grave situation for Guåhan. The military buildup is especially targeted as the deciding factor in the fate of the island:

538 Interview 20, Summer 2011.

So, I mean even though our militarization has everything to do with why Guam is under the U.S. today. Why Guam became a possession of the United States, you know, why the Insular Cases and all those fought in the court system. It seems like our people are being steered to extinction, and the militarization of Guam will spell a major impact whether they realize it or not. (Interview 4, Summer 2011)

Here, the speaker connects militarization to the political status Guåhan has in relation to the U.S. By discussing the island as a “possession” that is situated “under the U.S.,” they allude to colonization. Thus, it is colonization that severely limits the people of the island and pushes them dangerously close to extinction. The interviewee also points out that the island’s inhabitants do not necessarily recognize these devastating effects as colonization. In this way, Interviewee 4 expresses that the militarization of Guåhan will exacerbate the current situation of colonization, even if colonization remains unconscious or unrecognized by the people.

Another interviewee refers to militarization as “the new colonization.” In this way, they argue that the outcome of the U.S. military buildup plans, will add another dimension to an all too familiar repertoire of U.S. colonization tactics in Guåhan.

And, the most messed up thing about all of this *militarization as the new colonization* as this one woman said “It takes away. It’s like we’re not treated as human you know? We’re treated like we’re inhuman and so in the process of that happening, the ones who partake really become inhumane.” But I like to think of it further, because it’s not only about humanity it’s about life. And those spaces that they create are about death. (Interview 2, Summer 2011, emphasis added)

In this excerpt, the interviewee reveals both/neither identities as they criticize militarization. Arguing that militarization has a powerful diminishing effect. This is a destructive force that “takes away” and justifies “inhumane” treatment of the local population. Interviewee 2 counterposes these devastating facets of militarization and colonization against the importance of preserving “life.” This reference to “life” alludes to the local population, and the need to sustain indigenous cultural practices against the forces of destruction from the U.S. military. Further challenging militarization, the

interviewee identifies U.S. military spaces as constructing areas “about death.” The interviewee alludes to the U.S. when referencing “the ones who partake” in inhumane treatment and by using the term “they.” In both of these examples the interviewee labels the U.S. military as an external entity that creates and occupies these death spaces on Guåhan. At the same time, the local population is positioned as the victims of inhumane treatment, as the collective “we” that is struggling to maintain their life and humanity against the devastation “they” cause through militarization and colonization.

Contradiction of the U.S. buildup coming to Guåhan so that the island can protect *its* interests and allies of a government that has forgotten the local population:

The Buildup: A Catalyst for the Movement

One interviewee discussed the buzz surrounding the DEIS and the catalyst it created for the movement: “I was very excited when the DEIS was released. I mean of course, we were depressed because of what it contained. But it did lead to sort of this grassroots movement. And, WAG arrived on the scene and that’s been helpful.”⁵³⁹ Then, the Interviewee goes on to state, “I’ve learned this throughout the world from different people I’ve met: You just gotta ride the wave when it’s here. And when the DEIS was released, guess what: the wave was here.”⁵⁴⁰ By using water metaphors, the Interviewee discusses WAG and the local efforts to respond to the DEIS as an incoming “wave.” This wave metaphor also parallels Tarrow’s discussion of social movements that act in waves of collective action.⁵⁴¹

In discursively highlighting the convergence between colonization and militarization, another interviewee explains how “we come from a long line of

⁵³⁹ Interview 10, Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁰ Interviewee 10, Summer 2011.

⁵⁴¹ Sidney Tarrow, “National Politics and Collective Action: Recent Theory and Research in Western Europe and the United States.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 14 (1988): 435.

colonialism, but our people still continue to push forward.”⁵⁴² Then, moving from the colonial lineage, the interviewee discusses contemporary militarization through the buildup:

Most recently, I think the biggest impetus could quite possibly be the military buildup because it pushes people to be in an *uncomfortable space*. It’s people having to deal with the taking away of our land, the destruction of our resources and the taking away of our resources. And, we’re noticing that decisions are not being made with our consent. (Interview 3, Summer 2011, emphasis added)

Here, the interviewee identifies the U.S. military buildup as sparking local actions and consciousness by pushing people into “an uncomfortable space.” This uncomfortable space results from the local recognition of the ongoing effects of colonization and the resulting loss of land and resources. Other interviewees also explain the U.S. military buildup as provoking an awakening with the local population. The public outcry was tremendous, as Interviewee 10 explained:

People were interested and were awakening. And, I think so that if we had to find silver lining with the buildup in this entire experience and process is it’s really allowed people to *start to question the relationship that Guam has with the United States*. You know and to look at it a little more closely, because most people just don’t. (Interview 10, Summer 2011)

Here, the interviewee depicts a “silver lining” for the buildup since the issue served as the catalyst for critical consciousness among the local population. The buildup is attributed with provoking questions about “the relationship that Guam has with the United States,” in this way the Interviewee identifies a moment for mobilizing decolonization efforts along with opposition to the buildup. The above two examples articulate both/neither identities as occupying an uncomfortable space between U.S. colonization and militarization that is made manifest in contemporary buildup. The buildup is identified as

542 Interviewee 3, Summer 2011.

the catalyst for a local consciousness and movement to challenge the loss of lands, resources, and voice at the decision making table.

The DEIS Review & Comment

Criticizing the DEIS scoping meetings, one interviewee argues that the “Scoping meetings became too much for them. Those bureaucrats, those privately contracted people from Hawai’i and wherever.”⁵⁴³ By using the labels “those” and “bureacrats” along with “people from Hawai’i” the Interviewee externalized the DOD and their off-island personnel working on the DEIS. Then, they explained the scoping meetings as a flawed process, “Definitely limited if you want to know a communities concerns. Throw a big party, bring some good food, follow their custom, but if you’re just there to do your protocol...”⁵⁴⁴ In this quotation a type of “us versus them” language is used to articulate division between the DOD (identified as “you”) and the local population. The Interviewee accuses the DEIS review process as more concerned with “those” outsiders’ “protocol” than the local community. In fact, the only consideration given to the local community is through the DOD’s mischaracterization of the local culture as just interested in “a big party,” with “some good food.” Compounding this situation, the scoping meetings have a problematic process of soliciting local input:

Sure, you know, get a community center, set up your tables, set up your foam boards and show a few PowerPoint presentations. And, then tell people that if they have comments or questions to “just write it down or email.” Especially in a place where you know it’s not the norm. We don’t write things down, and you’re not going to get a comment out of that, people writing it down. (Interview 2, Summer 2011)

The statement “we don’t write things down,” functions to establish a collective identity among the local population while simultaneously resonating with the history of ancient

⁵⁴³ Interview 2, Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁴ Interview 2, Summer 2011.

Chamoru society that was an oral culture. This cultural reflection also constructs the DOD as an external “you” while arguing against the likelihood that locals will give a comment because it is “not the norm.”

Another member of WAG described the DEIS and the comment process as archaic in contrast to the DOD’s technological capabilities:

DOD can drop a bomb on a place via remote control, but the comments to the EIS are not text searchable. So you have to literally go through every single page to either find a response to your own comment, or to find a response that a government agency has on a particular issue. It was a nightmare to read through. (Interview 9, Summer 2011)

This excerpt exposes the military power projection and the ease with which the DOD can drop bombs “via remote control,” yet its technological advances do not translate over for the local community. Here, the interviewee juxtaposes the DOD’s world class technologies against the inability to easily navigate through DEIS comments because they “are not text searchable.” This WAG member alludes to the “nightmare” situation of reading through the DEIS.

We Are Guåhan: The Movement from the Middle

Members of WAG discuss the strategic and purposeful tactics they used to challenge the military buildup, but these expressions are generally coupled with statements that simultaneously dismiss any radical, political characterizations of the group. In this way, WAG members articulate their own organization, activities, and materials through a discourse that muddles their opposition. This grey discourse also illuminates the both/neither identities of WAG members who construct a narrative of the organization that struggles to fit in with mainstream society while articulating opposition to the status quo. As one Interviewee explained:

I think that WAG is already extremely sort of *in the middle*. Its already *middle of the road*. And, so why wouldn't you just want to formalize it? And, just become like an Amnesty International, or a Greenpeace. It's kind of already like that, but actually, actually it's not. Because WAG right now is simply sort of, its simply messages. It is not actually advocacy, or lobbying, or action. The only kind of action, which it has is hikes, bus stops, [things] like that. And, so you know, those are good. And, that's where it becomes an issue of: what is your goal? (Interview 12, Summer 2011).

Using this discourse of the "middle," this Interviewee explains that the organization is now characterized as "simply messages" rather than direct actions. Criticizing the group for only engaging in hikes and bus stops, the Interviewee asks what are the goals for WAG? This question reveals the vexing rhetoric of WAG as an organization that struggles to articulate its opposition. It is from this conflicting, middle position that I consider how locals discussion WAG activities and efforts through an emerging discourse of both/neither identities.

The Grey Papers: Just Facts, No Positions

In describing the organization, WAG members tend to downplay descriptions of radical or activist actions. As one Interviewee stated:

The materials that we produce and the presentations that we make, for the most part, are very balanced, very calm and based in documents that the Department of Defense or the government of Guam has put out themselves. We're not making up statistics; we haven't come up with this stuff on our own. Its just material that we are summarizing and giving out to other people.

I think people don't even necessarily even call us activists. Because yes, there is still a smaller group of people that still tries to group us in as "crazy activists against military buildup" but we've done things a lot differently than activist groups have done in the past. And, it's put us in a place that's very mainstream. (Interview 1, Summer 2011)

By discussing their materials and actions as "balanced" and "calm," they draw a distinction between WAG and "crazy activists." Alluding to *The Grey Papers*, this interviewee explains that their *Papers* are based in "the documents that the Department of

Defense or the government of Guam” provided and that this information is not made up. This move signals the potency of the *Papers* as documents rooted in the very information and language of the DEIS document. However, in the very next breath, the interviewee describes the *Papers* as “just material that we are summarizing and giving out to other people,” this move dismisses the *Papers* as antagonistic documents against the buildup. Instead, it discursively paints a picture that their own documents are simply providing information rather than offering sharp criticism and strong opposition to the Department of Defense. This Interviewee even describes that the organization has become part of the mainstream. The characterization of WAG fitting into the mainstream, demonstrates how WAG members strive to construct an identity for the organization as simply providing information rather than confrontation. However, by focusing on providing information about the buildup issues the organization members also must articulate some form of opposition. As one member stated, “We always have been and always will be an issue based organization, you know. We aren’t like ‘freedom, and jobs, and apple pie.’”⁵⁴⁵ Even in describing WAG as “an issue based organization” the Interviewee separates WAG from the U.S. and its iconic symbols of America such as “freedom” and “apple pie.”

WAG discusses the audience they were trying to reach with *The Grey Papers Series*, this description highlights the painstaking efforts of the organization to establish itself as an information organization as opposed to an activist group:

Those that are far on one side and have already decided they’re going to support the build up at all costs and it doesn’t matter. They’re going to make money, and that’s it – we probably will never reach those people. But for those people who have made a decision based on no information, we are giving them information to make a better-informed decision. And, in some ways that’s different from what activist groups do. In the EPA *Grey Paper* that we put out, where we could have

⁵⁴⁵ Interview 9, Summer 2011

used a really polarizing image of again, excuse my language here, but shit in water. We laughed about that. “What kind of images are we going to use here? We could show *take*’ [feces] water...” And, so we talked about that and its just like there’s no need to do that. It polarizes people. And were not trying to do that, we don’t want to influence people in a specific direction; we’re trying to give them information. (Interviewee 1, Summer 2011)

The Interviewee goes on to explain the conscious choice to include an image of a young girl drinking clear water from a fountain. This image was used to convey the impact the buildup would have on fresh water supply, but also it was important for WAG that “people don’t pick up the brochure and say, ‘Oh, this is an activist flyer.’ It’s information. It’s general information. So, it’s definitely enabled us to reach a different portion of the population.”⁵⁴⁶ Interviewee 9 also explains, “WAG has occupied a space where we try to be as encompassing as possible.”⁵⁴⁷ This depiction illustrates the grey properties of the organization; by occupying as a space that is “as encompassing as possible” it becomes difficult to carve out a space that exists in opposition to anything. The Interviewee immediately continues by explaining: “You know people who don’t want any more military here at all, or period, can use the information that we put out. Or, people who favor the build up principle but don’t want it to be harmful to the people on Guam can still use the information.”⁵⁴⁸ This quotation demonstrates how WAG appeals to people across a spectrum of both opposition and support for the military buildup. This discourse reveals the problematic position of WAG, by operating within a grey space and striving to be all “encompassing” the organization appeals to everyone rather than claiming a position about the buildup.

Interviewees also position WAG within the landscape of other Guåhan social movement organizations. These individuals draw comparisons between WAG and other

⁵⁴⁶ Interviewee 1, Summer 2011

⁵⁴⁷ Interviewee 9, Summer 2011.

⁵⁴⁸ Interviewee 9, Summer 2011.

local groups, with interviewees often describing WAG as occupying a middle ground. As a member of the Guåhan Coalition for Peace & Justice explained:

You know WAG was very conservative when they first started, saying “this is not a bit about choosing sides, it’s just presenting information.” You know you’ve got *Nasion* [*I Nasion Chamoru*] that’s very clear on its side. You’ve got our Coalition [Guåhan Coalition for Peace & Justice] that really has probably, if I have to surmise it, been more focused on education than anything but clearly taking a side. Just using it as a vehicle to educate the community about what we’ve uncovered, what we’ve unearthed, or what we’ve learned. So, I think all of it is good you know. And, it’s very...we’re just all up against a very difficult task. (Interview 10, Summer 11)

This Interviewee describes WAG as “conservative” organization that deliberately avoids “choosing sides.” The Interviewee then separates WAG from other local organizations that are “very clear” about “taking a side.” This discourse characterizes WAG as a murky and unclear organization that avoids taking a hard fast position. Although they seem to raise this as a criticism against WAG, the Interviewee shifts to unify the local organizations by stating, “all of it is good.” This unification is an important part of alliance building on the ground, since the U.S. military buildup had deleterious affects on everyone. However, another Interviewee argues that there are consequences associated with WAG becoming associated with things that “people cannot be against.”⁵⁴⁹ Taking up safe and unchallenging activities means that WAG is no longer representing the reasons:

why a lot of people wanted to start it in the first place. A lot of people wanted to start it to speak truth to power. And, not speak truth in terms of saying, “these statistics from the DEIS say this” and “this is this...” but speaking truth in terms of talking about the way things are. Talking about the way things are, talking about colonization, decolonization, stuff like that. But, We Are Guåhan has resisted that. (Interview 12, Summer 2011)

⁵⁴⁹ Interview 12, Summer 2011. Here referring to WAG’s concern for island beautification, hikes, and issues such as: education, environment, jungle & wildlife from *The Grey Papers* series.

This criticism challenges *The Grey Papers* as documents that simply present statistics, rather than using WAG as a platform for more direct opposition that could “speak truth to power.” Instead, WAG is identified as an organization that trades off with decolonization.

The Heritage Hikes: Retelling the Story

As one WAG member explained, the organization purposefully focused on connecting culture, heritage, and land as an important step in the process of responding to the U.S. military buildup. These connections were forged through the Heritage Hikes:

The other thing that we kind of focused in on doing is really trying to strengthen the connection to our culture, and our heritage, and our land—which kind of gets lost in this whole process. Doing things like the Heritage Hikes, the walk that we did just a few weeks ago, because, you know, it’s funny because Leevin [Camacho] always tells this story differently than I do but with the military buildup. And, even before the military buildup, the story that’s always been told is the American story. (Interview 1, Summer 2011)⁵⁵⁰

From this excerpt, both/neither identities are articulated as the Interviewee positions “our culture, and our heritage, and our land” as a local Chamoru identity that is distinct from the U.S. At the same time, the Interviewee explains that the “American story” has dominated on Guåhan which points to the island’s belonging to the U.S. nation-state. The Interviewee goes on to explain that “our Heritage Hikes” offer a way to take value in “our history, and our culture, and our land” by offering a way to “educate ourselves on our true history.”⁵⁵¹ This description of the Heritage Hikes as a direct challenge the “military buildup” process that overlooked the local concerns for culture, heritage, and land. It also

550 The “the walk that we did just a few weeks ago” is a reference to the Manenggon Walk that some members of WAG participated in to honor Chamoru ancestors who lost their lives during World War II. See: KUAM News, “Manenggon Walk Honors Chamorro Lives Lost in WWII,” YouTube video, 9:34, from an interview televised by KUAM news on July 9, 2011, posted by “kkuamnews,” July 9, 2011, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9h8ccJDkBg4> (See also, Leo Babauta, “War Atrocities: Manenggon Concentration Camp,” *Guampedia*, <http://guampedia.com/war-atrocities-manenggon-concentration-camp/>)

551 Interview 1, Summer 2011.

reveals WAG's intentional efforts to reclaim the Chamoru history and cultural values of land in order to change Guåhan's "story." Together, this discussion demonstrates that the Heritage Hikes resonated with the Chamoru cultural concept of *inafa' maolek* as a way of restoring balance which is often "lost in this whole process" of the military buildup.

Another Interviewee describes their involvement with WAG as connected to the local indigenous culture.

I always looked at WAG as a think tank, an indigenous think tank. We're on the streets, we're in your houses, we're part of the community, but we're the ones that's willing and ready, and armed to decipher this jargon. We're their greatest mistake. We're your past coming back to haunt you. We're the product of corporal punishment for speaking Chamorro in school. (Interview 26, Summer 2011)

In this excerpt, WAG is positioned as synonymous with indigenous identity and forms "an indigenous think tank." By using "we" language and references to place (streets, houses, community) the Interviewee also conveys the visibility of WAG and their work as the organization "willing and ready, and armed to decipher this jargon." The term jargon alludes to the DEIS document. The Interviewee then shifts to position the WAG as a collective "we" that contrasts with the U.S. military "them." By identifying WAG as "*their* greatest mistake" and an example of "your past coming back to haunt you," the speaker articulates the trouble that WAG poses for the U.S. and its history of colonization in Guåhan. Calling WAG "the product of corporal punishment for speaking Chamorro in school" also signals the alignment of the organization with Chamoru indigenous identity, and locates the group within the history of U.S. assimilation policies following World War II.

Pågat Lawsuit

Interviewees discussed Pågat, focusing in particular on the lawsuit filed against the DOD over the proposed firing range complex. As Interviewee 9 explains, “The lawsuit is being filed to protect and defend something that we love, and Pågat has become a concrete example of our culture and our heritage. At the abstract level it is a symbol of true *identity*.”⁵⁵² With this statement the Interviewee explains the lawsuit’s purpose to protect and defend, resonating with the principles established in the *inefresi* pledge “from deep within my heart” to protect the resources of the Chamoru.⁵⁵³ The Interviewee describes Pågat as something that “we love” and symbolic of “our culture and our heritage” which is expressed as the collective Chamoru “identity.” These discursive moves create unity and establish Chamorus as distinct from the U.S. military actions.

Another member of WAG explains that, “Our actions have influenced the way that things move forward with the filing of the Pågat lawsuit. There are definite ways that we feel we protected the community, or forced DOD to follow the law.”⁵⁵⁴ From this account, the lawsuit is again described in collective terms, this time directly opposing the DOD by forcing it to comply with the law. The use of “our” and “we” language signal a common local identity that worked to protect Pågat against the forces of the U.S. In these examples, the Interviewees both construct the local community as a collective that is distinct from the U.S. Despite this positioning of the local community as divergent from the U.S., Interviewee 1 goes on to describe the goals for WAG without articulating any concrete opposition to the U.S.: “I think the ultimate goal is *not necessarily to stop the build up*. The ultimate goal is really to grow a more educated community, a more

⁵⁵² Interview 9, Summer 2011. Emphasis Added.

⁵⁵³ Office of the Governor of Guam, “Relative to Adopting Inefresi, the Chamoru “Pledge of Allegiance,” <http://documents.guam.gov/sites/default/files/E.O.-98-28-Relative-to-Adopting-Inifresi-the-Chamorro-P.pdf>.

⁵⁵⁴ Interview 1, Summer 2011.

sustainable community, a community that cares about its resources, and is willing to protect the things that don't have monetary value.”⁵⁵⁵ This quotation reveals the both/neither identities of WAG members, that at once express Chamoru cultural identity as something to preserve and protect against the U.S. but simultaneously deny outright opposition to the U.S. military buildup that is threatening these cultural elements on the island. This is a telling reminder of the middle and grey position from which WAG came to operate. As a result, the organization came to signify many things for arrange of people, allowing them to tap into the group and identify with it. People they can draw their identities from it and feel identity with it. Although the Heritage Hikes and bus stop paintings offer additional opportunities for the community to get involved with WAG's *prutehi yan difendi* campaign, these activities also came to be considered weak movement activities since they did not directly challenge anything.

An Interviewee who was involved with some of the DEIS review process and WAG activities explained that WAG “made very good use of the public meetings that were part of the [DEIS] process” and was successful and by virtue of being a group that “in reality was not against the buildup.”⁵⁵⁶ Although it may seem odd to say that WAG, an organization involved in a lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Defense, was “not against the buildup,” this description accurately demonstrate the problematic of both/neither identities for a social movement organization. By not outwardly and publicly expressing direct opposition to the buildup, it became a group that constantly occupied the grey space between claiming belonging to the U.S. nation-state and its legal structure while simultaneously striving to articulate difference from the U.S. through a collective Chamoru culture. This positioning created a situation:

⁵⁵⁵ Interview 1, Summer 2011. Emphasis added.

⁵⁵⁶ Interview 12, Summer 2011.

That, unfortunately, led to We Are Guåhan becoming more powerful and more important. If it had gone in the direction of being *against the buildup*, like *explicitly* against the buildup, and taking talking points which are *against the buildup* as opposed to what it does now... which is talking points that are *critical of the buildup*. It would have been more, it would have been cooler, but less powerful and less popular. Because We Are Guåhan has a really funky blend of things right now, where a lot of people like it because they think it is against the buildup, and a lot of people like it because they don't think it is against the buildup. (Interview 12, Summer 2011)

By simply being “critical of the buildup” without being directly “against the buildup,” WAG represents an organization challenged by its own both/neither identity that simultaneously mixes appeals to collective identity formation as Chamorus while also adapting a strategy toward U.S. institutions.

It is from this vexed rhetorical position that local discussions about the military buildup were also trapped between claiming the U.S. nation and articulating an opposing identity apart from the U.S.

“States” of Comparison

Speaking about the military buildup, one interviewee explained the complexity and problematic nature of the buildup by contrasting Guåhan with California:

If this happened in Berkley California, I guarantee it that there would have been protests. There would have been Senators and Congressmen, both houses, who would have been clamoring for more information because the constituents would have wanted that information. There would have been more transparency; they would have put out a detailed plan. They would have explained in more peaceful fashion leading up to the holistic approach. Much more care would have been given. That's not done here. (Interview 20, Summer 2011)

This excerpt positions the buildup as an imposition upon Guåhan without the peoples' consent. It exhibits contradictory nature of both/neither identities where the U.S. government does what it wants on Guåhan, in comparison to other places in the U.S. where the government would be held accountable to the public. Interviewee 20 argues that if the buildup would have happened in Berkeley: “there would have been protests,”

information from the Senate and Congress, and transparency about the military plans. However, because the buildup happened in Guåhan these luxuries of accountability do not exist and are simply “not done here.” The opening and closing lines also demonstrate the way that distinctions are drawn between iconic locales of the U.S. versus Guåhan as a “here” that does not fit within the national terrain. This example also parallels previous discussions from Chapters 3 and 4, where both/neither identities are articulated in the way that Guåhan is understood in reference to or comparison with various U.S. states.

Another Interviewee articulates the U.S. military buildup as a typical part of the DOD actions around the world. Interviewee 9 discusses the DOD actions and responds to the idea that the buildup would have happened differently if it had occurred somewhere else:

Although, the funny thing from...well it's honestly not funny. There are a lot of people on Guam, who are like: “This wouldn't have happened if Guam wasn't an unincorporated territory.” I'm like that's absolutely not true. This kind of stuff happens in Texas. It happens everywhere! The Department of Defense tries to impose its role on people everywhere. (Interview 9, Summer 2011)

This Interviewee contests the idea that the political status of Guåhan was what influenced the DOD to select the island for the buildup. To refute the idea that Guåhan's “unincorporated territory” label plays a role U.S. military decision-making, the interviewee next offers Texas as an example to demonstrate that the DOD does not discriminate in its selection of sites. By using the term “everywhere” the interviewee argues the U.S. military has an expansive reach that “tries to impose its role on people” anywhere.

This example makes several important discursive moves. By explaining that the DOD did nothing out of the ordinary when imposing the military buildup on Guåhan, the Interviewee connects the island with other places belonging to the U.S. nation-state.

Discursively lumping Guåhan with Texas, has the rhetorical effect of *assimilating* the island into the terrain of the U.S. and sharply shifting the discussion away from political status. Dismissing the idea that the “unincorporated territory” status has any influence on the DOD provides a way for the Interviewee to articulate a blanket criticism of the DOD for its indiscriminate militarization “everywhere.” However, this critique of the DOD as a global military institution is only expressed after purposefully and directly *decoupling* the island’s political status from the critique of militarization. Rather than connecting the two struggles of decolonization and demilitarization, the Interviewee denies critical considerations of Guåhan’s political status and fails to entertain the deeper structural issues of U.S. colonization.

This example demonstrates the vexing rhetoric from the local movement.⁵⁵⁷ On the one hand, Interview 20 compared California to Guåhan in order to articulate the injustices occurring as a direct result of island’s political status. Namely, that the political status traps the island in a situation without political consideration in the U.S. military buildup. On the other hand, Interview 9 articulates opposition to the U.S. DOD through an assimilation of Guåhan into the nation, drawing similarities with Texas and everywhere. These two distinct positions between Interviewee 20 and Interviewee 9 demonstrate the difference in both/neither identities articulated at the local level. Interviewee 20 expresses the precarious position of Guåhan in comparison to the U.S., and moves toward advocating decolonization for the island. While Interviewee 9 expresses an exclusive focus on the issue of U.S. militarization without addressing, or even entertaining, the issue of decolonization. It is perhaps telling that this latter

557 Other Interviewees also draw comparisons between Guåhan and U.S. locales, including San Francisco (see Interview 1), Texas (see Interview 12).

Interviewee is a member of We Are Guåhan, who dismissed political status as influencing the manner or form in which the U.S. military imposed its plans on the island.

Together these examples reveal how both/neither identities articulate desire to bring Guåhan into the U.S. nation-state and seek similar recognition and rights as states like California and Texas. They also uncover the importance of establishing Guåhan as a distinct place, separate from any belonging to the U.S. It is in this space of self-determination that the island has the strongest foothold from which to challenge the Department of Defense for occupying the island and imposing military buildup on the indigenous lands.

These local interviews demonstrate the both/neither identities as articulated by individuals involved in activism, community building, and organizing in Guåhan. The interviews are characterized by a number of themes. Locals discuss deep connections to history, place, and culture in order to articulate a collective Chamoru identity. At the same time, they identify themselves in relation to and as part of the nation-state, which discursively brings Guåhan in line with the U.S. These interviews reveal that the repertoire of collective actions from the local level must contend with the overarching discourse of American national belonging. Interviewees demonstrate the complexity of both/neither identities for activists, organizers, and community members who are struggling to articulate demands for justice.

Perhaps moving toward an answer to the vexing rhetorical positions of both/neither identities, one Interviewee 10 explained, “all these little sort of enclave [movement] activities, that allow us to express ourselves culturally are so important because that's part of replacing things [colonization].”⁵⁵⁸ This is a conscious effort, where one needs “to make a deliberate choice and decision to move in the direction of

⁵⁵⁸ Interview 10, Summer 2011.

reclaiming their identity as Chamorros.”⁵⁵⁹ Thus, challenging U.S. colonization requires supplanting these external forces with a Chamoru identity.

⁵⁵⁹ Interview 10, Summer 2011.

Conclusion: Restoring the Balance

This project has focused on a relatively brief period in Guåhan's contemporary timeline, the U.S. military buildup from 2005 to 2012, and situated it within a wider net of the complex histories of militarization and colonization. This period of time also constituted the emergence of grassroots efforts to contend with the U.S.-Japan Realignment agreement, a proposed \$10.3 billion buildup project that included the U.S. Department of Defense relocating roughly 8,000 Marines and their 9,000 dependents to Guåhan by 2014.⁵⁶⁰ Three major proposed actions of the military buildup included: 1) construction of permanent infrastructure and facilities to support a full spectrum of warfare training for the relocation; 2) construction of an Army Missile Defense Task Force for U.S. military to practice intercepting intercontinental ballistic missiles; 3) the construction of a deep-wharf to allow passage of nuclear-powered aircraft carriers through the island's only harbor.⁵⁶¹ These major construction plans at the center of the buildup would require killing entire limestone forests, wiping out hundreds of acres of jungle, destroying massive areas of coral reef, denying local access to traditional fishing grounds and places of worship, and desecrating burial sites dating roughly 2,000 years.⁵⁶²

This impending destruction necessitated novel regimes of discourse that articulated opposition to the U.S. military buildup. These efforts constructed demands laden with both/neither identities that articulated the dichotomy of *belonging with* and *opposition to* the U.S. The anti-militarization movement created a multifaceted strategy

560 Condoleezza Rice et al., 2006, *United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation*, United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee Document. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/doc0605.html> (accessed April 29, 2010). See part 1(b).

561 Aguon, "On Loving the Maps," 67.

562 Aguon, "On Loving the Maps," 67.

of opposition that wove a dynamic web of social movement rhetoric. Ultimately, this culminated in the DOD shifting its plans away from Pāgat Village and changing the course of the U.S. military buildup from its original plan.

To outline the broader implications of resistance in Guåhan, I first consider Guåhan as a site for cultural production and political practice. Then, I address my research questions that opened this project: What are the rhetorical and discursive practices of contemporary indigenous social movement efforts against U.S. militarization in Guåhan? And, how do indigenous activists negotiate multiple levels of identification through communication in challenging common sense about militarization? Finally, I address the question: How can U.S. institutions function as sites of rhetorical invention for resistant politics? How do colonized subjects use rhetoric to articulate their relationships to the U.S. nation-state that might intervene beyond both/neither identities?

RHETORICAL PRACTICES: A POLITICS OF *INAF*A' *MAOLEK*

Rhetorical perspectives provide a foundational framework for analyzing the intricacy of intertwining colonialism, nationalism, and resistance in Guåhan. Furthermore, it is undeniable that U.S.-Guåhan relations are influenced by American national identity, militarization, and colonization. Ultimately, rhetoric offers avenues for understanding and reconciliation of these unwelcome/uninvited influences. I have examined facets of American colonial politics that are often excluded from U.S. media, exposing the issues of silence and disregard portrayed by the U.S. toward Guåhan as it tyrannically using the island for its saber rattling throughout Asia and the Pacific. Examining the historical context of U.S. colonial control still present today exposes how the U.S. forces and perpetuates its “domestic” security policy onto Guåhan. Navigating through the history of colonization also reveals how U.S. military, political, and

economic considerations have converged to continue holding Guåhan in a state of political limbo for over a century. Understanding the political, social, and economic context of the movement clearly shows that the contemporary struggles are a continuation of past conflicts.

Exploring the rhetorical and discursive practices of contemporary resistance provides a unique point of departure from the literature surrounding peacemaking and protest in the Pacific. The situation of U.S. hyper-militarization in the Pacific presents the need for scholarly inquiry into the uses of language as political power making, mobilization, community organizing, and cultural preservation throughout the Pacific. Emphasizing the role of rhetoric in the struggle for social and political change in Guåhan, this project informs broader inquiries of U.S. military policy toward non-self-governing territories and contributes to interdisciplinary work in the fields of communication studies and indigenous studies.

I have argued that Guåhan is a site of necessary inquiry as it is the nexus that links the complexity of Chamoru indigenous identity and U.S. national belonging, to U.S. military and security policy. These issues concern rhetorical scholars for a number of reasons. First, colonization and the ongoing legacy of United States' colonialism cannot be ignored. In the twenty-first century, this represents a potent political and communicative force within the context of U.S. militarization throughout the world. Second, rhetorical scholars with an interest in social movements should consider the implications that colonization has on collective organizing and resistance within indigenous communities. In particular, Communication Studies offers a constructive area for critical inquiry and interdisciplinary work with indigenous studies and decolonization methodologies. Finally, scholars should take interest in the rhetorical processes of

contemporary indigenous resistance to settler colonialism and in the discursive tactics of anti-militarization movements manifested by politically vexed locales.

BOTH/NEITHER IDENTITIES IN A TERRAIN OF SETTLER COLONIALISM

My analysis has focused on the both/neither identities emerging from the movement. These both/neither identities are characterized by the contrasting articulations of *belonging to* and *exclusion from* the U.S. nation-state. They express profound contradictions of sameness and difference. This phenomenon vexes the movement rhetoric and the self-frames used by its members, since articulating oneself depends upon a contradictory positioning in relation to the U.S. antagonists. My case study chapters have illustrated how the movement in Guåhan applies complicated rhetoric—a mix of Chamoru identity and strategy that is adapted to U.S. institutions and audiences. By catering to these U.S. institutions while at the same time arguing for indigenous rights and autonomy, the movement reveals seemingly opposite appeals to inclusion and demands grounded in its exclusivity.

Moving back and forth between these contradictions these identities reveal a incongruous sort of “togetherness in separation,” that parallels the phenomenon of settler nation-states historically trying to “render the persistence of ‘nations within’ as a domestic concern without international implication.”⁵⁶³ These *nations within* are classified in contradictory domestic/international ways as a primary mechanism for putting indigenous claims to political life and sovereignty in a seemingly impossible bind. This bind holds indigenous peoples in a state of enduring colonial ambivalence from the U.S. nation-state while also positioning indigenous groups as “domestic to the

563 Alyosha Goldstein, “Where the Nation Takes Place: Proprietary Regimes, Antistatism, and U.S. Settler Colonialism,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107 (2008): 833, 837.

United States in a foreign sense.”⁵⁶⁴ In this way, settler colonialism in the U.S. has “insinuated itself over time in such away as to obscure the persistence of colonialism as anything other than a historical trace, as well as to ostensibly naturalize settlers by habitation and descent.”⁵⁶⁵ Settler colonialism thus reveals the logic of the U.S. nation-state as “overdetermined by competing colonial regimes, settler claims, circuits of slavery, and the negotiation of seemingly incommensurable borders and cosmologies.”⁵⁶⁶

These competing regimes also demonstrate how settler colonialism is “premised on displacing indigenes (or replacing them) on the land,” and represents a condition of possibility that remains formative while also changing over time.⁵⁶⁷ Considering these powerful elements of settler colonialism also reveals how competing orientations to land influence communication about space and place. As Michael Warner states, “settling is intransitive, or, if it has an object, the object is merely the land.”⁵⁶⁸ From this observation, Warner argues the rhetoric of settlement constructs a narrative free of violent conquest within the history of British American colonies. This benevolence in U.S. history also demonstrates the problematic orientation to the land, and highlights the disjunct between settler colonialism’s view of land within a proprietary framework and the indigenous orientation to land as a collective and sacred resource.

Recalling the analysis from Chapters 4, We Are Guåhan used *The Grey Papers* series to create a collective identity with the local community and explain the buildup

564 Bruyneel, *The Third Space*, 220 (see p. 56 n. 184).

565 Goldstein, “Where the Nation,” 833-834.

566 Ibid., 835

567 Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism*, 1. See also: Goldstein, “Where the Nation,” 835; Ian Tyrrell, “Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History,” in *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, ed. Thomas Bender (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 170.

568 Michael Warner, “What’s Colonial about Colonial America?” in *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America*, ed. Robert Blair St. George (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 56.

impact in relation to the land and its effects on the environment, the traffic, and the overall population. These local connections, rooted in the landscape of Guåhan had to contend with the language from the U.S. Department of Defense that articulated changes to the land as a natural and inevitable outcome. The both/neither discourses of these artifacts demonstrate the complexity of articulating opposition to the U.S. military while using their language and framework for communicating. By employing a fact-checking style and directly quoting the DEIS, *The Grey Papers* positioned themselves within the U.S. institutional discourse that legitimizes and naturalizes settler colonialism. Although the *Papers* provided a direct response to the DEIS and educated the local population about its contents, the series also illustrates how WAG remained within a stagnant position bound by the colonial discourse of the U.S. military and trapped within the grey space. In a parallel manner, Chapter 5 discussed the organizing of WAG and their local activities of Heritage Hikes and the *Prutehi yan Difendi* campaign. These activities rhetorically constructed a sense of place by connecting with the land through hikes and a documentary film short about the efforts to protect and defend Pãgat from the U.S. firing range complex. In both of these chapters, I explained the complexity of simultaneously constructing collective identity while also comparing, defining, and referencing Guåhan with the U.S.

The local movement's connections expressed with their lands are complicated by settler colonialism and the U.S. claims to the land as part of its domestic terrain. Additionally, as Chapter 3 demonstrated, activism at the UN level against the U.S. nation-state must contend with the dual position of Guåhan as both domestic and foreign but still not quite fitting into the international arena. In the UN context, the effect of settler colonialism is ever-present. Petitioners from Guåhan at once communicate a need for recognition within the international framework, while simultaneously must still

depend upon the approval of the U.S. as “administering authority” for self-determination efforts to be binding. As these chapters have shifted between the local and the international levels of engagement, they have demonstrates how both/neither identities hold Chamorus and Guåhan within the same precarious place. This place is a contradictory position, characterized by muddled and grey discourse that strives to articulate a challenge against the U.S. while also holding itself to the U.S. in order to express the need for recognition, rights, and even compensation. In spite of these contradictory elements, and perhaps because of them, a decolonizing methodology helps guide my rhetorical analysis and interpretation of indigenous activism. This methodology also helped me identify and understand the concept of both/neither as a way of analyzing rhetoric that attaches to American identity while also encompassing elements of decolonization.

MOVING BEYOND THE “GREY”: IMPLICATIONS FOR GUÅHAN

I have attempted to chart contemporary Chamoru activism and social movement organizing that has emerged in response to the proposed U.S. military buildup. In my focus on the contemporary elements of activism, I also recognize the previous waves of activism and organizing in Guåhan as an important part of the groundwork for these contemporary efforts to emerge. It is from these roots of early of OPI-R and *I Nasion Chamoru* that movements and organizations in Guåhan and among the Chamoru diaspora have been able to find stable ground to organize and articulate their resistance in the twenty-first century. The repertoire of social movement activism spans the return of a Chamoru delegation to the United Nations in 2005 up through the tumultuous period following the DEIS release in 2009, and the Pāgat lawsuit outcome in 2012. These

activities demonstrate the convergence of issues of U.S. national belonging, and indigenous identity framing.

The complexity of colonial desire and the effect of U.S. colonization in Guåhan creates a phenomenon of Chamorus wanting to be recognized by the U.S. while simultaneously not wanting to be victimized by the U.S. This leads to a phenomenon Advocating for certain rights and recognitions as “Americans” or “citizens” in the local context, is coupled with a simultaneous advocacy for sovereignty from the U.S. These examples highlight how the grey space binds Chamorus, and keeps them in this precarious position. This grey space between has implications for legal recourse, as Julian Aguon explains the law has an “inability to accommodate our stories in U.S. territorial jurisprudence” and the judicial branch has yet to “come up with a satisfactory legal justification for maintaining modern colonies deemed not to be a part of the United States, but instead merely possessions of the United States.”⁵⁶⁹ This colonial enterprise inflicts violence on a people “who must find our way in a country that *neither* wants us nor wants to let us go.”⁵⁷⁰

This phenomenon has several implications for Guåhan. First, because of U.S. colonization and its continuance in Guåhan, the both/neither concept will continue on for the foreseeable future. This will continue to influence how Chamorus not only understand themselves and their identity in Guåhan, but also how local residents communicate about the island and employ vernacular discourse about national belonging with the U.S. In Guåhan, there is a conflation of terms ranging from “America,” “U.S.,” “state,” “nation,” “domestic,” and “country” when discussing the island and how it fits or relates into the

569 Aguon, “On Loving the Maps,” 64-65. Emphasis added. See also: Christina D. Burnett and Burke Marshall, *Foreign in a Domestic Sense: Puerto Rico, American Expansion, and the Constitution* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001).

570 Aguon, “On Loving the Maps,” 64-65.

terrain of U.S. nationalism. These terms are also used to situate the island as part of the U.S. in order to compare Guåhan against other locales that may not enjoy the same “freedoms” and luxuries from the “States.” These discursive examples demonstrate how communicating about the island and identifying within it are fraught with a lack of vocabularies. Without vocabularies outside or beyond the terms that encircle the U.S., then Chamorus and other residents have limited mechanisms for articulating a belonging that is completely distinct from their colonizing nation-state. Second, it is my hope that understanding these complicated situations can lead to understanding how to move beyond these grey spaces and discourses. In doing so, it is important for Guåhan to continue striving for decolonization and to directly challenge the forces of colonization and the naturalized settler colonial presence within the land. Absent direct confrontation with these core elements, the daily experience of life in Guåhan will continue to be expressed within these muddled spaces and dominated by a discourse that normalizes grey discourse and both/neither identities.

As a result of experiences with colonialism, displacement, and migration the Chamoru diaspora was propelled to the “mainland” United States; this movement is attributed, in part, to the island’s inferior political status, which encourages people to move in order to secure voting rights for the U.S. president.⁵⁷¹ Thus, the Chamorus of Guåhan represent a Pacific Islander diaspora that has emerged as the third largest Pacific Islander community on the U.S.⁵⁷² This exodus of Chamorus also reveals political and cultural identity crises for many Chamorus in diaspora, given that they are detached from their homeland geographically but remain within the boundaries of the U.S. colonizer.⁵⁷³

571 Michael P. Perez, “Pacific Identities beyond US Racial Formations: The Case of Chamorro Ambivalence and Flux,” *Social Identities* 8 (2002): 457.

572 Herbert R. Barringer, Robert W. Gardner, and Michael J. Levin, *Asian and Pacific Islanders in the United States* (New York: Russel Sage, 1995).

573 Perez “Pacific Identities,” 466.

Given these tensions many Chamorus spend significant time both on Guåhan and in the U.S.; or they remain connected via mass media, communication technology, cultural continuity and long-distance family ties. As a result diasporic Chamorus are strongly rooted in the “island community” and are very keen on the political issues on Guåhan.⁵⁷⁴ Such political connections between the Chamoru diaspora and the Chamorus on Guåhan, highlight the role of the diaspora in resistance efforts both on and off the island.

MOBILIZING DECOLONIZING METHODOLOGIES: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

As I argued in previous chapters, We Are Guåhan functioned as an important component of the local efforts to challenge U.S. militarization and provided a strong educational campaign that led to wider efforts beyond the DEIS. However, as WAG moved to establish itself as a multi-ethnic organization focused on the buildup this had the effect of limiting WAG. First, this orientation limited WAG because it positioned them as a completely open organization that perpetuated a sentiment of ambiguity even as WAG was opposing the military buildup. One way that WAG could have avoided this pitfall would have been to critique the U.S. buildup plans writ large, rather than just challenging the plans as proposed. This move would have required a deeper level criticism of U.S. militarization and colonization. Thus, it would have required WAG to enter into the discussion about decolonization and choose a side in that discussion about the political future for the island vis-à-vis self-determination for its indigenous people. However, by not taking opportunities or picking a side that pushed for decolonization, the organization became a very effect means of challenging the proposed military buildup without moving toward a lasting confrontation to U.S. militarization.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid., 473-375.

Additionally, the both/neither identities emerging from WAG artifacts demonstrate how the organization does not outwardly claim a side in the debate. Although their materials, organizing, and actions clearly position them as opposed to the military buildup plans they are never directly expressing an identity of “anti-militarization.” This non-stance further complicates the identity of the movement and the resonance they had with the local population. Furthermore, it also shows the grey space that came to characterize WAG and their operations. Despite having a clear position in opposition to the buildup, the organization was read positively from both sides. This caused a situation in which WAG was seen as picking multiple sides, ultimately muddling the efficacy of the organization to provided a sustained public critique against the military buildup beyond the Pāgat lawsuit.

The both/neither identities of WAG are further layered with complexity as the organization came to be recognized as a catch all community organization on the island. On the one hand, anti-military supporters of WAG embraced their efforts to challenge the DOD; on the other hand, WAG received support from community members who were glad to see that someone was watching out to make sure that their “rights” had been considered as the buildup was being implemented. This scenario demonstrates a potential limitation for WAG as a social movement organization remained open in its articulation as a group opposing the U.S. military buildup “as planned” rather than sharpening its criticism to the U.S. military buildup as a whole or the U.S. nation-state for imposing its military’s plans on the island without prior consultation. Even these latter options that I have just posited for WAG are indicative of the situation created by a grey political status as a non-self-governing territory.

The prevailing idea of wanting to be “part of the U.S.” but at the same time have some form of sovereign control does not equate logically. In that scenario, if Guåhan

were to completely form part of the U.S. then its citizens could not expect to have any prior discussions about the U.S. basing politics.⁵⁷⁵ To be a part of the U.S. would mean Guåhan would relinquish any expectation of discussion or engagement with the DOD about building a base or relocating its military forces. Taken as a whole, this phenomenon demonstrates the important considerations that identity frames pose for social movements.

INDIGENOUS IDENTITY FRAMING

Understanding identity frames within indigenous social movements provides a means of recognizing nuances within the repertoire of collective action and social movement activities. Although WAG worked diligently to establish a collective identity, their efforts were not focused specifically on creating a collective Chamoru identity even as they articulated a number of Chamoru cultural concepts and values (such as *inafa' maolek*, the *inefresi*, connection with the Chamoru language). WAG provides a strong case study for considering the implications for social movement organizing and resistance from indigenous populations in the Pacific. This resistance occurred through local and international efforts centered on the issues of ancestral land, language and cultural revitalization, and self-determination for Chamorus. What is particularly interesting about this movement is the way that identity framing occurred through actions that both depend upon and reinforce communicative channels directed against the U.S. nation-state. Identity framing for indigenous social movements provide a way of shifting the worldview and orientation away from the devastating affects of settler colonialism.

⁵⁷⁵ The term “discussion” is used here because the U.S. Federal Government does not use the term “consultation” for Guåhan as that would imply a foreign government. See also: Aguon, “On Loving the Maps,” 60.

Identity framing is signifying work that assigns meaning and interpretations in order to demobilize antagonists, yet for indigenous social movements the language of contention is often already dictated by the antagonist settler colonial government. Additionally, because social movement frames generally help create a sense of self expressed by defining oneself against an antagonist,⁵⁷⁶ it is difficult to position both/neither identities as a frame from which to challenge. In a traditional identity frame, the social movement actors defines themselves *against* the antagonist but within the both/neither framework the simultaneity of defining *with and against* demonstrates the need for viable alternatives in framing indigenous opposition to colonization. This means, social movements must grapple with finding another form of contentious discourse. Additionally, from my case studies I consider that movements engaged in identity framing must carefully consider the language of contention that is heavily steeped within U.S. frameworks. For example, social movements that place emphasis on equality and rights should be cautious to connect these demands to historical inequities, paying attention to colonization and its contemporary remnants; and take caution when embodying American principles as they envision their opposition to the state and articulate their actions.

This project also demonstrates the implications of U.S. institutions and discourse operating within and through social movement efforts. The Chamoru movement's engagement with the UN has not yet translated into success in terms of achieving self-determination, or meaningful steps toward decolonization. By directing public attention in an issue-specific and temporary manner, the UN operates within the established format of national public spheres. The implications for this arena are troubled as traditional

⁵⁷⁶ See discussion of identity framing in Chapters 1 & 4.

public spheres for nation-states do not account for or even adequately capture the unique status of non-self-governing-territories.

Due to the both/neither status of Guåhan, when opposition is being articulated it can sometimes be labeled and attached to U.S. freedoms such as the First Amendment. Because of the muddled application of the U.S. Constitution to Guåhan, this trope does not make sense yet it is still used as a way to express the benefits of the U.S. governance. Instead, perhaps what is needed is a way to talk and discuss decolonization and self-determination that is not dominated by an American framework. One example of moving in that direction would be to adopt the term “non-self-governing-territory” (NSGT) rather than “unincorporated territory” or “U.S. territory.” As I explained in Chapter 3, the term “non-self-governing-territory” signals Guåhan’s right to self-determination as recognized by the UN. By adopting a self-frame that reaffirms and celebrates autonomy and self-determination, the language can shift away from discursive constructions of Guåhan as being excluded from the U.S. or not quite part of the U.S. Instead of focusing on incorporation (read: assimilation) to the U.S., the movement efforts should be striving to convey Guåhan as radically challenging the U.S. system altogether. Given that it is a settler colonial system that has maintained the island in this precarious grey state for so long. Adopting NSGT provides a mechanism for highlighting a more positive self-frame for the movement and individuals involved in collective action.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE U.S. MILITARY

An insidious form of Chamoru dispossession occurs in the extremely high enlistment rates and the numbers killed-in-action while serving the U.S. military.⁵⁷⁷ This phenomenon is born of the paradox of patriotism that persists within Guåhan, where U.S.

⁵⁷⁷ Bevacqua, “The Exceptional Life,” 42. The killed-in-action rates are up to 5 times the average, see Aguon, “On Loving the Maps,” 62.

loyalty and national belonging is articulated through military service even as the residents are denied the freedoms they are serving to protect. As explained in chapter 1, high enlistment rates for indigenous peoples are a common trend. This situation illuminates both/neither identities and the colonizer's use of indigenous and minority populations to normalize militarization while subjugating communities such as Guåhan. These both/neither identities relate to what Michael Lujan Bevacqua has explained as the ironies of the U.S., together hiding and revealing Guåhan. On the one hand, U.S. colonizing *hides* its violence through ingrained discourses of civilization and sacrifice; while on the other hand, soldiers from Guåhan and throughout the Pacific are significantly overrepresented in the U.S. military.⁵⁷⁸

Challenging these outcomes of militarization both visible and hidden, should be a component of collective action but should not completely dominate social movement efforts. As Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrated, when expressing opposition to militarization and the U.S. military buildup the discourse of dislocation provided a way of articulating distance and opposition against the military. However, in order to challenge these outcomes of militarization, local efforts should be cautious when employing securitizing discourse and U.S. military discourse as they articulate demands. Because indigenous communities are already so over-represented in the military, it is important to find an alternative to the securitizing jargon that inundates these spaces. As WAG demonstrated with their Heritage Hikes and *We Are Pågat* documentary film, creative ways of articulating connections to space, place, and people can provide an alternative to dominant discourses of U.S. militarization.

Ultimately, for Guåhan the success of challenging the military relied upon a well organized repertoire of activities and collective actions. The spectrum of events,

⁵⁷⁸ Bevacqua, "The Exceptional Life," 42.

discussions, materials, local media, and online presence from the movement offered a fitting response to the U.S. buildup since its announcement in 2005. Taken together, the local actions also demonstrate the importance of waging efforts at the grassroots level and by the community members who will be most affected by the military realignment. The UN approach was an important component of the movement, but it did not deliver the message directly to the U.S. and the Department of Defense. As such, the implication for anti-militarization movements also must consider the historical and cultural context of the area. For WAG, the success of generating local support is, in part, connected to the ability of the group to position their discourse in a way that resonated with the locals' knowledge of their history and contemporary landscape. This also included making allusions and direct references to the negative impacts from the history of U.S. militarization, and respecting the concerns of the locals who already feared loss of more lands and lack of consultation about the buildup.

IMAGINING THE POLITICS BEYOND BOTH/NEITHER: SUBJECTS IN SOVEREIGN SPACE

I now consider how U.S. institutions can function as sites of rhetorical invention for resistant politics. I have already explained how pitfalls in the UN and the U.S. governing documents lead to contradictory and problematic issues for Chamorus articulating their demands. In spite of these tensions, I consider “whether and how colonized and indigenous communities like Guam can tap normative power, legal and pre-legal, to fuel political change on their own terms, such as through self-determination.”⁵⁷⁹ Here, Aguon points to the possibility of self-determination as a legal path for indigenous communities. He highlights the element of fueling political change “on their own terms,” which may provide a way out of the muddled grey space of

⁵⁷⁹ Aguon, “On Loving the Maps,” 62.

both/neither identities. Additionally, indigenous communities focusing on self-determination can provide a way of moving beyond the U.S. legal framework which is also paradoxically situated for them. Milner S. Ball has also explained that the claims to “monopoly” and “multiplicity” in U.S. jurisprudence for indigenous tribes are irreconcilable.⁵⁸⁰ The lack of reconciliation from within the U.S. government legal structure also demonstrates the trouble of positioning both/neither identities within that discourse or framework.

In an attempt to move beyond both/neither identities as a vexed rhetoric that complicates organized resistance and articulation of demands, I consider how colonized subjects can use rhetoric to intervene against the nation-state without being dependent upon it. This project has put forth a framework for understanding the contradictory scene that lies at the crossroads between settler colonial ideology and indigenous resistance. This both/neither concept helps recognize and understand contradictions and complications emerging from social movement discourse. This intersection between ideology and indigenous resistance shapes and produces Chamoru subjectivity and their subsequent acts of peaceful mobilization. Through the UN testimonies Chamorus are suggesting an alternative to U.S. dominance and beginning to subvert the confines of the UN system through the use of the Chamoru language in their testimonies. While not a large component of the testimonies, the language choice is a feature that characterizes the testimonies as being distinct and creating a collective identity without motioning toward or attempting to reconcile with the U.S. The UN testimonies and the mosaic of collective actions from the Guåhan social movement coalesce around expressing opposition to U.S.

580 Milner S. Ball, “Constitution, Court, Indian Tribes,” *Law & Social Inquiry* 12 (1987): 25 & 112. Constitution and the U.S. laws are considered a monopoly by virtue of representing the supreme law of the land, while multiplicity refers to the way the U.S. laws also claim to recognize the sovereignty of Native American nations, as original occupants of the land. See also: Addie C. Rolnick, “The Promise of *Mancari*: Indian Political Rights as Racial Remedy,” *New York University Law Review* 1 (2011): 958-1045.

territorial rule and to the impending military buildup. These expressions are for the purpose of maintaining peace, yet need to also forge a more polarizing critique against the U.S. This critique might be best expressed through indigenous identity formation. As Julian Aguon explains:

In horrific irony, we are utterly dependent on the success of the U.S. colonial project for our survival. Thus, the re-assertion of our indigeneity is a way back to wholeness and integrity; it not only provides us with a measure of political freedom, but also reestablishes our sustainability and our ability to thrive on our own island and to rejoin the family of Pacific nations.⁵⁸¹

This view offers several advantages for current mobilization efforts and future research. By uncovering political texts that ideological constructs have attempted to bury deep beneath the surface, this perspective brings attention to the underrepresented arena of U.S. non-self-governing-territories within communication scholarship. This project challenges and contributes to communication studies scholarship, first by recognizing the rhetorical and discursive dimensions of cultural and political struggles in relation to the U.S. nation-state; and second, by addressing the pressing need for focused attention on indigenous resistance within U.S. territorial islands in the era of hyper-militarization throughout the world.

Calling attention to this area of the world is essential both for engaging the wider American public that remains largely unaware or uninterested about the U.S. colonial territories, and for acknowledging the efforts of colonized peoples to organize and peacefully resist injustices within their lands. As my case studies have shown, it is necessary to acknowledge colonization and self-determination efforts as the twenty-first century unfolds. Because colonized peoples are subjected to ideological relationships, understanding the discourses of self-determination offers a necessary step on the path

581 Aguon, "On Loving the Maps," 167, note 138.

toward true peace. Additionally, as a method of rhetorical analysis, the both/neither concept informs broader ideological criticisms and an understanding of social movements while attending to the imperative issues of self-determination, decolonization, cultural preservation, and peace in the Pacific.

Given the political status of the island, the efficacy of these efforts remains to be seen. Understanding how dominant political discourse serves the foundations of colonial ideology is a crucial recognition for social movements seeking to build solidarity and to voice their demands for a decolonized future. This inquiry holds implications for communication studies, as a field concerned with shared symbols and meaning-making scholars should be particularly concerned with the complexities of signification from both/neither identities. Rhetorical studies, in particular, can benefit from considerations of contradictory and vexing dimensions of identities in social movements. Operating from within settler colonies, these fraught subject positions continue to organize and articulate demands. This demonstrates the importance of rhetorical studies to attend to and interpret messages from within cultural, political, social contexts of U.S. colonialism. From this understanding, peoples worldwide are in better positions to find their emancipatory potential, and to challenge, resist, and wage peaceful forms of protest against the insidious forms of colonial violence throughout the world.

Bibliography

- “A Citizen’s Guide to the NEPA. Having Your Voice Heard,” Council on Environmental Quality Executive Office of the President, December 2007, p. 7-9. Accessed May 2013, http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/Citizens_Guide_Dec07.pdf.
- Abdel-Malek, Anouar. *Social Dialectics: Nation and Revolution*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1981.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. “The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power Through Bedouin Women.” *American Ethnologist* 17 (1990): 41-55.
- Ada, Joseph F. and Leland Bettis. “The Quest for Commonwealth, the Quest for Change.” *Issues in Guam’s Political Development: The Chamorro Perspective*, 1996.
- Adelman, Madelaine. “The Military, Militarism, and the Militarization of Domestic Violence.” *Violence Against Women* 9 (2003): 1118-1152.
- Aguon, Julian. *Just Left of the Setting Sun*. Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2006.
- . *The Fire This Time: Essays on Life under U.S. Occupation*. Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2006.
- . “On Loving the Maps Our Hands Cannot Hold: Self-Determination of Colonized and Indigenous Peoples in International Law.” *UCLA Asian Pacific American Law Journal* 16 (2010/2011).
- . *What We Bury at Night: Disposable Humanity*. Tokyo: Blue Ocean Press, 2008.
- Aguon, Mindy. “Guam Gets 90 Days to Review DEIS.” *KUAM NEWS*. October 28, 2009. <http://www.kuam.com/global/story.asp?s=11402872>.
- . “Lawsuit Filed Over Pagat-as-firing Ranges.” *KUAM News*. November 18, 2010. <http://www.kuam.com/Global/story.asp?S=13522721>.
- Alvarez, Sonia E., Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar. *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1998.
- Anaya, S. James. *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Appendix A,” *Federal Register* 72.44 (2007): 10186-10187. http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents/archive/SummaryReport/Appendix_A.pdf
- Aron, Raymond. *Imperialism and Colonialism*. Vol. 17, Montague Burton Lecture on International Relations Series. Leeds. 1959.

- Ball, Milner S. "Constitution, Court, Indian Tribes." *Law & Social Inquiry* 12 (1987): 1-140.
- Banivanua Mar, Tracey and Penelope Edmonds. *Making Settler Colonial Place: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Barker, Michael J. "Civil Society, Empowered or Overpowered? The Role of the Mass Media in "Promoting Democracy" Worldwide." Refereed paper presented to the Australian and New Zealand Communication Association, University of Adelaide 5-7, July 2006.
- Battiste, M., Bell, L., and Findlay, L. M. "Decolonizing Education in Canadian Universities: An Interdisciplinary, International, Indigenous Research Project." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26 no. 2, (2002): 82-95.
- Beer, Francis. *Militarization: Peace Against War*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1981.
- Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment" *Annual Review of Sociology* 26 (2000): 611-639.
- — —. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." *International Social Movement Research* 1(1988): 197-217.
- — —. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Carol McClung Mueller and Aldon D. Morris, 133-135. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Ben-Eliezer, Uri. *The Making of Israeli Militarism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Bernstein, Alison R. *American Indians and World War II: Toward a New Era in Indian Affairs*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.
- Bernstein, Mary. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Gay and Lesbian Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (1997): 531-565.
- Bertram, Geoff. "The Political Economy of Decolonization and Nationhood in Small Pacific Societies." In *Class and Culture in the South Pacific*, edited by A. Hooper, et al., 16-31. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, 1987.
- Betts, Raymond F. *Decolonization*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Bevacqua, Michael Lujan. "The Exceptional Life and Death of a Chamorro Soldier: Tracing the Militarization of Desire in Guam." In *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho, 33-62. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- — —. "The Gift of Imagination: Solidarity Against U.S. Militarism in the Asia-Pacific Region," *Pacific Asia Inquiry* 2 (2011): 145-160.

- Beverly, John. "The Impossibility of Politics: Subalternity, Modernity, Hegemony." In *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, edited by Ileana Rodríguez, 47-63. Duke University Press, 2001.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "On the Irremovable Strangeness of Being Different." In "Four Views on Ethnicity." Special Issue, 34-40. *PMLA*, 113 (1998): 34-39.
- — —. "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation." In *Nation and Narration*, edited by Homi K. Bhabha, ch. 16 p. 291-322. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56 (1970): 109-119.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Bowers, John W., Donovan J. Ochs, and Richard J. Jensen. *The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control*. Long Grove: Waveland Press, Inc., 1993.
- Breuilly, John. *Nationalism and the State*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Brock, Bernard L. and Robert Lee Scott, *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth-century Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Brooke, James. "On Farthest U.S. Shores, Iraq Is a Way to a Dream," *The New York Times*, July 31, 2005. http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/31/national/31recruit.html?_r=0.
- Brown, Michael F. "Sovereignty's Betrayals." In *Indigenous Experience Today*, edited by Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Storn, 171-196. Oxford: Berg, 2007.
- Brummett, Barry. "Towards a Theory of Silence as Political Strategy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66 (1980): 289-303.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Buhain, Janela. "Anti-Military Buildup Group to Hold Rally." *Marianas Variety*, August 6, 2010. <http://mvguam.com/local/news/13567antimilitarybuildupgrouptoholdrally.html>.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Permanence and Change*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.
- Burnett, Christina D. and Burke Marshall. *Foreign in a Domestic Sense: Puerto Rico, American Expansion, and the Constitution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.

- Bystydzienski Jill M. and Steven P. Schacht. *Forging Radical Alliances Across Difference: Coalition Politics for the New Millenium*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.
- “Calvo Calls for Appointments to Decolonization Commission.” Office of Governor Eddie Baza Calvo. Accessed February 5, 2013. <http://governor.guam.gov/2011/04/28/calvo-calls-appointments-decolonization-commission/>.
- Camacho, Keith L. and Laurel A. Monnig, “Uncomfortable Fatigues: Chamorro Soldiers, Gendered Identities, and the Question of Decolonization in Guam.” In *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Setsu Shigematsu and Keith L. Camacho, 147-179. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Camacho, Keith L. *Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory, and History in the Mariana Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2011.
- — —. “Transoceanic Flows: Pacific Islander Interventions across the American Empire.” *Amerasia Journal* 37 (2011): ix.
- Camacho, Leevin, and Daniel Broudy. “ ‘Sweetening’ The Pentagon’s Deal in the Marianas: From Guam to Pagan.” *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 11 (2013): n. pag. www.japanfocus.org.
- Carragee, Kevin M. and Lawrence R. Frey. “Introduction: Communication Activism for Social Justice Scholarship.” In *Communication Activism Volume 3: Struggling for Social Justice Amidst Difference*, edited by Lawrence R. Frey and Kevin M. Carragee, 1-68. New York: Hampton Press, 2012.
- Castells, Manuel. “Globalisation and Identity.” *Transfer: Journal of Contemporary Culture* 1 (2007): 56-66.
- Cavanagh, Edward and Lorenzo Veracini. *Settler Colonial Studies* (Blog). 2010. <http://settlercolonialstudies.org/about-this-blog/>.
- Charland, Maurice. “Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the People Québécois.” *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73 (1987): 133-150.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Clair, Robin Patric. "Organizing Silence: Silence as Voice and Voice as Silence in the Narrative Exploration of the Treaty of New Echota." *Western Journal of Communication* 61 (1997): 315-37.
- Clifford, James. “Varieties of Indigenous Experience: Diasporas, Homelands, Sovereignties. In *Indigenous Experience Today*, edited by Marisol de la Cadena and Orin Storn, 197-223. Oxford: Berg, 2007.

- Cloud, Dana L. "Hegemony or Concordance? The Rhetoric of Tokenism in 'Oprah' Winfrey's Rags-to-Riches Biography." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 13 (1996): 115-137.
- . "Foiling the Intellectuals: Gender, Identity Framing, and the Rhetoric of the Kill in Conservative Hate Mail." *Communication, Culture, & Critique* 2 (2009): 457-479.
- Cloud, Dana L. and Joshua Gunn, "Introduction: W(h)ither Ideology?" *Western Journal of Communication* 75 (2001): 407-420.
- . "The Null Persona: Race and The Rhetoric of Silence in the Uprising of '34." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 2.2 (1999): 177-209.
- Cohen, Jean. "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements," *Social Research* 52 (1985): 663-716.
- Condon, Stephanie, "Hank Johnson Worries Guam Could "Capsize" After Marine Buildup." April 1, 2010. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20001567-503544.html
- Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. *Anti-Indianism in Modern America: A Voice from Tatekeya's Earth*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2001.
- . *New Indians, Old Wars*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007.
- Cott, Nancy F. Afterword to *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History*. Edited by Ann Laura Stoler, 469-472. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Cunningham, Lawrence J. *Ancient Chamorro Society*. Honolulu: The Bess Press, 1992.
- Dahre, Ulf Johansson, "After the Change: The Opposition Against Indigenous Movements in Hawai'i." In *Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination Knowledge Indigeneity*, edited by Henry Minde, 141-155. The Netherlands: Eburon Delft, 2008.
- Dalisay, Francis S. "The Spiral of Silence and Conflict Avoidance: Examining Antecedents of Opinion Expression Concerning the U.S. Military Buildup in the Pacific Island of Guam." *Communication Quarterly* 60 (2012): 481-503.
- . "Social Control In An American Pacific Island: Guam's Local Newspaper Reports On Liberation." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 33 (2009): 239-257.
- Dames, Vivian. "Chamorro Women, Self-Determination, and the Politics of Abortion in Guam." In *Asian/Pacific Islander American Women: A Historical Anthology*, edited by Gail Nomura and Shirley Hune, 365-382. New York: New York University Press, 2003.
- . "Rethinking the Circle of Belonging: American Citizenship and the Chamorros of Guam." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2000.

- “Decolonization Meeting Held.” *Marianas Variety*. September 26, 2011. <http://mvguam.com/letter-to-the-editor/20040-decolonization-meeting-held.html>.
- Deetz, Stanley. *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Delgado, Guillermo P. “El globalismo y los pueblos indios: De la etnicidad a la aggression benevolente de la biomedicine,” In José Manuel Valenzuela Arce, ed., *Procesos culturales de fin de milenio*, 183-218. Tijuana: Centro Cultural Tijuana, Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1998.
- Delgado, Nick. “New Workshops Continue DEIS Analysis,” KUAM News, January 18, 2010. Accessed January 2013. <http://www.kuam.com/story/11842670/new-workshops-continue-deis-analysis?clienttype=generic&mobilecbypass>.
- . “We Are Guahan Issue Grey Papers.” KUAM News. March 1, 2010. <http://www.kuam.com/story/12067153/we-are-guahan-issue-grey-papers>.
- Department of the Navy, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation,” Department of Defense, Executive Summary, November, 2009, DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p. 4-39. Quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GVB on Tourism,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.
- . DEIS vol. 2, ch. 16, p.69. Quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” *The Grey Papers*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.
- Department of the Navy, “Guam and CNMI Military Relocation,” Department of Defense, Executive Summary, November, 2009, DEIS vol. 9, Appendix F, p. 4-39. Quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “GVB on Tourism,” <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.
- . DEIS vol. 2, ch. 16, p.69. Quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: “DOE on Education,” *The Grey Papers*, <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/01/doe-on-education/>.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Spectres of Marx: The State of Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, translated by Peggy Kamuf. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Diaz, Vicente M. and J. Kehaulani Kauanui. “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge,” *The Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2001): 315-342.
- Diaz, Vicente M. *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2010.
- . “Deliberating ‘Liberation Day’: Identity, History, Memory, and War in Guam.” In *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, edited by T. Fujitani, Geoffrey

- M. White, Lisa Yoneyama, 155-180. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001.
- — —. *Pious Sites: Chamorro Cultural History Between Spanish Catholicism and Liberal American Individualism in Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Dobbs, Michael. "The Rise of Political Fact-Checking, How Reagan Inspired a Journalistic Movement: A Reporter's Eye View," New American Foundation, Media Policy Initiative Research Paper, February 2012, http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/The_Rise_of_Political_Fact-checking.pdf.pdf
- Drzewiecka, Jolanta A. and Rona Tamiko Halualani. "The Structural-Cultural Dialectic of Diasporic Politics." *Communication Theory* 12 (2002): 340-66.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. New York: Verso, 1991.
- "EIS Documents." Guam Buildup EIS. <http://www.guambuildupeis.us/documents>.
- Enloe, Cynthia. Forward to *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*. Edited by Catherine Lutz. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- — —. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- — —. "Sneak Attack: The Militarization of U.S. Culture." In *Reconstructing Gender: A Multicultural Anthology*, edited by Estelle Disch, 525. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. "Globalization and the Politics of Identity," *UN Chronicle*, Autumn 1999. Accessed April 30, 2012. <http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/UNChron.html>.
- Eyerman, Ron. *Cultural Trauma: Slavery and the Formation of African American Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Falk, Richard. "Militarization and Human Rights in the Third World." *Security Dialogue* 8 (1977): 220-232.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Fieldhouse, David K. *Colonialism 1870-1945*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981.
- Fine, Michelle. "Working the Hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 70-82. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994.
- Firth, Stewart. "The Rise and Fall of Decolonisation in the Pacific." In *Emerging from Empire? Decolonisation in the Pacific*, ed. by Donald Denoon, 18-19. Canberra:

- Division of Pacific and Asian History, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, 1997.
- Fleras, Augie and Jean Leonard Elliott. *The Nations Within: Aboriginal-state Relations in Canada, the United States, and New Zealand*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Fraser, Nancy. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "PostSocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Fry, Greg. and Tarcisius Tara Kabutaulaka. *Intervention and State-building in the Pacific: The Legitimacy of 'Cooperative Intervention*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- Frey, Lawrence R., W. Barnett Pearce, Mark A. Pollock, Lee Artz, and Bren O. Murphy. "Looking For Justice In All The Wrong Places: On a Communication Approach To Social Justice." *Communication Studies* 47 (1996): 110-127.
- Fujitani, T. Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama. *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*. Durham: Duke University Press: 2001.
- Gailey, Harry. *The Liberation of Guam: 21 July-10 August, 1944*. Novato: Presidio Press, 1988.
- Gastil, John. *By Popular Demand: Revitalizing Representative Democracy Through Deliberative Elections*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Gerson, Joseph. "Empire and Resistance in an Increasingly Dangerous Era." *ZNet*, December 1, 2004. <http://www.zcommunications.org/empire-and-resistance-in-an-increasingly-dangerous-era-by-joseph-gerson>.
- Giroux, Henry. "The Militarization of U.S. Higher Education After 9/11." *Theory, Culture & Society* 25 (2008): 56-82.
- Gledhill, John. *Power and Its Disguises: Anthropological Perspectives on Politics*. Boulder: Pluto Press, 2000.
- Global Insight. *The Economic Impact & Tourism Satellite Account Perspective: Guam Tourism in 2005 Tourism Reporting, the Next Generation*. Global Insight Inc., 2007.
- Goldstein, Alyosha. "Where the Nation Takes Place: Proprietary Regimes, Antistatism, and U.S. Settler Colonialism." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107 (2008) 833-861.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated and edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

- Grievés, Vicki. "The 'Battlefields': Identity, Authenticity and Aboriginal Knowledges in Australia." In *Indigenous Peoples: Self-determination Knowledge Indigeneity*, edited by Henry Minde, 287-311. The Netherlands: Eburon Delft, 2008.
- Grizold, Anton. "Contemporary National Security in the Light of Militarization and Militarism." *Croatian Political Science Review* 37 (2001): 128-143.
- Grosfoguel, Ramón, and Ana Margarita Cervantes-Rodriguez. *The Modern/Colonial/Capitalist World-System in the Twentieth Century: Global Processes, Antisystemic Movements and the Geopolitics of Knowledge*. Westport: Praeger, 2002.
- Guåhan Coalition for Peace and Justice. "Stop the Military Buildup!." April 30, 2010. p. 39. <http://famoksaiyanwc.files.wordpress.com/2010/05/newsletter-2-1.pdf>.
- "Guma'Famoksaiyan," Famoksaiyan, November 16, 2009, <http://famoksaiyan.blogspot.com/search?updated-max=2009-12-03T16:30:00-08:00&max-results=7&start=14&by-date=false>.
- Gutierrez, Hanna M. T. "Guam's Future Political Status: An Argument for Free Association with U.S. Citizenship." *Asian-Pacific Law & Policy Journal* 4 (2003): 122-148.
- Gutmann, Amy and Dennis F. Thompson. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- GVB Impact Perspective, quoted in We Are Guahan. The Grey Papers: "GVB on Tourism," <http://www.weareguahan.com/2010/04/07/gvb-on-tourism-2/>.
- Haas, Ernst B. "What is Nationalism and Why Should We Study It?." *International Organization* 40 (1986): 707-744.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.
- . "New Social Movements." *Telos* 49 (1981): 33-37.
- . *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger with the assistance of Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1999.
- Hall, C. Michael, "Making the Pacific Globalization, Modernity and Myth." In *Destinations: Cultural Landscapes of Tourism*, edited by Greg Ringer. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Hall, John A. "Nationalisms: Classified and Explained." *Daedalus* 122 (1993): 1-28.
- Hall, Stuart. "Signification, Representation, Ideology: Althusser and the Post-Structuralist Debates." *Critical Studies In Mass Communication* 2 (1984): 91-114.

- . "Foucault: Power, Knowledge, and Discourse." In *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, ed. by Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates, 72-81. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2001.
- . "On Postmodernism and Articulation: An Interview with Stuart Hall," edited by Lawrence Grossberg. In *Stuart Hall, Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, 131-150. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Halualani, Rona Tamiko. " 'Where Exactly is the Pacific?' Global Migrations, Diasporic Movements, and Intercultural Communication." *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 1 (2008): 3-22.
- Handler, Richard. *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
- Hanlon, David and Geoffrey M. White. "Introduction." In *Voyaging Through the Contemporary Pacific*, edited by David Hanlon and Geoffrey M. White, 1-24. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Hau'ofa, Epeli. "The Ocean in Us." *The Contemporary Pacific* 10 (1998): 391-410.
- . "A Beginning." In *A New Oceania: Rediscovering Our Sea of Islands*, edited by E. Waddell, V. Naidu, and E. Hau'ofa, 126-139. Suva: University of the South Pacific School of Social and Economic Development, 1993.
- . "Our Sea of Islands." *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (1994): 148-161.
- Hauser, Gerard A. *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.
- Hauswirth, Heather. "Pangelinan Critical of Computability Study." KUAM News. January 18, 2010. <http://www.kuam.com/global/story.asp?s=11838078>.
- Heise, Lori L. "Violence Against Women: Translating International Advocacy into Concrete Change Conference on the Interventional Protection of Reproductive Rights: The Impact of Reproductive Subordination on Women's Health." *American University Law Review* 44 (1995): 1207-1211.
- Hendrix, Burke A. *Ownership, Authority, and Self-determination*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.
- Herman, Edward S. "The New York Times Versus the Civil Society: Protests, Tribunals, Labor, Militarization, and Wars," *Z Magazine Online* 18, no. 12 (2005).
- Herod, Andrew. *Geographies of Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

- Hattori, Anne Perez, Simeon Palomo, and Michael Lujan Bevacqua. *Minagahet*, vol. 8, no. 2, August 25, 2010. <http://www.minagahetzine.com/fatfatngafuluhugua.htm>.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hoffman, Stanley. "Clash of Globalizations." *Foreign Affairs* 81 (2002): 105-106.
- Hofschneider, Penelope Bordallo. *A Campaign for Political Rights on the Island of Guam 1899-1950*. CNMI Division of Historical Preservation, 2001.
- Howard, Alan. "Cultural Paradigms, History, and the Search for Identity in Oceania." In *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*, edited by Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer, 259-279. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.
- Howard, Philip N., and Malcolm R. Parks. "Social Media and Political Change: Capacity, Constraint, and Consequence." *Journal of Communication* 62 (2012): 359-362.
- Hunt, Scott A., Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow. "Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities." In *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 185-208. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- In, James R. "Editor's Commentary," *Wicazo Sa Review* 19 (2004): 5-8.
- "Inafa'maolek: Striving for Harmony." *Guampedia*. Accessed March 15, 2013. <http://guampedia.com/inafamaolek/>.
- Jacobs-Huey, Lanita. "The Natives Are Gazing and Talking Back: Reviewing the Problematics of Positionality, Voice, and Accountability among "Native" Anthropologists." *American Anthropologist* 104 (2002): 791-804.
- Jasper, James M. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Jaworski, Adam. *Silence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 1997.
- Johannesen, Richard L. "The Functions of Silence: A Plea for Communication Research." *Western Speech* 38 (1974): 25-35.
- Johnston, Hank, Enrique Laraña, and Joseph R. Gusfield, "Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements." In *New Social Movements From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield, 3-35. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.
- Joint Statement of the Security Consultative Committee. April 27, 2012. p. 2 http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/pdfs/joint_120427_en.pdf

- Kan, Shirley A. "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments." Congressional Research Service (CRS), March 29, 2012. <http://opencrs.com/document/RS22570/>.
- Kan, Shirley A., and Larry A. Niksch. "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments." Ed. (CRS), Congressional Research Service 2010. <http://opencrs.com/document/RS22570/>.
- Kane, Tim. "Who Are the Recruits? The Demographic Characteristics of U.S. Military Enlistment, 2003-2005." *Center for Data Analysis Report*. July 9, 2006. <http://www.heritage.org>
- Karp, James. "Judicial Review of Environmental Impact Statement Contents." *American Business Law Journal* 16 (1978): 127-156.
- Kaplan, Amy E. "'Left Alone with America': The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture." In *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, edited by Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, 3-21. Durham: Duke University Press 1993.
- . "Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association." *American Quarterly* 56 (2003): 10.
- Kauanui, J. Kehaulani. "Off-Island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum*, 21 (1998): 681-693.
- Kempf, Wolfgang. "Cosmologies, Cities, and Cultural Constructions of Space: Oceanic Enlargements of the World." *Pacific Studies* 22 (1999): 97-114.
- Kerrigan, Kevin. "Federal Judge Dismisses 'Without Prejudice' Davis Lawsuit Over Political Plebiscite." *Pacific News Center*. January 9, 2013. http://www.pacificnewscenter.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=30429:davis&catid=45:guam-news&Itemid=156.
- Kirk, Gwyn. "Environmental Effects of U.S. Military Security: Gendered Experiences from the Philippines, South Korea, and Japan." In *Gender and Globalization in Asia and the Pacific: Method, Practice, Theory*, edited by Kathy E. Ferguson and Monique, 294-317. Mironesco, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.
- Kly, Diana and Yussuf Naim Kly. *In Pursuit of the Right to Self-determination: Collected Papers & Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Right to Self-Determination & the United Nations*, (Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press, 2001).
- . *In Pursuit of an International Civil Tribunal on the Right to Self-determination: Collected Papers & Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Right to Self-Determination, the United Nations, and International Civil Society*. Atlanata, GA: Clarity Press, 2006.
- Kovach, Margaret. "Emerging from the Margins: Indigenous Methodologies." In *Research as Resistance: Critical, Indigenous, and Anti-oppressive Approaches*,

- edited by Leslie Brown and Susan Strega, 19-36. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 2005.
- KUAM News, "Residents Hold Protest Fighting for Native Rights," July 15, 2008. <http://www.kuam.com/story/11077005/residents-hold-protest-fighting-for-native-rights>
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. 2nd ed. Brooklyn: Verso, 2001.
- Laclau, Ernesto. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso, 2007.
- Langman, Lauren. "From Virtual Public Spheres to Global Justice: A Critical Theory of Internetworked Social Movements." *Sociological Theory* 23 (2005): 42-74.
- Lee, Michael. "The Populist Chameleon: The People's Party, Huey Long, George Wallace, and the Populist Argumentative Frame." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 92 (2006): 355-78.
- Leibowitz, Arnold H. *Defining Status: A Comprehensive Analysis of United States Territorial Relations*. London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1989.
- Limtiaco, Steve. "Residents Protest along Marine Corps Drive." *Pacific Daily News*. May 24, 2006.
- Linnekin, Jocelyn, and Lin Poyer. Introduction to *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific*, edited by Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1990.
- Lippard, Lucy. Foreword to *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, by Dean MacCannell. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Lipsitz, George. "Why Asian American Studies Matters Now." Lecture presented at The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, September 6, 2012.
- . *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Temple: Temple University Press, 2006.
- . "Stan Weir: Working-Class Visionary." In *Singlejack Solidarity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- Lutz, Catherine. "Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis." *American Anthropologist* 104 (2002): 723-735.
- . *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle Against U.S. Military Posts*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- . "US Military Bases on Guam in Global Perspective." *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 30-3-10, July 26, 2010. n. pag. 12 June 2012. <http://www.japanfocus.org/-catherine-lutz/3389>.

- Lyons, Oren. *Voice of Indigenous Peoples: Native People Address the United Nations*. Edited by Alexander Ewen. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers, 1994.
- MacCannell, Dean. *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*. London: Routledge, 1992).
- Marler, T.E. and A. Moore. "Military Threats to Terrestrial Resources Not Restricted to Wartime: A Case Study from Guam." *Western Pacific Tropical Research Center, UOG. Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering* 5 (2011) :1198-1214.
- Marsh, Kelly. "Guam." *The Contemporary Pacific*, 19 (2007): 182-189.
- Mater, M. "A Structural Transformation for a Global Public Sphere? The Use of New Communication Technologies by Non-governmental Organizations and the United Nations. In *Counterpublics and the State*, edited by R. Asen and D. Brouwer. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.
- McCaffrey, Dawn & Jennifer Keys, "Competitive Framing Processes in the Abortion Debate: Polarization-vilification, Frame saving, and Frame Debunking." *Sociological Quarterly* 41 (2000): 41-62.
- McGee, Michael Calvin. "The 'Ideograph': A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 1-16.
- . "In Search of 'The People': A Rhetorical Alternative." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61 (1975): 235-249.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis." *Communication Monographs* 56 (1989): 91-111.
- Melucci, Alberto. "The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach," *Social Science Information* 19 (1980): 199-226.
- Meyer, David S., and Sidney Tarrow. *The Movement Society*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997.
- Mignolo, Walter D. "Coloniality of Power and Subalternity." In *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, ed. Ileana Rodríguez 435-436. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Miles, Donna. "Gates Views Growth Under Way in Guam." *American Foreign Press Service*, May 30, 2008. <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=50042>.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Introduction: Cartographies of Struggle." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, 1-47. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
- Monnig, Laurel A. "Proving Chamorro": Indigenous Narratives of Race, Identity, and Decolonization on Guam." PhD diss., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2007.

- Morgan, Matthew J. *The American Military after 9/11: Society, State, and Empire*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Morgensen, Scott Lauria. *Spaces Between Us*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Morton, Stephen. *Gayatri Spivak: Ethics, Subalternity, and the Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- Mouffe, Chantal. "Hegemony and New Political Subjects: Toward a New Concept of Democracy," translated by Stanley Gray. In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 89–101. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Nadel George H., and Perry Curtis. *Imperialism and Colonialism*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Naputi, Tiara. "Guerra del Gas: Resistance, Subaltern Counterpublics, and Indigenous Resistance in Bolivia." Master's thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2009.
- Natividad, LisaLinda. "HITA I MANAO'TAO YINI NA TANO [We are the People of this Land]," (Re) Collection: Women for Genuine Security, <http://www.genuinesecurity.org/Newsletter/wearethepeopleofthisland.html>.
- Natividad, LisaLinda and Gwyn Kirk. "Fortress Guam: Resistance to US Military Mega-Buildup." *The Asia-Pacific Journal*. May 10, 2010. n. pag. <http://www.japanfocus.org/-LisaLinda-Natividad/3356>.
- Natividad, LisaLinda and Victoria Lola Leon-Guerrero. "The Explosive Growth of U.S. Military Power on Guam Confronts People Power: Experience of an island people under Spanish, Japanese and American Colonial Rule." *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 49. December 6, 2010. http://japanfocus.org/-Victoria_Lola_Leon-Guerrero/3454#sthash.cdEMFGnG.dpuf.
- Niezen, Ronald. *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- NOW on PBS, "The Marines Are Landing." NOW on PBS Shows, 25:08. December 11, 2009. <http://www.pbs.org/now/shows/550/>.
- O'Brien, Jean M. *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Ono, Kent A., and Sloop, John M. "Commitment to Telos: A Sustained Critical Rhetoric." *Communication Monographs* 59 (1992): 48-60.
- Palomo, Tony. *An Island in Agony*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1984.
- Park, Gene. "7,000 Marines: Pentagon Announces Shift to Guam," *Pacific Daily News*. October 29, 2005, <http://www.guampdn.com/article/20051030/NEWS01/510300302/7-000-Marines>.

- Paulay, Gustav. "Marine Biodiversity of Guam and the Marianas: overview." *Micronesia* 35/36 (2003): 3-25.
- Pease, Donald E. "New Perspectives on U.S. Culture and Imperialism." In *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, edited by Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, 22-40. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Perez, Michael P. "Contested Sites: Pacific Resistance in Guam to U.S. Empire." *Amerasia Journal* 27 (2001): 97-114.
- . "Pacific Identities Beyond US Racial Formations: The Case of Chamorro Ambivalence and Flux," *Social Identities* 8 (2002): 457-479
- . "Chamorro Resistance and the Prospects for Sovereignty in Guam." In *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination*, edited by Joanne Barker, 169-190. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Petersen, Glenn. *Traditional Micronesian Societies: Adaptation, Integration, and Political Organization in the Central Pacific*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2009.
- Perez, Santos Craig. "Chamorus Address United Nation, Urge Need for Self-Determination" (Blog). November 3, 2008. <http://craigsantosperez.wordpress.com/2008/11/03/>.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. *Globalization or Empire*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Political Status Education Coordinating Commission. *Hale'-ta I Ma Gobetna-ña Guam. Governing Guam: Before and After the Wars*. 1994, Hagåtña (Guam).
- . *Hale'-ta – Kinalamten Pulitikât: Sinenten I Chamorro; Issues in Guam's Political Development: The Chamorro Prospective*. 1996, Hagåtña (Guam).
- Rainbird, Paul. *The Archaeology of Micronesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Ramos, Alcida R. *Indigenism: Ethnic Politics in Brazil*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998.
- Ray, Charles, "Congressman Clarifies Island Tipping Comment." *CNN*. April 1, 2010. <http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2010/04/01/congressman-clarifies-island-tipping-comment/?fbid=YUADj-tX3LK>.
- Reger, Jo, Daniel J. Myers, and Rachel L. Einwohner. "Introduction: Identity Work, Sameness and Difference in Social Movements." In *Identity Work in Social Movement*, edited by Jo Reger, Daniel J. Myers, and Rachel L. Einwohner, 1-20. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- "Residents Hold Protest Fighting for Native Rights." *KUAM News*. July 15, 2008. <http://www.kuam.com/story/11077005/residents-hold-protest-fighting-for-native-rights>.

- Rice, Condoleeza, Donald Rumsfeld, Taro Aso, and Fukushima Nukaga. "United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation." United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee Document. May 1, 2006. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/doc0605.html>.
- Ridgell, Clint. "Video: Trust Attorneys Now Expect Hawaii Judge to Throw Out Navy's Motion to Dismiss Pagat Lawsuit." *Pacific News Center*. November 18, 2011. November 18, 2011, <http://ns1.pacificnewscenter.com/>.
- — —. "Residents Testify Against Federal Land Condemnation." December 29, 2009. <http://decolonizeguam.blogspot.com/2009/12/residents-testify-against-federal-land.html>.
- — —. "Chamorro Nation Sounds Off at Scoping Meeting," KUAM News. April 18, 2007. Spokesperson Debbi Quinata. <http://www.kuam.com/story/11070006/chamorro-nation-sounds-off-at-scoping-meeting>.
- Rogers, Robert F. *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1995.
- Rolnick, Addie C. "The Promise of *Mancari*: Indian Political Rights as Racial Remedy," *New York University Law Review* 1 (2011): 958-1045.
- Ross, Andrew L. "Dimensions of Militarization in the Third World." *Armed Forces & Society* 14 (1987): 561-578.
- Rubin, Jeffrey. "Ambiguity and Contradiction in a Radical Popular Movement." In *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*, edited by Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, 141-164. Boulder: Westview Press, 1998.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- — —. *Reflections on Exile and Other Literary and Cultural Essays*. London: Granta, 2000.
- Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Scott, Robert L. "Rhetoric and Silence." *Western Speech* 36, (1972): 146-58.
- Shigematsu, Setsu. and Keith L. Camacho, eds. Introduction to *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Silliman, Stephen W. "The 'Old West' in the Middle East: U.S. Military Metaphors in Real and Imagined Indian Country." *American Anthropologist* 110 (2008): 237-247.

- Skjelsbæk, Kjell, "Militarism, Its Dimension and Corollaries: An Attempt at Conceptual Clarification." *Journal of Peace Research* 16 (1979): 213–229.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*. New York: New York University Press, 1979.
- . *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- . *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity, 1995.
- Smith, Cherryl W. "Kimihi Te Matauranga: Colonization and Iwi Development." Master's Thesis, University of Auckland, 1994.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 1999.
- . *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. London: Zed Books, 2012.
- Smith, Tony. *Pattern of Imperialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Snow David A., and Dough McAdam. "Identity Work Processes in the Context Of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus." In *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by S. Stryker, T Owens, R White, 41-67. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 2000.
- Snow, David A. and PE Oliver, "Social Movements and Collective Behavior: Social Psychological Dimensions and Considerations." In *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, edited by K.S. Cook, G.A. Fine, and J.S. House, 571-599. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995.
- Souder, Laura Marie Torres. "Psyche Under Siege: Uncle Sam, Look What You've Done to Us." Presentation at the Annual Conference of the Guam Association of Social Workers, Guam, March 30, 1989.
- Souder-Jaffrey, Laura Marie Torres. *Daughters of the Island: Contemporary Chamorro Women Organizers on Guam*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1992.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Greenberg. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- . *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayati Chakravorty Spivak*. New York : Routledge, 1996.
- . "In a Word: Interview." *Differences* 1 (1989): 124-156.
- Stade, Ronald. *Pacific Passages: World Culture and Local Politics in Guam*. Sweden: Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology, 1998.

- Stephenson, Marcia. "Forging an Indigenous Counterpublic Sphere: The Taller de Historia Oral Andina in Bolivia." *Latin American Research Review* 37, no. 2 (2002): 99-118.
- Stewart, Charles J., Craig Allen Smith, and Robert E. Denton, *Persuasion and Social Movements*, 4th ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press Inc, 2001.
- Stewart-Harawira, Makere. *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization*. Karori: Huaia Publishers, 2005.
- Stoler, Ann. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Sturm, Circe. "Blood Politics, Racial Classification, and Cherokee National Identity: The Trials and Tribulations of the Cherokee Freedmen." *American Indian Quarterly* 22 (1998): 230-258.
- Sukola, Tiffany. "Guam expects 8,000 additional students by 2014." *Marianas Variety*. April 15, 2010. <http://www.mvariety.com/component/content/article/1/25643>.
- Symonds, Peter. "US Think Tank Plans Military Build-up against China," *World Socialist Web Site*, August 13, 2012. <http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2012/08/csis-a13.html>
- Tarrow, Sidney. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *Struggling to Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest*. Western Societies Paper No. 15. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1983.
- . "Comparing Social Movement Participation in Western Europe and the United States: Problems, Uses, Examples, and a Proposal for Synthesis." *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*. Special Issue. *Comparative Perspectives and Research on Collective Behavior and Social Movements* 4 (1986): 147-170.
- . "National Politics and Collective Action: Recent Theory and Research in Western Europe and the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology* 14 (1988): 421-440.
- Teaiwa, Teresia K. "Globalizing and Gendered Forces: The Contemporary Militarization of Pacific/Oceania." In *Gender and Globalization in Asia and the Pacific: Method, Practice, Theory*, edited by Kathy E. Ferguson and Monique Mironesco, 318-332. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008.
- Thompson, Lanny. "Imperial Archipelago: Representation and Rule." *American Studies Asia* 1 (2002): 3-39.

- The Insular Empire: America in the Mariana Islands*, DVD, Directed by Vanessa Warheit, 2009, Distributed by Horse Opera Productions. http://www.horseopera.org/Insular_Empire_2010/.
- Tilly, Charles. "National Self-Determination as a Problem for All of Us." *Daedalus* 122, no. 3 (1993): 29-36.
- Tyrrell, Ian. "Beyond the View from Euro-America: Environment, Settler Societies, and the Internationalization of American History." In *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, edited by Thomas Bender. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- U.S. Department of Defense, "Population Representation in the Military Services: Fiscal Year 2010 Summary Report," 1-45. <http://prhome.defense.gov>.
- U.N. "Charter of the United Nations." Accessed February 27, 2013. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>.
- U.N. Special Committee on Decolonization, "Chamoru Self-Determination Pa'Go," Testimony Presented by Edward Alvarez, May 30, 2012, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2011_guam.pdf.
- . "Chamoru Self-Determination Pa'Go," Testimony presented by Cristobal, Hope A., November 28, 2006, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/dp_2006_cristobal.pdf.
- . "Chamoru Self-Determination Pa'Go," Testimony presented by LisaLinda Natividad, May 30, 2012, http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2012_guam.pdf.
- U.N. "Special Political and Decolonization 4th Committee." The United Nations and Decolonization. Accessed February 27, 2013. <http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/fourthcomm.shtml>.
- Vanden, Harry E. "Social Movements, Hegemony, and New Forms of Resistance." *Latin American Perspectives* 34 (2007): 17-30.
- Van Dyke, Jon M., Carmen Di Amore-Siah, and Gerald W. Berkley-Coats. "Self-Determination for Nonself-governing Peoples and for Indigenous Peoples: The Cases of Guam and Hawai'i." *University of Hawai'i Law Review* 18 (1996): 623-648.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
- Viernes, James Perez. "Won't You Please Come Back to Guam? Media Discourse, Military Building, and Chamorros in the Space Between." Center for Pacific Islander Studies, Occasional Paper 44 (2009): 103-117.

- Walker, R. J. "The Genesis of Maori Activism." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 93 (1984) 267-281.
- Wander, Philip. "The Third Persona: The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism." *Central States Speech Journal* 34 (1983): 1-18.
- Warner, Michael. "What's Colonial about Colonial America?" In *Possible Pasts: Becoming Colonial in Early America*, edited by Robert Blair St. George, 49-72. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Warren, Bill. *Imperialism: Pioneer of Capitalism*. London: NLB, 1980.
- Warrior, Robert. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Waziyatawin, Angela Wilson and Michael Yellow Bird. "Beginning Decolonization." In *For Indigenous Eyes Only: A Decolonization Handbook*, edited by Waziyatawin Angela Wilson & Michael Yellow Bird, 1-8. Santa Fe: School of American Research, 2005.
- We Are Guahan, "The Grey Papers" series, <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>
- We Are Guahan. GHURA DEIS Comment, p. 1, quoted in We Are Guahan, The Grey Papers: "GHURA on Housing," <http://www.guampdn.com/assets/pdf/M0157636514.PDF>.
- Weaver, Teri. "EPA Analysis Finds Military's Plan for Guam's Growth is 'Inadequate'," *Stars and Stripes*. February 27, 2010. <http://www.stripes.com/news/epa-analysis-finds-military-s-plan-for-guam-growth-is-inadequate-1.99496>.
- Williams, Rhys S. "Constructing the Public Good: Social Movements and Cultural Resources." *Social Problems* 42 (1995): 122-144.
- Wilson, Shawn. *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishing, 2008.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (2006): 387-409.
- . *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell, 1999.
- Wood, Houston. "Cultural Studies for Oceania." *The Contemporary Pacific* 15 (2003): 340-374.
- Wooster, Robert. *The Military and United States Indian Policy, 1865-1903*. Omaha: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.
- Yamamoto, Eric K. and Susan Kiyomi Serrano. "The Loaded Weapon." *Amerasia Journal* 27/28 (2001/2002): 51-62.