THIRTEEN

Images of Empire and Visualizing Resistance in Guam (Guåhan)

Sylvia C. Frain

The United States' contemporary Pacific empire is maintained through colonial political arrangements and enforced through expansive military bases. In historical literature discussing World War II, particularly within American academies, Pacific militarization is portrayed as something of the past. If the Indigenous experience is even mentioned, it is a superficial narrative that presents the Indigenous residents as "patriotic" and "loyal" to the United States.[1]

In Guam (Guåhan), an unincorporated territory belonging to the United States, images of the continuous empire are framed and promoted as militaristic patriotism.[2] This chapter examines the visual production of imperial control as it manifests during the "Liberation Day" parade in Guam. The annual event commemorates the "liberation" of the island by the US Marines from the Imperial Japanese Army on July 21, 1944, during the last days of World War II.[3] This celebration is devoted to the US-imposed narrative of Indigenous Chamorro gratitude and American loyalty. It is visualized through American flags and weaponry, formations of marching young Indigenous troops, and the honoring of World War II survivors.

However, the post-WWII narrative of Americans as "saviors" and "liberators" is continuously challenged by the current realities of subpar medical services for the high number of returning veterans, the ongoing denial of financial compensation for World War II survivors (and their families), and the refusal of the United States to return ancestral Chamorro land (*tåno'*). Instead, the storylines of loyalty and gratitude have been appropriated by the US military and federal government to ensure continuing and expanding militarization in Guam.

Simultaneously, the Chamorros continue to resist the US-militarized empire through their cultural frameworks and principles, captured with new

media technologies and visualized across digital platforms. The images of resistance feature *latte* stones (pronounced "laddy"), limestone pillars that served as foundations for ancient houses. Today, the sacred formations serve as the visible foundation of resistance to continued political colonization and expanding militarization by the United States.[4]

Imperial Control

Guam remains as a non-self-governing island and is "hegemonically constrained by dominant American ideologies."[5] Due to the "remote location" of the islands in the Western Pacific, colonizers and war planners have been able to carry out their objectives in the region without visibility and with little outside questioning.[6]

The United States' imperial project in the Pacific began in 1893 with the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, followed by the Spanish-American War of 1898.[7] The United States strategically acquired the islands of Guam and the Philippines, Cuba and Puerto Rico, and US sovereignty was established over Eastern Sāmoa (today American Sāmoa).[8] The new island territories were exploited for US military and commercial purposes, and the United States did not consider extending the American ideals of "freedom," "democracy," or "US citizenship" to the local residents.[9]

In 1898, with the first arrival of the Americans, the Chamorro people were forced under US naval command, which controlled the island as "USS Guam," similar to "USS" naval battleships.[10] While the naval command claimed its mission during the US naval era (1898–1941) was "benevolent assimilation," a paradoxical policy of simultaneously denying Chamorro civil rights and making a determined effort to bring Chamorros more in line with American cultural sensibilities" was implemented.[11] Chamorros were introduced to American ideals and were encouraged to be "good Americans" by speaking English. However, they were not legal citizens; instead, the US federal government ignored and dismissed numerous petitions created by Chamorros calling for a civil government.[12] The naval command claimed that exercising self-determination to create a civilian government would render the island vulnerable, and they would not be able to "protect" the island from foreign powers.[13]

The US naval command's imperial ideology expanded from denying civil rights to abandoning the Indigenous population. Guam had been a communications outpost up though 1941, when the US military "deserted the island and its people."[14] While white US dependents and families were evacuated, Chamorro wives and children of US servicemen were left behind.[15] This history is left out of the dominant narrative promoted by the US mili-

tary, and instead the "return" of the US troops in July of 1944 is deemed heroic.

The Imperial Japanese Army attacked Pearl Harbor, Oʻahu (locally known as Wai Momi ["Pearl Waters"] or Puʻuloa ["Long Hill"]), Hawaiʻi, on December 8, 1941, while also simultaneously bombing the Philippines, Hong Kong, Singapore, the Dutch East Indies, and Guam.[16] On December 10, 1941, Guam was invaded by the Imperial Japanese Army and remained under brutal occupation until July 21, 1944. The Chamorros were the only civilian population held by "the enemy" during World War II, and they state that "the atrocities and daily humiliations of that time are burned forever into our psyches."[17] Today's discourse of militaristic patriotism, Chamorro gratitude, and American loyalty is founded on these experiences and on transgenerational trauma.

Liberation Day

Liberation Day is a legal holiday in commemoration of the anniversary of the liberation of Guam from Japanese occupation on July 21, 1944. The "liberation" of Guam began with the US Marine 3rd Expeditionary Force dropping hundreds of pounds of bombs on the island for thirteen days. The US military did not consider the Chamorro population in the (re)occupation. Today, there is "overwhelming evidence that America's return had more to do with military strategy then some altruistic desire to free the Chamorros from enemy occupation."[18]

When the US military forces returned to the island, the Chamorros felt an immense sense of appreciation.[19] Chamorro scholars have explained how Chamorro gratitude for "survival became synonymous with American Military Forces" and the United States (mis)understood their appreciation and ongoing thankfulness as "hyperloyalty."[20] They have suggested that it was "the only political language available to the Chamorros that could be heard and understood by the Americans."[21]

Chamorro scholar Laura Torres Souder-Jaffery further explains how the return of the US military fostered gratitude and promoted militaristic patriotism. She states, "It was the sheer largesse of their material possessions and supplies—the cases of Spam, surplus Jeeps, tents, boots, clothes, and more—[that] activated an Indigenous code of indebtedness, obligation, and reciprocity."[22] This "code of obligation" evolved into young Chamorro men enlisting in the US Armed Forces and young Chamorro women marrying servicemen. The post-World War II narrative surrounding Liberation Day is still used to support the empire through militaristic patriotism and enduring American loyalty.

Micronesian scholar and filmmaker Vince M. Diaz recapitulates, "Liberation Day has been certified as the official celebration of war . . . this official discourse combines the memories of Chamorro survivors and American soldiers and the political imperative of a postwar American colonial history and historiography to canonize America's return as one of liberation and to fashion a story of intense Chamorro patriotism and loyalty to the United States."[23]

This narrative continues to be visually and publicly demonstrated through American flags, the display of US military weapons, honoring World War II survivors, and encouraging young Chamorro troops. The discourse that the US military "rescued" and "freed" the Chamorro people is reenacted through the parade demonstration.

Parade

The annual "Liberation Day" parade, held every year on July 21, serves as a crucial enactment to honor the United States' empire. The procession moves along a one-mile stretch of Marine Corps Drive, the main road on Guam, named after the "Liberators." Built from coral after World War II, the road runs from the US Naval Station in the south, locally referred to as "Big Navy," north to Andersen Air Force Base, which encompasses the majority of the northern part of the island.[24]

The parade, accompanied by weeks of ongoing memorials across the island, serves as a public display of the imperial "official narrative . . . and [US] dominant paradigm."[25] US flags, military weaponry, and marching troops are paired with BBQ and red rice, Budweiser and plastic plates. Families camp out the night before to ensure their prime viewing spot, and the floats line up very early in the morning. Late summer in Guam is extremely hot, and Marine Corps Drive is a portion of the island that consists mainly of buildings and concrete.[26]

The annual celebration is a visual salute to the US empire, consisting of images that visually support imperial ideologies. An examination of the semiotics of this form of militarization reveals a "paradox of invisibility and visibility."[27] While many elements of militarism are seen out in the open, there are additional and less obvious influences that remain hidden under the surface.

Parade floats are constructed by each village on the back of semitrucks. The World War II–era US military jeep sitting atop an American flag the length of a semitrailer shown in figure 13.1 speaks to the promotion of US military might and militaristic patriotism. It is a combination of American hardware, the iconic jeep, surrounded by the symbolic *latte* stone, an ancient Chamorro technology.

Figure 13.1. A restored World War II–era US Army jeep is placed on the back of a semitruck flatbed decorated as an American flag in hopes of earning the "best float" award during the 71st Liberation Day Parade in Guam, 2015. Photograph by the author.

"Honoring" the Survivors and War Repatriations

The parade begins midmorning by honoring the World War II survivors, many of whom are in their late eighties, and each year the community loses more. The survivors have a special seating area from which to watch the parade. One float presented the phrase "We honor them," professional-style portraits of World War II survivors, and a star cutout with the markings of the US flag commemorate the themes of militaristic patriotism, survivors' gratitude, and loyalty to the United States (figure 13.2). The visible young children in the seating area are the descendants of war survivors and some have learned of wartime survival and the postwar experience through traumatic oral stories passed from generation to generation. The current generation of young Chamorros is continuing the work of their elders in the quest for compensation from the US government.

Each Liberation Day has a theme. For the 71st anniversary in 2015, the theme was "The Spirit of Hope, the Colors of Freedom—Espiriton Diniseha, meskla na kulot Libettat." The theme centers around American ideologies, and while it may not speak to actual tangible things, the "colors of freedom," or colors that *brought* freedom, visibly confirm the heroic efforts of

Figure 13.2. "Espirion, Dinsena, Meskla, Nakulot, Libetiat" means "The Spirit of Hope, the Colors of Freedom," and was the 71st Liberation Day's theme in 2015. Photographic portraits of World War II survivors are accompanied by the words "We Honor Them" and appear on numerous floats in the parade, as well as throughout the months of June and July in the local newspapers commemorating them. Photograph by the author.

red, white, and blue. The recognition of the "spirit of hope" references Chamorro survivors who never lost hope during the occupation, and is also written in Chamorro for the survivors. The image in figure 13.2 both captures the past (with the portraits of the survivors and the theme given in Chamorro) and supports future patriotism (through the dominating American flag and the participation of younger generations).

This visual remembrance does not translate into the material or financial realm. While World War II survivors are symbolically and publicly honored, true compensation continues to be delayed. The dominant narrative produced by the US military and federal government seizes upon the traumas of Chamorro World War II survivors' suffering and appropriates their gratitude. The empire's "honoring" is limited to public symbolism, as the survivors continue to wait for legally mandated financial compensation.

The US federal government has failed to release compensation for Chamorros who survived the Japanese occupation during World War II.[28] The group Guam World War II Reparations Advocates, formed in March 2016, filed a lawsuit on behalf of the survivors. Guam's nonvoting congress-

woman, Madeleine Bordallo, proposed the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act bill in the House five times. On December 8, 2016 (a symbolic seventy-five years after the US naval command abandoned and Japanese imperial forces occupied Guam), the US Senate passed the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, which included World War II repatriations.[29] On December 23, 2016, president Barack Obama signed into law the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act, Title XVII, Public Law 114–328. While Congresswoman Bordallo's office frames this as "a historic day for our island," Michael Lujan Bevacqua, assistant professor of Chamorro studies at the University of Guam, points out that the war reparation funds will be "distributed from taxation paid by employees of the US federal government stationed on Guam," and thus the United States will "compensate people with the money they would have gotten back anyways."[30]

Compensation was based on what survivors "endured," and claimants had one year to file for compensation if they had "suffered rape, injury, forced labor, internment or flight to evade imprisonment during that period."[31] The amounts of financial compensation are unexceptional. Victims of rape or severe injury, such as loss of limb or paralysis, may receive fifteen thousand dollars. Forced labor or injury, such as scarring or burning, may merit twelve thousand. Those who endured forced marches, internment, or hiding could potentially receive ten thousand.[32]

The shallowness and limitations of the empire's narrative of militaristic patriotism has been exposed. Chamorros have been fighting for compensation, which they are legally entitled to, for over seventy years. As the survivor population passes on, their grown children continue to (re)tell their parents' and grandparents' memories of massacres. In addition, accounts of gratitude and loyalty are tested when there is a lack of veteran services for those returning from war, and when the US military continually expands its footprint in the region. Within this imperial and militarized space, the lines between military and civilian populations are blurred.

Indigenous Reciprocity through US Military Service

After World War II, Chamorros "temporarily" sacrificed their land to the military to rebuild Guam. The United States constructed military bases—which remain today. Further, Chamorros enlisted in the US military in extremely high numbers, with nearly an entire generation of young people heading overseas. "Reciprocity meant that Chamorros became duty-bound to 'give the best they had'. And so, our people gave precious land and continue to offer our sons and daughters to show their appreciation to Uncle Sam [United States]. Obligation being a sacred duty, Chamorros have since been

caught in a never-ending cycle of 'paying back.'"[33] After July 21, 1944, the Chamorros who survived the wartime massacres, rape, and starvation under the Imperial Japanese Army occupation had their houses bulldozed by the US military. Land was obtained through eminent domain even though the Chamorros were not yet US citizens.[34] Families were removed to construct military installations and allow access for recreational sites for US servicemen.[35] Almost three-fourths of the island came under military control after World War II.[36]

The determination to have Chamorro ancestral land returned and families compensated after "liberation" now spans several generations. Much of the land remains restricted or has been approved for private commercial use, including a McDonald's restaurant. Jose Garrido, a Chamorro who continues to work to have his family's land returned, states in the documentary film *War for Guam*, "For many of us, the war is not over."

In addition to land, the enlistment rates of Indigenous peoples from Guam serving in the US Armed Forces are the highest, second only to American Sāmoa, with the Micronesian region serving as a "recruiter's paradise."[37] People of the Mariana Islands serve in every branch of the US Armed Forces, particularly the US National Guard, which is continuously deployed and redeployed to ongoing operations in the Middle East and North Africa.[38] Chamorros have defended US democracy in foreign wars at rates three times higher than those of any other state or territory, with one in eight inhabitants currently serving or having served in the US Armed Forces.[39]

While Chamorros serve in overseas US conflicts and have done so "in every war the US has fought since World War II; Vietnam, the Gulf War and the current War on Terror," the truth is that "more Chamorros have died per capita than any other soldiers."[40] As a result, the Mariana Islands communities have high "loss of life" ratios and suffer "killed-in-action" rates up to five times the national average.[41] Nearly every family in the islands has at least one family member who is either on active duty, a veteran, or has died in combat or by suicide.

The "support our troops" call is a fallacy, as veterans on Guam are without adequate medical care or mental health services. This is possible through imperial logic that uses the islands and its people to maintain the US empire overseas, but when those people return, a substandard system with underfunded resources fails veterans and is inappropriate for Indigenous and women veterans.[42] The closest full Veterans Association hospital facility is on Oʻahu, Hawaiʻi, nearly four thousand miles away.[43] Many returning soldiers who have been away from their families for months or longer do not want to leave again for treatment. The lack of funds available for Chamorro veterans directly confronts the narrative of "loyalty" and "patriotism" to an empire that does not give a person "freedom," "democracy," or support upon returning from the

frontlines.[44] The monetary wealth of the US military is evident "inside of the fence" and demonstrates how "communities adjacent to military bases generally obtain the least investment of any community under the US flag."[45]

While on Liberation Day there is visible "support" and the empire salutes the marching troops during the parade, this becomes meaningless in view of the lack of care for the veteran population. Health statistics reveal a much darker situation beneath the positive and proud themes of militarization displayed in the Liberation Day parade. The onerous sacrifices of military personnel affects entire families and communities.[46] The image of young Chamorro soldiers marching, the young girl potentially recording the parade and the onlooker kids sitting across the street, signify the next generation of loyal Indigenous soldiers, serving the United States flag (figure 13.3). The cycle of serving in the US forces is for many a family tradition and an expectation.

The imperial ideology of "patriotic" and "loyal" soldiers defending the

Figure 13.3. Indigenous youth serve in the US Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps program at very high rates, creating multigenerational military families of survivors, veterans, those on active duty, and those intending to enlist. Here, they march with American flags as younger generations look on, 2015. Photograph by the author.

US overseas has proven contradictory. The soldiers return home to the (militarized) Mariana Islands, where they are without a vote for commander in chief and where they receive the lowest financial and mental support for service war veterans in the United States.[47] As their contemporary war experiences follow Chamorro service members home, the resulting trauma and post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) creates a high number of medical and mental health issues. The Chamorros absorb the impact of the invisible trauma of returning from war while the highly visible training for preparation for war continues to militarize the islands. World War II trauma persists today and is compounded by the high rate of Chamorro service people returning from defending the United States in foreign wars. The current generation of Chamorro scholars frame it as the "ambivalent nature of Chamorro 'loyalty'" that informs "the false rhetoric of 'liberation.'"[48]

Other images from Liberation Day capture expressions that validate the narrative of Chamorros displaying gratitude and demonstrating loyalty. These include the large US flag towering over young people smiling and waving, dressed in general "Pacific attire." That is, clothing specific not to the Marianas but instead to the American concept of "the Pacific."[49]

"Reoccupation Day" and the "Invasion of Guam"

Liberation Day and its accompanying imperial discourses have been and are "contested even as [they are] commemorated."[50] While the annual event is designed to promote loyalty and patriotism to the United States—it has also been used to support narratives of demilitarization and decolonization.[51]

Chamorro political activist groups galvanized in the 1990s and publicly challenged Liberation Day's "narratives of triumph and loyalty, suggesting that the name 'Reoccupation Day' would better reflect the colonial reality of Guam."[52] In 1991, Angel Santos, founder and spokesperson of Nasion Chamoru, or Chamorro Nation, an Indigenous rights organization, wrote, "True freedom for the Chamorro people does not exist on Guam."[53] The Chamorro rights activists pushed for the removal of the US military from Guåhan and the return of ancestral land to the locals.[54]

Today's generation remains critical of the "liberator" and "savior" narrative. They question the concept of US "liberation" and refer to July 21 as the "invasion of Guam." They ask, "How can it be Liberation Day if the liberators never left, and instead, took our *tåno'* and still continue to militarize the island(s)?"[55] Nearly one-third of the island remains restricted for the use of the federal government and of all branches of the US Armed Forces. Guåhan has the "highest ratio of US military spending and military hardware and land takings from Indigenous populations of any place on earth."[56]

Contemporary Resistance

The US military and US-owned media outlets frame public forms of resistance to colonization and militarization as "unpatriotic." The longest-running newspaper on the island, the *Pacific Daily News* (*PDN*), began in 1947 as the *Navy News*. It was purchased in 1971 by the Gannett Corporation, an America-based company that publishes, among others, *USA Today*. Under this colonial control, the *PDN* consistently uses "discursive strategies to rally support for pro-American ideologies."[57]

News items surrounding Liberation Day in particular "favor[ed] continued American control of Guam and marginaliz[ed] prolocal demands for self-determination."[58] The *PDN* assists in maintaining the island as unincorporated American territory while reinforcing dominant American ideologies, including expressions of gratitude and praise to the American Marine liberators and the reaffirmation of Guam residents' loyalty to the United States.[59] The understanding of gratitude to the US military and loyalty to the United States is complicated by Chamorro activists today. Today's generation continues to support the subaltern perspective of Santos' editorial through new media platforms, a contemporary form of "guerrilla-like tactics."[60]

This generation understands that (self-)representation and the "political and cultural economy of images and modes of production that determine how Indigenous people represent themselves (aesthetic production) and are represented (who speaks for Indigenous peoples in the political arena)" are interrelated.[61] People from the Mariana Islands use "this [Western] tool to leverage and to support" their own culture, as they visualize their resistance in an effort to recover ancestral land and exercise self-determination.[62] Indigenous peoples of Guåhan who resist the US militarized empire likewise promote ancient cultural practices through photography and new media technologies.[63]

Ancient Technologies Visualized across New Technologies

The majority of visual resistance on Guåhan occurs in digital form, online, and is circulated across new media platforms.[64] "Community building occurs through a web-based arena, where blogs, websites and alternative media publications address issues of self-determination . . . blogs connect to alternative new coverage of military planning, interviews with activists."[65] Within the last five years, political groups in the Mariana Islands archipelago have been "pioneering a new format of Chamorro activism" by using online social media platforms for public advocacy and information dissemination.[66] Chamorro grassroots organizations are able to reach audiences beyond traditional mainstream media outlets, enabling alternative perspectives and providing space for "those

who would otherwise not have a voice against oppression."[67]

The symbol of that resistance is the *acha latte* stone, ancient limestone pillars that served as the foundation of homes and indicate ancient gravesites of the ancestors. These precontact carvings consist of two pieces (figure 13.4). The top, or *tåsa,* is a capstone with its curved side down, and the *haligi* is an upright slab from three to twenty feet high.[68] These *acha latte* stones are "recognized as sacred and have been adopted as icons of Chamorro culture and heritage."[69]

Figure 13.4. Latte stones are found only in the Marianas Archipelago and consist of two separate rock formations, 2015. The outline indicates the *tåsa* cap, or top portion, supported by the *haligi* base, or bottom portion. Photograph by Zea Nauta.

Inafa'maolek (To Make Good and Restore the Balance)

The Chamorro struggle against the US federal government and military is grounded in the Indigenous concept of *inafa'maolek,* roughly translated as to "make good for each other" by treating people well and to "restore the balance" with nature and the community.[70] This reciprocal principle is based on a commitment to family and the environment. Respect (*respetu*) must be applied to social relationships as well as the land, sea, and air so all can benefit from the gifts of the land and the sea (*i guinahan I tåno' ya tåsi*).[71] The importance of respect for the environment in Chamorro culture is further demonstrated through Indigenous protective frameworks formulated in response to the loss of land, language, and cultural practices to the United States.

Inifresi: *Prutehi yan Difendi* (The Chamorro Pledge: Protect and Defend)

Chamorros are "committed to protecting and defending the beliefs, the culture, the language, the air and the water of our cherished land."[72] The late Saena Bernadita Camacho-Dungca developed the Chamorro pledge in 1991

as an alternative to the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States, which is seen by some as imperialistic propaganda imposed on the people of the Mariana Islands.[73] Camacho-Dungca is remembered for her dedication "to the preservation of the Chamoru culture and language . . . [she] worked timelessly to pass down her knowledge to future generations."[74] Chamorros continue to recognize their role as protectors and defenders of their environment and culture for future generations. With the Inifresi as a guiding pledge, resistance is driven by the deep connection to the environment and culture. The Inifresi verbalizes the responsibility to safeguard what is Chamorro:

> The Chamorro Pledge
>
> From the highest of my thoughts, from the deepest of my heart, and with the utmost of my strength, I offer myself to protect and to defend the beliefs, the culture, the language, the air, the water, and the land of the Chamorro, which are our inherent God-given rights. This I will affirm by the holy words and our banner, the flag of Guåhan!
>
> The Inifresi
>
> Ginen i mas takhelo' gi Hinasso—ku, i mas takhalom gi Kurason—hu, yan i mas figo' na Nina'siñå—hu, Hu ufresen maisa yu' para bai hu Prutehi yan hu Difende i Hinengge, i Kottura, i Lengguahi, i Aire, i Hanom yan i tano' Chamoru, ni' Irensiå—ku Direchu ginen as Yu'os Tåta. Este hu Afitma gi hilo' i bipblia yan i banderå—hu, i banderan Guåhan![75]

The Inifresi uses the robust language of sacrifice, such as "with all my might," similar to US military slogans. However, it paradoxically calls for protection and defense *against* US political colonization, militarization, and destruction. It directly confronts how the "US" residents of the islands are denied Indigenous political rights of self-determination as US citizens without a vote for the US president.

The Inifresi is an Indigenous framework, separate from the imposed US political structure. In both written and oral form, it is recited, shared, debated, and honored at community gatherings. It appears in YouTube videos and in artwork, and is referred to in letters to the editor of the local newspapers. The Inifresi serves as a symbolic and cultural form of resistance, and provides this generation with dignity and a way to remember and tie into struggles of the past and support resistance for the future. The resistance to protect and defend (*prutehi yan difendi*) is visualized through the slogan written across the *latte* stone (figure 13.5).

While the US military claims to be protecting and defending the Mariana Islands archipelago and its people, many residents know that neither the

Chamorros peoples nor their rights to their lands are a priority. The images of imperial control are promoted as Indigenous gratitude, US loyalty, and militaristic patriotism. Yet these are ideologies that render Guåhan as not completely part of the United States, due to its nonvoting status, and enable further US militarization.

Figure 13.5. The phrase *prutehi yan difende* is from the Inifresi and means to "protect and defend" Chamorro culture, lands, and seas. This image demonstrates the connection between this framework and the *latte* stone as a form of Chamorro identity. Photograph by the author.

America's Continuing and Expanding Empire

As the US empire project in the Western Pacific continues, the Mariana Islands archipelago remains politically divided as two "insular areas" of the United States. Guåhan (imperially referred to as "Guam") is the most southern and populated island, and is an "organized, unincorporated territory" of the United States under the federal jurisdiction of the Office of Insular Affairs at the Department of the Interior. Guåhan continues to be the "longest colonized possession in the world."[76] The fourteen islands north of Guåhan are politically constructed as the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. These political arrangements consider the islands as *belonging* to the United States rather than as a *part* of it.[77] Continuing imperial control of the archipelago renders the islands (and people) politically and legally "dependent" due to the insular area and its non-self-governing status. This grants the US military unchecked power over the land, sea, skies, and even the people.

Although the archipelago is divided politically, US Department of Defense (DOD) planners make no distinction between political entities. The DOD conceptualizes every island in the Mariana Islands archipelago as a potential live-fire training range complex, as well as the current one-million-square-mile training area that surrounds the archipelago.[78] The DOD is "refocusing" on the Pacific region to meet the "challenges of America's Pacific Century" and further militarize Guåhan.[79] This invisible and visible expanding militarization is justified in the name of US "national security."

Increased militarization signifies how the empire's perspective of "peace" is possible only through militaristic means. The Liberation Day parade floats demonstrate the appropriation of Chamorro cultural representations of local

Figure 13.6. The US Air Force inserted their logo on top of a *latte* stone cutout and painted the words *pas,* Spanish for "peace," with the English "peace" on the bottom, 2015. The base is surrounded by flowers and rainbow decorations, which visually softens the theme. Photograph by the author

flowers and *latte* stones, with their theme of "hope" (*diniseha*) and "freedom" (*libettat*). The floats are supposed to signify peace, which the empire enforces through a "continuous bomber presence," including the B-1 Lancer bombers deployed to Andersen Air Force Base.[80] In addition to the appropriation of peace, the US Air Force has also taken the *latte* stone to clarify that "peace" accompanies the military presence. The US Air Force has placed their seal on top of a *latte* stone, visually imposing US militarism on Chamorro culture. This further instills the narrative that the US military symbolizes "peace" by attempting to reach out to the Chamorro community by spelling peace in Chamorro as "*pas* or *pås* (figure 13.6).

While on Liberation Day the US Air Force appropriates and militarizes the Chamorro symbol of resistance, the *latte* stone, in the name of "peace," the reality is that Guåhan has been selected as the "preferred destination" for the relocation of five thousand marines from the American Expeditionary Force (the same division that "liberated" the island) and their families from Okinawa, Japan.[81] This relocation is considered the largest and most expensive and expansive militarization plan of our time. As a result, the current generation of activists is combining cultural symbols of ancient technologies of the *latte* stone with new media technologies to visualize their resistance efforts.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed how the United States constructs the narrative of American loyalty, Indigenous gratitude, and militaristic patriotism to empire

in the unincorporated territory of Guåhan. Images captured during the annual Liberation Day parade expose a visual production of imperial discourse through the demonstration of flags, weapons, and marching Indigenous troops, as well as the remembrance of civilian prisoners of war. The US military promotes itself as a provider of peace for the region. Yet, peace is ultimately conceptualized through US militaristic means. Guåhan's non-self-governing political status accommodates further militarization. Narratives of loyalty and gratitude have thus been appropriated by the US military and federal government, including the US appropriation of Indigenous culture.

Activists today remind the community that when the Liberation Day celebrations are over, the World War II survivors are still fighting for financial compensation and their ancestral land. Veterans returning from the empire's wars are still without access to complete medical and mental health services. The foundations of resistance must remain as strong as the *latte* stone.

Notes

I express my gratitude to those working for decolonization and demilitarization across the Mariana Islands archipelago and Oceania. I hope my scholarly solidarity and academic activism contributes to the quest for Chamoru self-determination and upholds *tino rangatiratanga o te iwi Māori* (Māori self-determination). I completed the final revisions of this work on Waiheke Island in Aotearoa (New Zealand). I recognize the *tangata whenua* (people of the land) as Paoa Pukunui, descendants of Ngāti Paoa Mana Whenua ki Waiheke who continue to uphold the *rangatiratanga* (autonomy) of Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland), Tīkapa Moana (Hauraki Gulf), and Te Waitematā (Bay).

1. Vicente M. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day'": Identity, History, Memory, and War in Guam," in *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s),* ed. Geoffrey M. White, L. Yoneyama, and T. Fujitani (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Timothy P. Maga, "Democracy and Defense: The Case of Guam (1918–1941)," *Journal of Pacific History* 20, no. 3 (1985): 156–172; Laurel Anne Monnig, "'Proving Chamorro': Indigenous Narratives of Race, Identity, and Decolonization on Guam," PhD diss., University of Illinois, 2007; Amy Owen, "Guam Culture, Immigration and the US Military Build-Up," *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 51, no. 3 (2010): 304–318; John Ries and Mark Weber, "The Fateful Year 1898: The United States Becomes an Imperial Power: The Great Debate over American Overseas Expansion," *Institute for Historical Review* 13, no. 4 (1993): 4–13; Miyume Tanji, "Chamorro Warriors and Godmothers Meet Uncle Sam," in *Gender, Power, and Military Occupations: Asia Pacific and the Middle East since 1945,* ed. Christine De Matos and Rowena Ward (Hoboken, NJ: Taylor and Francis, 2012); Teresia K. Teaiwa, "Militarism, Tourism and the Native: Articulations in Oceania," PhD diss., University of California, 2001; and Valerie Woodward, "'I Guess They Didn't Want Us Asking Too Many Questions': Reading American Empire in Guam," *Contemporary Pacific* 25, no. 1 (2013): 67–91, 218.

2. For a continental US-centric project, see documentary photographer Nina Berman's collection *Homeland* (Great Britain: Trolley, 2008), which visually examines the militarization of American life post-9/11, in particular the "burgeoning homeland security state."

3. Stripes Guam, "72nd Guam Liberation Queens Results," *Stripes Guam,* June 16, 2016, ://guam.stripes.com.

4. Sylvia C. Frain, "Resisting Political Colonization and American Militarization in the Marianas Archipelago," *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 12, no. 3 (2016): 298–315.

5. Francis Dalisay, "Social Control in an American Pacific Island: Guam's Local Newspaper Reports on Liberation," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 33, no. 3 (2009): 242.

6. Simon Winchester, *Pacific: Silicon Chips and Surfboards, Coral Reefs and Atom Bombs, Brutal Dictators, Fading Empires, and the Coming Collision of the World's Superpowers* (New York City: HarperCollins, 2015).

7. Francis Hezel, "From Conversion to Conquest: The Early Spanish Mission in the Marianas," *Journal of Pacific History* 17, no. 3 (1982): 115–137.

8. Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Judith Selk Flores, *Estorian Inalahan: History of a Spanish-Era Village in Guam* (Hagåtna, Guam: Irensia, 2011).

9. Ross Dardani, "Weaponized Citizenship: A Critical Race Theory Analysis of U.S. Citizenship Legislation in the Pacific Unincorporated Territories" (PhD diss., University of Connecticut, 2017), 95.

10. Michael Lujan Bevacqua, "America-Style Colonialism," web log post, Guampedia, November 11, 2014, http://www.guampedia.com.

11. Michael R. Clement, Jr. "*Kustembre,* Modernity and Resistance: The Subaltern Narrative in Chamorro Language Music" (PhD diss., University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2011), 67.

12. Anne Perez Hattori, "Righting Civil Wrongs: The Guam Congress Walkout of 1949," *Isla: A Journal of Micronesian Studies* 3 (1995): 1–27.

13. Christine Taitano DeLisle, "Navy Wives / Native Lives: The Cultural and Historical Relations between American Naval Wives and Chamorro Women in Guam, 1898–1945" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2008), 41.

14. Ralph Stoney Bates, Sr. *An American Shame: The Abandonment of an Entire American Population* (CreateSpace, 2016).

15. Sahuma, "10 Things to Think about Each July," web log post, *Mumun Linahyan,* October 21, 2015, https://mumunlinahyan.com.

16. Don A. Farrell, *History of the Northern Mariana Islands* (Saipan: Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands Public School System, 1991), 343.

17. Joseph F. Ada, "Guam: Equal in War, but Not in Peace; Elusive Emancipation," *New York Times,* October 19, 1991, http://www.nytimes.com.

18. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 157.

19. Cecelia Perez, "A Chamorro Retelling of Liberation," in *Kinalamten Pulitikat-Sinehten I Chamorro/Issues in Guam's Political Development: The Chamorro Perspective*, 70–77 (Mangilao, Guam: Guam Political Status Education Coordination Commission, 1996).

20. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 161.

21. Ibid., 165.

22. Laura Marie Torres Souder-Jaffery, "Psyche under Siege: Uncle Sam, Look What You've Done to Us," in *Uncle Sam in Micronesia: Social Benefits, Social Costs*, ed. Donald H. Rubinstein and Vivian Dames (Guam: Micronesian Area Research Centre, University of Guam Press, 1991).

23. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 156.

24. There are five additional naval sites on Guam, including Ordnance Annex, or "Naval Magazine," which contains the only freshwater reservoir and stores nuclear materials.

"Big Navy" is built on the ancient Chamorro village of Sumay, which was bombed, the survivors relocated, and the land confiscated. The Santa Rita-Sumay Peace Memorial, located at the original Santa Rita Village entrance, is dedicated to the "Chamorros of Sumay Village and all those who died during World War II." Santa Rita was established in April 1945 by the US Naval Government as a World War II temporary refugee camp for the displaced Chamorros of Sumay Village. See James Perez Viernes, "Fanhasso i Taotao Sumay: Displacement, Dispossession, and Survival in Guam" (master's thesis, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2008), 103. Once a year in early April, Naval Base Guam allows families and the descendants of those lost and buried at Sumay to visit their land (*tåno'*) and ancestors for one day during the "Back to Sumay" event. Kevin Tano, "Revisiting History: Going Back to Sumay," *Pacific Daily News*, April 7, 2018, https://www.guampdn.com.

25. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 159.

26. On a personal note, I attended the seventy-first Liberation 2015 parade on Marine Corps Drive. I, along with Chamorro women scholars Dr. Tiara Na'puti and Dr. Lisalinda Natividad, handed out decolonization information with several female social work students from the University of Guam. To my surprise, many people attending the parade understood and spoke about the hypocrisy of US "liberation" and land takings and further militarization, but they said they were at the parade to see family, friends, enjoy the barbecue, and celebrate summer. See Lisalinda Natividad and Gwyn Kirk, "Fortress Guam: Resistance to US Military Mega-Buildup," *Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 19, no. 1 (2010): 1–17.

27. Kathy E. Ferguson and Phyllis Turnbull. *Oh, Say, Can You See? The Semiotics of the Military in Hawai'i*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

28. In January 2020, the first 205 World War II claims were processed by the administration of the current governor of Guam, Lou Leon Guerrero. See Haidee Eugenio Gilbert, "'They Took Everything from Us': Survivors Say War Pay Not Worth the Torture, Suffering," *Pacific Daily News,* February 7, 2020, https://www.guampdn.com. Sabrina Salas Matanane, "WWII Reparations Group Plans to Take Uncle Sam to Court," *Kuam News*, March 28, 2016, http://www.kuam.com.

29. Madeleine Z. Bordallo, "War Claims Passes," December 8, 2016, https://bordallo.house.gov.

30. Radio New Zealand, "Guam War Reparations Questioned," December12, 2016, http://www.radionz.co.nz.

31. US Department of Justice. "Guam Claims Program," last modified June 12, 2018, https://www.justice.gov.

32. Wyatt Olson, "Compensation Claim Period Opens for Guam Victims of WWII Japanese Occupation," *Stars and Stripes*, June 21, 2017, https://www.stripes.com.

33. Souder-Jaffery, "Psyche under Siege."

34. Laura Thompson, "Guam's Bombed-Out Capital," *Institute of Pacific Relations* 16, no. 6 (1947): 66–69.

35. Anne Perez Hattori, *Colonial Dis-Ease: US Navy and Health Policies and the Chamorros of Guam, 1898–1941*, *Pacific Islands Monograph Services* (Honolulu, Hawai'i: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Center for Pacific Islands Studies, 2004).

36. The 2015 documentary film *War for Guam*, directed by Frances Negrón-Muntaner, provides a Chamorro perspective of the World War II experience and lingering US military legacy. The lack of compensation for World War II survivors as well as land taken by the United States, is highlighted. The film's website is www.warforguam.com. See also Frances Negrón-Muntaner, "End the War in Guam," web log post, June 5, 2016, http://www

.huffingtonpost.com; and Sylvia Frain, "War for Guam (Film Review)," *Asia Pacific Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (2016): 126–129, https://www.uog.edu.

37. Justin Nobel, "A Micronesian Paradise—for U.S. Military Recruiters," *Time,* December 31, 2009.

38. Rick Cruz, "National Guard Airmen Prepare to Deploy," *Pacific Daily News*, January 4, 2016, http://www.guampdn.com; Neil Pang, "23 Guam Army Reservists Deploy to Afghanistan," *Guam Daily Post*, October 3, 2016, http://www.postguam.com; Jerick Sablan, "Guam Air Guard Headed to Afghanistan," *Pacific Daily News*, September 25, 2015, http://www.guampdn.com.

39. Ross Tuttle, "Island of Warriors," video file, *America by the Numbers*, PBS, October 11, 2014, http://www.pbs.org.

40. Leon Guerrero, Victoria-Lola, Kerri Ann Naputi Borja, Sabina Flores Perez, and Fanai Cruz Castro, "Hita Guåhan," in *Chamoru Testimonies Presented to the United Nations Special Political and Decolonization Committee, New York, NY* (2006), 11. https://issuu.com/guampedia/docs/hita_2006.

41. Tiara R. Na'puti and Michael Lujan Bevacqua, "Militarization and Resistance from Guåhan: Protecting and Defending Pågat," *American Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2015): 857.

42. Women are the fastest-growing population of US veterans and homeless citizens, with a suicide rate two and a half times higher among veterans than among civilian women, and over 70 percent of them are single mothers. See Samatha Kubek, "The Invisible Veterans," web log post, *Huffingtonpost*, December 20, 2016, http://www.huffingtonpost.com; and Lily Casura, "There's a New Face for Veteran Homelessness, and It's Female: Over Seventy Percent Are Single Mothers," *Garnet News*, February 1, 2017, http://garnetnews.com. Mary F. Calvert, a US-based documentary photographer, has worked to publicize and humanize the hidden statistics through a series of photography projects. Access the photographs from "Missing in Action: Homeless Female Veterans" is available at http://maryfcalvert.com. Calvert also produced "The Battle Within: Sexual Violence in America's Military," available at http://maryfcalvert.com/the-battle-within-examining-rape-in-america's-military. She wrote, "Women who join the US Armed Forces are being raped and sexually assaulted by their colleagues in record numbers. An estimated 26,000 rapes and sexual assaults took place in the armed forces last year; only one in seven victims reported their attacks, and just one in ten of those cases went to trial." See the two-part series online at https://www.maryfcalvert.com/usa-military-sexual-assault-the-women.

43. Tuttle, "Island of Warriors."

44. Sylvia C. Frain, "Women's Resistance in the Marianas Archipelago: A US Colonial Homefront & Militarized Frontline," *Feminist Formations* 29, no. 1 (2017): 97–135.

45. Negrón-Muntaner, "End the War in Guam," 5.

46. Sylvia C. Frain and Betty Frain, "'We Serve Too!' Everyday Militarism of Children of US Service Members," *Childhood* 27, no. 3 (August 2020): 1–15.

47. For short digital films' perspective on the lack of veterans' services in the Mariana Islands, see the PBS special by Tuttle, "Island of Warriors" and the 2018 documentary *Island Soldier* (http://www.islandsoldiermovie.com) about the role Micronesian soldiers play in the US Armed Forces.

Two visual exhibitions were held on Guåhan in 2014 to honor Micronesians and Chamorros who both served and are currently serving. The first photo exhibition to "highlight the largely unrecognized role played by Pacific Island soldiers and contractors in the recent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan" was Ben Bohane's war photography exhibition *Desert Islanders.* See

"Exhibition Highlights Pacific Soldiers in Afghanistan," Waka Photos, accessed March 15, 2021, http://www.wakaphotos.com.

The second was *Sindålu: Chamorro Journeys in the U.S. Military*, a local exhibition curated by Humanities Guåhan in partnership with the Smithsonian that explored "the many significant and oftentimes unrecognized journeys of Chamorro men and women who currently serve or have served in the U.S. Military." See Sahuma, "Sindalu: Chamorro Journey Stories in the US Military," web log post, January 22, 2015, https://mumunlinahyan.com.

Note: Due to the lack of women's voices within the exhibit, Humanities Guåhan then launched the Guam Women Warriors project; an oral history and digital exhibition dedicated to active duty service and women veterans. Lacee Martinez, "Humanities Council Helps Female Veterans Share Their Stories," *Pacific Daily News*, January 31, 2015, http://www.guampdn.com. Also see the Guåhan Humanities Council Facebook page, https://www.facebook.com/guam.council.

48. Craig Santos Perez, "Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory, and History in the Mariana Islands by Keith L Camacho," review, *Contemporary Pacific* 25 (2013): 191.

49. To view ancient Chamorro style recreated as contemporary fashion, see the photo gallery at Lacee A. C. Martinez, "FestPac Fashion Eyes Three Eras of Style," February 18, 2016, *Pacific Daily News*, https://www.guampdn.com.

50. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 156.

51. Keith L. Camacho, *Cultures of Commemoration: The Politics of War, Memory, and History in the Mariana Islands*, Pacific Islands Monograph Series 25 (Honolulu: Center for Pacific Islands Studies and University of Hawai'i Press, 2011).

52. C. S. Perez, "Cultures of Commemoration," 191.

53. Angel Santos, "United States Return Was Re-occupation, Not Liberation," *Pacific Daily News,* July 21, 1991, 21–22. The *PDN* may "sympathize with the resistance of prolocal actors but may only do so after first reaffirming the actors' loyalty to the United States." See Dalisay, "Social Control," 245.

54. Robert F. Rogers, *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1995).

55. Sahuma, "Rethinking July 21st," web log post, July 21, 2016, https://mumunlinahyan.com.

56. Catherine Lutz, "US Military Bases on Guam in Global Perspective," *Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 30, no. 3 (2010): 8.

57. Dalisay, "Social Control," 240.

58. Ibid., 254.

59. Ibid., 247–249. Dalisay's analysis of items published in the *Pacific Daily News* between the fiftieth and sixtieth anniversaries (1994–2004) of Liberation Day "reveals how a local, mainstream newspaper in a US colonial context could serve to influence colonized actors into consenting with their subordinate positions . . . and the PDN may legitimize the importance of adhering to the norm of American loyalty by framing this norm under the guise of colonial reciprocity." Ibid., 253. "Guamanian" is a term created in the 1950s to recognize everyone living on Guåhan at that time—including the settler and military populations.

60. Diaz, "Deliberating 'Liberation Day,'" 157).

61. Hokulani K. Aikau, "Indigenous Theory," Department of Political Science, University of Hawai'i, 5 May, 2015, http://www.politicalscience.hawaii.edu.

62. "Mary T.," personal communication with the author, October 5, 2015. I presented *Hashtag Guam/#Guam #Guahan: How Digital Photography and Social Media on Guam Is Redefining Who Photographs the Pacific* at the twenty-second Pacific History Association in 2016.

The "Photographing the Pacific" panel, chaired by Max Quanchi, a leader in Pacific Islands photographic research, traces the history of photography in the region directly to colonialism. I discussed how young people on Guåhan use the new media platform Instagram for cultural, political, and spiritual purposes. Chamorro historian and scholar Dr. Anne Hattori has also written about the role of photography as a form of remembering; see Anne Perez Hattori, "Re-membering the Past," *Journal of Pacific History* 46, no. 3 (2011): 293–318.

63. Tonia San Nicolas-Rocca and James Parrish, "Capturing and Conveying Cultural Knowledge Using Social Media," *International Journal of Knowledge Management* 9, no. 3 (2013): 1–18.

64. Sylvia C. Frain, "Fanohge Famalåo'an & Fan'tachu Fama'lauan: Women Rising: Indigenous Resistance to Militarization in the Marianas Archipelago," ebook, Guampedia, 2018, https://www.guampedia.com.

65. Tiara R. Na'puti, "Speaking the Language of Peace: Chamoru Resistance and Rhetoric in Guahan's Self-Determination Movements," *Anthropologica* 56, no. 2 (2014): 311n9.

66. Manuel L. Cruz III and Lilnabeth P. Somera, "I A'adahi: An Analysis of Chamorro Cyberactivism," unpublished paper discussed on "Public Radio Guam," February 3, 2016, https://www.podbean.com/site/EpisodeDownload/PB5C56ACSYHU5, 6, 22.

67. Ibid., 21.

68. Zea Nauta, "Hami i Tåsa," web log post, July 17, 2015, Hagan Guåhan, https://haganguahan.com.

69. Viernes, "Fanhasso i Taotao Sumay," 103n149.

70. Christine Taitano DeLisle, "Destination Chamorro Culture: Notes on Realignment, Rebranding, and Post-9/11 Militourism in Guam," *American Quarterly* 68, no. 3 (2016): 565; Dipåttamenton I Kaohao Guianhan Chamorro, *Chamorro Heritage: A Sense of Place*, ed. Research Department of Chamorro Affairs, Publication and Training Division, The Hale'-ta Series (Hagåtña, Guåhan: Political Statues Education Coordinating Commission, 2003), 23.

71. Na'puti and Bevacqua, "Militarization and Resistance," 848.

72. Leevin T. Camacho, "Resisting the Proposed Military Buildup on Guam," in *Under Occupation: Resistance and Struggle in a Militarised Asia-Pacific*, ed. Daniel Broudy, Peter Simpson, and Makoto Arakaki (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars, 2013), 189.

73. Bevacqua, "America-Style Colonialism," web log post, Guampedia," 2014, last updated March 21, 2021, http://www.guampedia.com.

74. Roselle Romanes, "Author of Inifresi Dr. Bernadita Camacho Dungca Passes Away at Age 75," *Pacific News Center*, February16, 2016, accessed March 3, 2016, http://www.pacificnewscenter.com.

75. L. T. Camacho, "Resisting the Proposed Military Buildup," 183.

76. Kisha Borja-Kicho'cho and A. Ricardo Aguon Hernandez, "Guam (Guåhan)," in *The Indigenous World 2012*, ed. Cæcilie Mikkelsen (Copenhagen: International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs/IWGIA, 2012), 232.

77. 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, no. 1 (2011): 67.

78. US Marine Corps Forces Pacific, "Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands Joint Military Training," ed. United States Department of the Navy (Honolulu, HI: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific, 2015).

79. Hillary Rodham Clinton, *America's Pacific Century*, ed. US Department of State (Honolulu, HI: East-West Center, 2011); and Michael Green, Kathleen Hicks, and Mark

Cancian, "Asia-Pacific Rebalance 2025: Capabilities, Presence, and Partnerships: An Independent Review of U.S. Defense Strategy in the Asia-Pacific" (Washington, DC, Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2015).

80. John M. Smith, "Continuous Bomber Presence in Guam," Military.com, February 10, 2017, http://www.military.com.

81. James Perez Viernes, "Won't You Please Come Back to Guam? Media Discourse, Military Buildup, and Chamorros in the Space Between," *Contemporary Pacific* CPIS (Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific) occasional paper 44 (2007): 103–118.