8 Oceania Resistance

Digital autoethnography in the Marianas Archipelago

Sylvia C. Frain

Arrival: Antonio B. Won Pat International Airport Authority, Guam

Due north of Papua New Guinea and a three hour flight from Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines, Guam (Guåhan) is one of fifteen islands in the Marianas Archipelago. The fourteen islands north of Guam are politically referred to as the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). The entire archipelago is considered at times 'domestic' ('part of' the United States) while at other times 'international.' To navigate this 'both/ neither' space, which complicates contemporary territorial/imperial, national/(trans) international, domestic/foreign understandings, is disorienting and exhausting (Na'puti, 2014, p. 302). Passengers traveling on the seven-hour flight from Honolulu, Hawai'i, do not receive meals as the flight is 'domestic,' yet there is an INT (international) designation on the United Airlines boarding pass (Tupaz, 2015). Contrarily, the thirty-minute flight from the neighboring island of Saipan in the CNMI requires passengers to proceed through U.S. customs and passport control.

As the only port of entry for arriving tourists and civilians, the (inter) national airport functions as an introduction to the colonial political status of the archipelago. The 'Welcome to the United States of America' sign at Guam International Airport is a contemporary manifestation of the continuing United States (U.S.) imperial control (Bevacqua, 2014). Although local residents and indigenous CHamoru people are United States' citizens with American passports, they do not vote for the U.S. president nor have voting representation in the U.S. House of Representatives or Senate. U.S. imperial ideologies continue through today's official tourism motto, 'Guam, Where America's Day Begins' which is plastered on the walls of the baggage claim and arrival area.

In 2016, indigenous CHamoru *famalåo'an* (women) (de)militarized and revised the slogan to 'Guam, Where America's War Begins' (Mchenry, 2016). The hyper-militarization of the island is represented through the portraits and memorial in honor of the 'Fallen Brave of Micronesia,' which greets visitors as they travel into the lobby of the airport. The wording on the plaque does not directly say how these 'brave' people of Micronesia ended up 'fallen' serving in

American wars, but instead celebrates the Amero-centric mission 'for freedom' and remembering of "their sacrifice for the protection of our way of life" (Frain & Frain, 2020).

Contemporary indigenous peoples refer to themselves as 'CHamoru' and identify their pre-European-contact ancestors as *Taotao Håya* (ancient people) on Guam, and *I Man'mofo'na or Tautau Mo'na* (those that came before us) in the CNMI (PSECC, 1993; G. Cabrera, personal communication, February 16, 2015). The varying spellings of 'CHamoru,' 'Chamoru,' and 'Chamorro' continue to be a form of self-determination and resistance to a label imposed by prior colonizers. Since the ancient CHamoru language was orally shared, the spellings of words, phrases, and names were incorrectly written down by Spanish conquistadores, European whalers, Jesuit missionaries, the U.S. Naval Command, and the U.S. federal government. Therefore, many cultural practitioners view the spelling 'Chamorro' (with a lower-case "h" and with a "ro" at the end) as lacking a critical view of colonial histories and see it as a form of compliance with the current U.S. colonial-militarized presence. How 'CHamoru' is spelled is a "visible, practical… and conscious assertion of the indigenous population," to intentionally retake ownership over cultural identity (Taitano, 2014, n.p.). The CHamoru language continually "represents a culturally grounded discourse that draws attention to the identity and solidarity of indigenous people of Guåhan" (Na'puti, 2014, p. 307).

I choose to utilize the spelling of "CHamoru" based upon the discussion with the late wayfinder and celestial navigator, Ignacio "Nash" Camacho in 2015. According to Camacho, "'CHamoru' is the linguistically correct version that the most serious cultural practitioners embrace. 'Chamorro' is the GovGuam [the Government of Guam] legal spelling for their official use and is purely political. I *am* CHamoru" (N. Camacho, personal communication, June 5, 2015).

Today, the Marianas Archipelago is politically divided into two "insular areas" of the U.S. Contemporary government administrations use these "alternative terms to distance themselves from colonial frameworks, despite ongoing policies that continue to disenfranchise Indigenous peoples" (Dé Ishtar, 1994, p. 4). Guåhan (still imperially referred to as 'Guam') is the most populated island and politically is an "organized, unincorporated territory" of the U.S. under the federal jurisdiction of the U.S. Office of Insular Affairs at the Department of the Interior. It continues to be the "longest colonized possession in the world" (Borja-Kicho'cho' & Aguon Hernandez, 2012, p. 232). This political arrangement considers the islands as 'belonging' to the U.S., which grants the U.S. military unrestricted power over the land, sea, skies, and people (Alexander, 2015). The "U.S. federal conceptualizations of Pacific Ocean spaces function as an *oceanic security state* – financially controlled through the world's largest Exclusive Economic Zones… and enjoying impunity as U.S. legal jurisdictions are diluted" (Na'puti & Frain, 2020).

Although the archipelago is divided politically, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) planners make no distinction between political entities. Every island in the Marianas Archipelago is conceptualized as a potential Live Fire

Training Range Complex (LFTRC), as well as the current 100-million-square-mile training and weapons testing area that surrounds the archipelago. Currently, the DoD is planning to relocate 5,000 Marines from Okinawa, Japan, and construct three additional LFTRCs on the islands of Guam, Tinian, and Pågan (U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific, 2015). This is part of the 2011 U.S. foreign policy referred to by numerous names in the media and by defense officials: "The Pivot to East Asia," "The Asia(-)Pacific Pivot," "The Pivot to the Pacific," "The Strategic pivot," "The Realignment," or the "Rebalance(ing)." Locally, it is referred to as the "buildup" (Na'puti & Bevacqua, 2015, p. 841).

While the DoD and U.S. military planners are hesitant to outline the main objective of the buildup, Kathleen H. Hicks, Senior Vice President at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, simply states that the strategic objective is to avoid a war with China (Green et al., 2015). However, as Chinese tourists remain a main source of income for Guam, the Guam Visitors Bureau remains uncritical of the buildup despite the (conservative) estimated annual loss of $118 million in tourism revenues (DeLisle, 2016, p. 563). The urgency of my research is due to the expanding militarization of the Marianas Archipelago, which is scarcely written about in academic spaces or mentioned in the (inter) national media.

For CHamoru women, there is a direct link between colonial control and escalating militarization. Contemporary expanding militarization is a continuation of imperial domination of the island and people which *famalåo'an* (CHamoru women) have been resisting for nearly five hundred years. Today Oceania "still churns with its colonial and nuclear legacies" and continues through escalating militarization (Teaiwa, 2010, p. 16).

An invitation + instructions

I critically navigated Guam's port of entry for the sixth time in 2015 with the U.S. customs officials smiling and saying, "welcome back." I returned not as a daughter who lives in the village of Ipan in the south of Guam, but as a doctoral student critically inquiring through a "settler responsibility" lens (Garrison, 2019, p. 1) for four months. As a white woman researcher, born in a settler state (the continental U.S.) and funded by another settler state's (New Zealand) educational institution, my unique positionality as an "outsider" culturally, but also a partial "insider" as a U.S. citizen on/in a possession/territory "belonging" to the U.S., conferred (re)search obligations. I was informally invited by several "academic activist auntie," friends of my mother as well as younger "scholarly resister sisters," to use my doctoral studies as a form of resistance against U.S. colonialization and militarization collectively with the *famalåo'an* of the islands.

Their invitation was the first step of my critical autoethnographic wayfinding journey, beginning with confronting my role as a settler scholar. This accountability manifested as creating and disseminating open, public, shareable, accessible, informative, and understandable (re)search useful for the local community

who made the research possible in the first place. They guided me to ensure the research was not being done *on* them but rather *for* their cause, as *encouraged* by them, and *with* their participation at all stages of research (Hokowhitu et al., 2010, p. 18).

A women–centred approach

Shortly after the invitation, I was gifted written guidance, which continues to instruct my lifelong wayfinding as (re)search journey. In 1989, the Women in the Pacific Conference was held at the University of Guam and produced the 'Women-Centered Research Agenda for Outsider Research in Micronesia' (Participants, 1992). I was unable to access this document online, and by physically being on the island I was able to access these guidelines. I include my responses in italics below to demonstrate my early reflections documented during my critical autoethnographic fieldwork:

1. Local women who assist outside researchers should receive some form of credit.
   Please see the acknowledgements at the end of this chapter.
2. It should be recognized that there are important differences between and among the cultures of Micronesia.
   I learned a great deal about the complexities of CHamoru and Refaluwasch cultures and I honor their differences and similarities in relation to Micronesian and Oceanic communities and societies.
3. Careful consideration should be given to the following two questions: (i) for what purpose is the research being done? (ii) who is going to read the results of this research? Answers should be supplied to local women before the proposed research is initiated.
   i)   *This (re)search seeks to contribute to ongoing resistance to the gendered and environmental politics of everyday and expanding U.S. militarization.*
   ii) *New media platforms and digital spaces enable the resistance (re)search to reach a wider and more diverse audience.*
4. The researchers should provide a list of research questions to local women so they may discuss these questions among themselves in the context of their own community.
   A list of questions was provided along with the consent forms. However, specific research questions were rarely used to structure the conversation or "talk-story" session(s).
5. Local women need to be able to consider whether or not the researcher may violate cultural values and norms.
   I continue to engage in open and collaborative dialogue, feedback, and discussions. I recognize it is not the community's responsibility to educate me. Therefore, I work to ensure I am not violating cultural values and norms. I also appreciate feedback when I do overstep my boundaries.

6. Some knowledge is private by cultural definition and researchers are expected to be aware of this and to respect it.

    Yes, I have learned while I may ask a certain question, the response may not be directly in response to that question and it is not acceptable to persist in questioning or to keep prying.

7. Arrangements should be made for the collaboration of local people in the proposed research. The credibility of the research results will be suspect if the research is conducted entirely by an outsider.

    New media platforms, such as Facebook and Instagram, are excellent for ongoing collaboration, editing, and dissemination.

8. Local women want to have the right to review research reports prepared by outsiders prior to the submission of these reports by researchers to outside agencies or for publication.

    Yes, my informants in the Mariana Islands have read all of my writing. I have obtained their permission for use before inclusion in a publication on a blog or in a journal.

9. Local women would like to prevent unsolicited researchers from just 'showing up' in their communities and expecting everyone to cooperate with their research.

    As my mother lives there, and due to my previous frequent trips beforehand, I had established ongoing relationships with my 'academic aunties' and 'scholarly sisters' who invited me to collaborate on this project.

10. Local women would like to discourage the attitude of some outsider researchers that the latter have a great unasked-for benefit to bestow on the community. For example, the outside researcher who comes into the community and asks, "Do you meet the requirements for the (unsolicited) research I am planning to do here?" should be encouraged to adopt a more enlightened attitude and possibly be discouraged from doing research in that community.

    This is what fuels my desire to decolonize resistance studies while addressing my settler responsibility.

11. Local women would like a centralized clearinghouse to be developed for the purpose of registering all women-centered research being planned or conducted in the region, with the additional responsibility of disseminating and applying to the policies for outsider research presented here.

    I am a Research Associate with the Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center (MARC) at Unibetsedåt Guåhan, the University of Guam, which will hold copies of my academic publications for those interested on the island. In addition, I have my publications accessible on new media platforms, Oceania Resistance Facebook page, or by request. I also recognize that it is time-consuming reading and reviewing my writing, and do not expect all women to have the (unpaid) time to do so.

12. Local women of Micronesia emphasize the following guideline for outsider researchers: "You must earn the right to learn."

> *I love(d) this experience; it taught me patience and appreciation. I also realize that just because a doctoral research project has a deadline and is coming to an end, the "right to learn" is an ongoing process.* (Frain, 2018, pp. 69–71).

(Re)search as resistance in Oceanic spaces

These recommendations led to the selection of a decolonized approach: firstly to use my privilege to engage with (re)search *as* resistance (Brown & Strega, 2005), and secondly to use methods which "emphasizes reflexivity and privileges Indigenous epistemologies, interests, and perceptions" (Genz et al., 2016, p. ii). The notion of '(re)search' marks a decolonized conceptualization for critically (re)analyzing history and academic outputs. The '(re)' signifies a (re)examination of previous research, founded on imperial ideologies and from mostly male perspectives. To '(re)search' is to (re)comprehend legal, political, and social systems of settler colonialism. I employ the term (re)search to symbolically challenge imperial and Western-dominated forms of inquiry. I had been given an opportunity to work on a doctoral thesis with time to (re)search the histories of an archipelago which settler colonists and the U.S. military stole from the indigenous population (Arvin et al., 2013; Ngata, 2016; Shigematsu & Camacho, 2010). I was encouraged to understand how U.S. militarization relies on imperial ideologies which consider the islands U.S. sovereign soil, and how indigenous tåno' (land) is acquired in the name of American "national security" (Frain, 2016, p. 302). For *famalåo'an* (CHamoru women), there is a direct link between colonial control and escalating militarization. Contemporary expanding militarization is a continuation of imperial domination and *famalåo'an* resistance is part of a long, matriarchal legacy (Frain, 2017, p.105).

Secondly, to conduct (re)search *as* resistance in the Marianas Archipelago, a deep understanding of Oceanic epistemologies and approaches to resistance is essential. Ocean spaces are interconnected, "waterways comprised *in relation to* archipelagos, atolls, and islands, directly challenges Western orientations of the ocean as *belonging to* the U.S. or other colonial nation-states in the service of settler colonialism and militarism" (Na'puti & Frain, 2020, p. 3). The late poet and Microwoman, Teresia K. Teaiwa considers variability and constant flux to help theorize indigenous lands *in relation to* the ocean, where the ocean figures prominently in concepts of home(land) for Pacific Islander communities (2005). These ways of knowing are fluid, alive and involve the spirit of collectivity, reciprocity, and respect and sacred relationships, including a spiritual interconnection between self and ancestors, the natural environment, wider cosmos, and a collective sense of culture and community (Kovach, 2005). Indigenous Oceanic perspectives of place are fluid and dynamic and require constant observations and adjustments, skills identical to those required of a wayfinder. Navigating away from an imperially created language of the nation-state, such as 'transnational,' which reinforces the settler state, the term 'trans-oceanic' better describes our fluid resistance methodology (Camacho, 2011).

Transoceanic honors the ability to connect across large distances of ocean to foster relationships and support each other's efforts for decolonization and demilitarization in the region. Teawia decolonizes the notion of "solid-arity," (Land, 2015) to "fluidarity," as people of Oceania "have more water and ocean than any other part of the world" (Teaiwa & Slatter, 2013, p. 449).

Therefore, the term "transoceanic fluidarity" best describes the experiential wayfinding (re)search process in which I collaborate with women activists, educators, and protectors, through digital resistance to expanding militarization throughout the Marianas Archipelago (Frain, 2017, p. 122). I was instructed to collaborate digitally across new media platforms, specifically Facebook, to share information related to resisting U.S. colonialization and expanding militarization. This affirmed my belief that critical autoethnography, in conjunction with Participatory Action Research (PAR) and digital media, were the best methods to respond to the invitation and challenge conventional (colonial) forms of ethnographic fieldwork.

Methodologies

Critical and emancipatory conceptual research "incorporates emancipatory methodologies such as feminist research and participatory research and Indigenous methodologies" (Kemmis & McTaggart 2005, p. 570). Feminist and queer researchers critique social relations as a gendered process PAR incorporates activism as a form of research. Indigenous research paradigms and methodologies directly resist the "hegemony of traditional research methodologies" (Brown & Strega, 2005, p. 8). By honoring these approaches, academic decolonized theories and methods support and reinforce practical, action-oriented efforts for political, social, cultural, and economic decolonization (Smith, 2012).

Decolonization theory, unlike post-colonial theory, "acknowledges that the colonists have not left" (Sillitoe, 2015, p. 78). Considering the "world as 'post-colonial,' from Indigenous perspectives, is to name colonialism as finished business" (Smith, 2012, p. 99). In disregarding historical analysis, colonialism is replicated and repeated through the research process. A post-colonial "theoretical positioning, in its very name… frees one from historical analysis" (Kovach, 2009, p. 75). Contemporary government administrations use alternative terms to distance themselves from colonial frameworks, such as "insular areas," despite ongoing policies that continue to disenfranchise indigenous peoples (Dé Ishtar, 1994, p. 4). The structures of colonialism and its lasting effects are present for indigenous peoples, particularly for those in Oceania and specifically for those in the Marianas Archipelago.

Indigenous methodologies, indigenous (re)search frameworks, and indigenous injury are all "research methodologies that encompass Indigenous epistemologies" (Kovach, 2009, p. 21). 'Indigenous' people, as defined by Alice Te Punga Somerville are "people who are Indigenous to the specific land where we/you are located as well as Indigenous to the nation-state where we/you are

located as well as Indigenous to another space on the globe on which we/you are located" (2016). These methodologies are a way of knowing that is "fluid," "alive," and involves the spirit of "collectivity, reciprocity, and respect" (Kovach, 2005, p. 27). Indigenous worldviews vary greatly but contain a common thread of relational spaces and sacred relationships, including a spiritual interconnection between self and ancestors, the natural environment, and wider cosmos, and a collective sense of culture and community.

Participatory Action Research

PAR aims for the empowerment of the community, based on continued communication between the participants and researcher and incorporates activism as a form of research (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). To regain "control of the research process has been pivotal for Indigenous peoples in decolonization. One methodology from the margins, participatory research, has been an ally" (Stringer, 2007, p. 23). This emancipatory method brings people who were formerly 'subjects' of research injury into the process as co-creators and co-researchers who participate in the entire research process (Brown & Strega, 2005). These (re)search methods constitute "a radical departure from accepted standards and common expectations… [that] requires researchers to develop sufficient flexibility to see, ask, listen, and understand in new ways" (Wheatly & Hartmann, 2013, p. 157). These observational skills are central to successful wayfinding, both as (re)search and as celestial navigation (Diaz, 2011). Similar to other community-based methods, PAR's framework is fluid and socially contextual, depending on the requirements of the community and the concerns of the participants. I include excerpts of my autoethnographic fieldwork notes as *italics* in the footnotes throughout my doctoral thesis to demonstrate the fluid process of working with the community and to highlight the evolution of my understanding and role as a (re)searcher (Frain, 2018, p. 3).

One example of the collaborative (re)search process took the form of a collaborative conversation with Dr. Vivian Dames, who informed me, "PAR research has not been carried out here [the Marianas Archipelago] before!" At the end of the two-hour conversation at my mother's kitchen table, we concluded I needed a "collaborative approach" as "I have commitments to multiple organizations through a partnership that is fluid and (re)negotiated." We created community-based research questions which address "Key issues: how can my research work to benefit you (the organization)? How would it be most helpful process for me to share my work? Your options as an organization, what would you like me to emphasize, highlight, focus on? How should we share this research with the community?" (Frain 2018, p. 72).

PAR also occurs in the digital form as communication across new media platforms with specific *famalåo'an* who agreed to review my writing and content before submission for publication or posting online. Our interaction begins

in a WhatsApp group as a conversation, evolves into text as a Word document then is uploaded on a shared Google Drive, edited and sent via Facebook messenger, and then eventually posted on Instagram. Formal and informal gatherings, collaborative conversations, and "talk-story" sessions with women, often happen in their backyard.

Critical autoethnographic approaches

There is a strong need for (self)reflectivity within research in general, but particularly so for a non-indigenous (re)searcher working with indigenous communities (Dauphinee, 2010). Critical autoethnographic analytical approaches are relevant to emancipatory (re)search as it was formed in the "wake of colonialism" when (re)searchers created the term "self-reflexivity" to understand the "ethnographic limitations and potentials" of research (Alsop, 2002, p. 2). Critical autoethnography addresses the politics of representation (by whom and about whom) and the power relations within traditional ethnographic research (Wall, 2006; Boylorn & Orbe, 2014). It also breaks the voice of the "dominant narrative" to allow "different voices to intersect, overlap, resist, and contrast one another. It is a form of writing that resists language, all while making a case of it" (Roth, 2005, p. 13). I intentionally conduct(ed) my (re)search with particular attention to the influences of my own opinions and opportunities formed by my status as an American citizen and New Zealand resident and as a settler colonialist/outsider (Chawla & Atay, 2018). This critical autoethnographic approach as an example of wayfinding enabled me to challenge my assumptions, biases, and privilege, explore and question my identity and cultural, political and spiritual beliefs, and test my legal knowledge(s) of my nation-state. I constantly reevaluate my role as a (re)searcher and adjust my contributions depending on feedback and events occurring in the community. This ebb and flow is comparable to wayfinding, which requires flexibility and demands sensitivity to alter the course according to the elements.

Re-reading and writing up my autoethnographic fieldwork notes in my doctoral thesis was an exercise in reflective questioning to address how my (re)searcher position is affected by my own epistemologies and how it created space for critical narratives and the inclusion of my emotions and observations (Davies, 2012). By resisting the dominant (re)search narrative, I can (self) reflectively inquire about my *own* experience as a U.S. (re)searcher struggling with issues of the colonial and military power of my country. I critically investigate the imperial nature of the research process and my (expected) role in it (Ellis et al., 2011). The process of autoethnography applies (self)reflexive narrative by "having a closer look at one's own longings and belongings" and when "viewed from a distance can change one's perspective considerably" (Alsop, 2002, p. 2). (Self)reflexive narrative acknowledges that (re)search writing is a practice that is inevitably informed by who we are and how we live our lives.

Digital spaces

Linda Tuhiwai Smith has been a leader in efforts to decolonize the academy, including assisting settler scholars to ensure their work is welcomed and relevant as well as accessible for indigenous communities which make the research possible (2012). For Smith, it is the (re)searcher's obligation to share the research collected and gathered with the community and participants. Smith recommends producing "open and public, straightforward and shareable research that can easily be understood by the community" (personal communication via Skype, June 10, 2015). She confirmed the academic arena is not available to everyone and accessing written and visual work in scholarly outlets such as academic journals does not directly or immediately benefit the women and their community. I must look beyond traditional journals and engage with alternative forms of knowledge creation, such as creative works, including audio-visual material on digital platforms.

New media technologies such as mobile phones and screen devices are naturally woven into Oceanic cultures, socially organized around families and clans. Most people in the Marianas Archipelago use smartphones and tablets and are social media literate (Burns, 2008). These digital tools connect family and friends spread across large geographical areas and time zones. People from the Mariana Islands (also known as the Marianas Archipelago) use "this [Western] tool to leverage and to support our own culture" ("Mary Taitano," personal communication, October 5, 2015). The majority of visual representation of the Marianas Archipelago is happening in digital form and is circulated across the new media platforms Facebook and Instagram (Frain, 2016).

In addition to familial connections, new media is used strategically for decolonization and demilitarization efforts. Today, the younger generations of women are collaboratively using new media technologies to foster fluidarity with others working for decolonization and demilitarization (Frain, 2017, 2016). "Community building occurs through a web-based arena, where blogs, websites and alternative media publication address issues of self-determination… blogs connect to alternative new coverage of military planning, interviews with activists" (Na'puti, 2014, note 9). Within the last five years, political groups in the Marianas Archipelago have been "pioneering a new format of Chamorro activism" by using social media platforms for public advocacy and information dissemination (Cruz & Somera, 2016, pp. 6, 22). CHamoru 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" (p. 21). New media research processes includes visual and textual content analysis of the online content across numerous platforms. Digital spaces are arguably the latest practice of resistance in the Marianas Archipelago (Na'puti & Frain, 2017, p. 15).

The younger generation of women resisting colonization and militarization suggested an appropriate space for a non-indigenous scholar is online to contribute by creating a public database. "Mary Diaz," who requested a pseudonym

to maintain her anonymity due to the small community and current role in government, used the metaphor of weaving a mat to make all of my (re)search data freely accessible in one area. Others spoke of creating a digital fishing net to catch the scattered and dispersed online information and disseminate from one specific site.

I created the (re)search-oriented Oceania Resistance Facebook page to serve as one Pacific-specific site to share (de)militarization and (de)colonization art, blogs, events and highlight academic announcements, educational opportunities, and regional news. "Research-oriented" emphasizes it as an online space to publicly archive my critical autoethnographic (re)search data as opposed to storing it only on my personal computer. The page (re)distributes (re)search as resistance resources for others rising against colonization and militarization. I selected Facebook as my new media platform as I was familiar with its design and format, and I was already connected there with many people in the Marianas Archipelago. The continuation of the page, born during early collaborative conversations with the community and supported by scholars, is intended to serve as a centralized digital space focusing on Oceania. It serves as a fluid example of critical autoethnographic work as wayfinding as I continue to observe, reflect, and adjust my digital contributions accordingly. I am honored to continue to weave a digital mat in support of others working to "decolonize America's militarized empire in the Pacific… [through] genealogies of resistance" (Camacho, 2011, p. xiv).

Conclusion

This chapter outlines my critical autoethnographic practice during my doctoral studies in the Marianas Archipelago in 2015. With a settler's responsibility, I accepted the invitation from the *famalåo'an* (CHamoru women) to use my privileged (re)search practice as a form of resistance. A dozen instructions created by Micronesian women for non-indigenous scholars working with their communities launched my decolonizing wayfinding journey and continues to direct my contemporary collaborations. Through participatory action research, I work to ensure I am accountable to the community and my (re)search is relevant. My critical autoethnographic practice continues to make space for self-reflectivity and the inclusions of emotions. Contemporary wayfinding is (re)search in fluidarity with communities across digital spaces through critical autoethnographic approaches and with new media technologies. The Facebook page Oceania Resistance continues as an example of wayfinding in fluidarity as "*fanohge famalåo'an*" (women rise) across Oceania to resist political colonization and expanding militarization.

Acknowledgments

Si Yu'us Må'åse' and *Olomwaay* (thank you) to the *famalåo'an* (women) of the Marianas Archipelago, whom I consider my academic activist aunties and

scholarly resister sisters. I also acknowledge Waitaha, Kāti Māmoe, and Kāi Tahu, who hold the *mana* of Te Wai Pounamu Aotearoa (South Island, New Zealand), where I wrote my doctoral thesis now accessible as an e-publication on the educational website: Guampedia.

References

Alexander, R. (2015). Living with the fence: Militarization and military spaces on Guahan/Guam. *Gender, Place & Culture*, *23*(6), 1–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2015.1073697

Alsop, C. K. (2002). Home and away: Self-reflective auto-/ethnography. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *3*(3), 1–13.

Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations*, *25*(1), 8–34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/ff.2013.0006.

Bevacqua, M. L. (2014). Interpretive essay: Colonialism – then and now. *Guampedia*. www.guampedia.com/american-style-colonialism/.

Borja-Kicho'cho', K., & Aguon Hernandez, A. R. (2012). GUÅHAN. *IWGIA*. www.iwgia.org/regions/oceaniapacific/guam.

Boylorn, R., & Orbe, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Brown, L., & Strega, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Burns, A. F. (2008). Visual literacy through cultural preservation and cultural resistance: Indigenous video in Micronesia. *Journal of Film and Video*, *60*(2), 15–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jfv.0.0006

Camacho, N. (2015). Personal communication, June 5, 2015.

Camacho, K. L. (2011). Transoceanic Flows: Pacific Islander interventions across the American Empire. *Amerasia Journal*, *37*(3), ix–xxxiv. http://dx.doi.org/10.17953/amer.37.3.m372lun15r8p420m

Chawla, D. & Atay, A. (2018). Introduction: Decolonizing autoethnography. *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*, *18*(1), 3–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532708617728955

Cruz III, M. L., & Somera, L. P. (2016). *I A'adahi: An analysis of Chamorro cyberactivism*. [Unpublished paper]. The University of Guam.

Dauphinee, E. (2010). The ethics of autoethnography. *Review of International Studies*, *36*(03), 799–818. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0260210510000690

Davies, C. (2012). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. Milton Park: Taylor & Francis.

DeLisle, C. (2016). Destination Chamorro culture: Notes on realignment, Rebranding, and post-9/11 militourism in Guam. *American Quarterly*, *68*(3), 563–572. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aq.2016.0052

Dé Ishtar, Z. (1994). *Daughters of the Pacific*. Melbourne: Spinifex Press.

Diaz, V. M. (2011). Voyaging for anti-colonial recovery: Austronesian seafaring, archipelagic rethinking, and the re-mapping of indigeneity. *Pacific Asia Inquiry*, *2*(1), 21–32. www.uog.edu/_resources/files/schools-and-colleges/college-of-liberal-arts-and-social-sciences/pai_pgs_21-32.pdf

Ellis, C., Adams, T., & Bochner, A. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research*, *36*(4), 273–290. www.jstor.org/stable/23032294

Frain, S. (2016). Resisting political colonization and American militarization in the Marianas Archipelago. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *12*(3), 298–315. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.3.7.

Frain, S. (2017). Women's Resistance in the Marianas Archipelago: A US colonial homefront and militarized frontline. *Feminist Formations*, *29*(1), 97–135. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/658645.

Frain, S. (2018). Fanohge Famalåo'an and Fan'tachu Fama'lauan. Women rising: Indigenous resistance to militarization in the Marianas Archipelago. *Guampedia*. www.guampedia.com/fanohge-famalaoan-and-fantachu-famalauan/.

Frain, S. & Frain, B. (2020). "We serve too!": Everyday militarism of children of United States service members. *Childhood, Special Issue: Children, Childhoods, and Everyday Militarisms*. 1–20. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0907568220914709

Garrison, R. (2019). Settler responsibility: Respatialising dissent in "America" beyond continental borders. *Shima*, *13*(2), 1–20. https://shimajournal.org/issues/v13n2/07.-Garrison-Shima-v13n2.pdf

Genz, J., Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, N., La Briola, M., Mawyer, A., Morei, E., & Rosa, J. (2016). *Militarism and nuclear testing* (Vol. 1). Honolulu: Center for Pacific Islands Studies: University of Hawai'i–Mānoa.

Green, M., Hicks, K., & Cancian, M. (2015). *Asia-Pacific rebalance 2025. Capabilities, presence, and partnerships: An independent review of U.S. Defense strategy in the Asia-Pacific.* https://csis-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/legacy_files/files/publication/160119_Green_AsiaPacificRebalance2025_Web_0.pdf.

Hokowhitu, B., Kermoal, N., Andersen, C., Reilly, M., Petersen, A., Altamirano-Jimenez, I., & Rewi, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Indigenous identity and resistance: Researching the diversity of knowledge.* Auckland: Otago University Press.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 567–605). Walnut Creek, CA: Sage Publications.

Kovach, M. (2005). Emerging from the margins: Indigenous methodologies. In Brown, L., & S. Strega (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 19–36). Canadian Scholars' Press.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto/Buffalo/London: University of Toronto Press.

Land, C. (2015). *Decolonizing solidarity: Dilemmas and directions for supporters of indigenous struggles.* Winnipeg: Zed Books.

Mchenry, T. (2016, September 26). Guam's role in US regional tensions discussed at second General Assembly. *Pacific News Center.* www.pacificnewscenter.com/local/10993.

Na'puti, T. (2014). Speaking the language of peace: Chamoru resistance and rhetoric in Guahan's self-determination movement. *Anthropologica*, *56*(2), 301–313. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/561635.

Na'puti, T., & Bevacqua, M. (2015). Militarization and resistance from Guåhan: Protecting and defending Pågat. *American Quarterly*, *67*(3), 837–858. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aq.2015.0040.

Na'puti, T., & Frain, S. (2017). "Decolonize Oceania! Free Guåhan!" Communicating resistance at the 2016 Festival of Pacific Arts. *Amerasia Journal*, *43*(3), 2–34. https://doi.org/10.17953/aj.43.3.

Na'puti, T., & Frain, S. (2020). Indigenous perspectives of Oceania: Challenging the United States oceanic security state. In Anderson J., Davies A., Peters, K. & Steinberg P. (Eds.). *The Routledge handbook of ocean space.* New York/London: Routledge.

Ngata, T. (2016, October 18). Stone in our shoe: The military co-option of indigineity and protection exposed. *The Non Plastic Maori.* https://thenonplasticmaori.wordpress.com/2016/10/18/stone-in-our-shoe-the-military-co-option-of-indigineity-and-protection-exposed/.

Participants. (1992). Women-centered research methodology workshop: Concerns and guidelines for outsider research in Micronesia. *Isla: A Journal of Micronesian Studies,* *1*(2), 432–434.

Political Status Education Coordinating Commission [PSECC] (1993). *Hale'-ta: Hestorian Taotao Tano'. History of the Chamorro people.* Agana, Guam.

Roth, W. (Ed.) (2005). *Auto/biography and auto/ethnography: Praxis of research method.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Shigematsu, S., & Camacho, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Militarized currents: Toward a decolonized future in Asia and the Pacific.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Sillitoe, P. (2015). *Indigenous studies and engaged anthropology the collaborative moment.* Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Winnipeg: Zed Books.

Somerville, A. T. P. (2016, September 13). *An indigenous scholar's request to other scholars* [Status update]. Facebook. www.facebook.com/notes/alice-te-punga-somerville/an-indigenous-scholars-request-to-other-scholars/10154473137695786

Stringer, E. (2007). *Action research* (3rd ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Sage Publications.

Taitano, G. (2014). Chamorro vs. Chamoru. *Guampedia.* www.guampedia.com/chamorro-vs-chamoru

Teaiwa, T. (2005) Native thoughts: A Pacific studies take on cultural studies and diaspora. In*:* Thompson, C. and Harvey, G. (Eds.), *Indigenous diasporas and dislocations* (pp. 15–35). New York/London: Routledge.

Teaiwa, T. (2010) Bikinis and other s/pacific n/oceans. In Shigematsu, S. & Camacho, K. (Eds.), *Militarized currents: Toward a decolonized future in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 15–31). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Teaiwa, T., & Slatter, C. (2013). Samting Nating: Pacific waves at the margins of feminist security studies. *International Studies Perspectives,* *14*(4), 447–450. http://repository.usp.ac.fj/id/eprint/9078.

Tupaz, R. (2015, November 6). NMI, Guam AGs to United: Improve flight services. *Saipan Tribune.* www.saipantribune.com/index.php/nmi-guam-ags-to-united-improve-flight-services/.

U.S. Marine Corps Forces Pacific. (2015). *Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands Joint Military Training.* Honolulu: Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific. www.cnmijointmilitarytrainingeis.com/documents.

Wall, S. (2006). An autoethnography on learning about autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* *5*(2), 146–160.

Wheatly, E., & Hartmann, E. (2013). Participatory action research. In Shepherd, L. (Ed.), *Critical approaches to security: An introduction to theories and methods* (pp. 146–157). Milton Park: Taylor & Francis.