Umespipiha i Fino' CHamoru Among non-fluent Young CHamorus on Guåhan:
Exploring language revitalization, ethnolinguistic identity, indigeneity and
CHamoru activism amongst non-fluent CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z

BY

EDWARD LEON GUERRERO

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
IN
MICRONESIAN STUDIES

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE
Dr. Donald H. Rubinstein, Chair
Dr. Mary Therese F. Cruz
Dr. Michael L. Bevacqua

University of Guam

May 2020

Abstract

CHamoru identity is shaped, negotiated, and contested by political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and historical forces, which has led to a weakened CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity and a language shift towards English. For CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z that lacks a strong ethnolinguistic identity, what the language means for their CHamoru identity is not entirely clear as there has not been a comprehensive study on their conceptualization of CHamoru identity. By analyzing how young CHamorus articulate their CHamoru identity in relation to the CHamoru language, we can understand the processes of CHamoru identity re-articulation and the political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and historical forces that guided and actively shape the boundaries of the ethnolinguistic identity among CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z, which may provide relevant information for CHamoru language advocates, policy-makers, and teachers.

A literature review on the construction of CHamoru identity, indigeneity, language revitalization as well as interviews with fourteen young CHamorus and analysis of CHamoru language usage on social media informs the thesis. The results map out the relationships among the concepts of language and identity to understand the processes of CHamoru identity re-articulation in relation to the language by laying out the various motivating and inhibiting variables that actively influence language learning. The thesis makes recommendations on how to move forward with CHamoru language revitalization.

Keywords: *chamoru language, identity, millennials, language revitalization, constructivism*

Dedication

To young CHamorus who have undertaken the language learning journey:

Your struggle is our struggle

To the *Kumision I Fino' CHamoru:*

Continue the national project

To CHamoru language advocates:

Do not give up

To open-access research:

Liberate academics from paywalls

Para i nana-hu biha Maria yan tata-hu bihu Eddie:

Saga gi Minahgong

Acknowledgment

"No man is an island entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent" wrote metaphysical poet John Donne. These lines now divorced from its original Christian context in popular culture, means that no one is truly self-sufficient. I take this to heart. Without the help of many amazing individual, this thesis would not have been possible.

I must first acknowledge my extraordinary thesis committee. My chair and advisor si Don Rubinstein, thank you for your mentoring, patience, and even more patience over the years; and ensuring that I finish the thesis. I like to especially acknowledge the pain you experienced during your impeccable proof-reading; You must have suffered as much as me! You certainly live up to your imposed nickname Rubin-god. Si Miget Bevacqua, dångkolo si Yu'os Ma'åse' para a'ayuda yu' duranten tiempon chinatsaga! Hu gof agradesi na umakuentosi ham gi fino' CHamoru kada umasodda' ham ya ti ma'å'ñao yu' kumuentosi hao sa gofli'i'on yan humitde hao. Lokkue hu sen agradesi hao sa achokka' ma'pos hao Unibetsedåt Guåhan, sigi ha' sumåga hao gi iyo-ku komitde. Si Mary Cruz, dångkolo si Yu'os Ma'åse' para i gineftao-mu, inayuda-mu, yan na'boboka yu' kada umali'e' ham! Hu gof agradesi na hågu iyo-ku profesot ya siña humalom yu' iyo-mu ofisina maseha ngai'an pues umakuentosi ham pot maseha håfa.

I am beyond grateful for my friends: i che'lu-hu si Nate, my confidant si Francine, Bran the Wheeler, David, Danny Phantom, Erriu my Palauan brother, King Romina, RTZ, Andrew iyo-ku CPR ga'chong, John, Andy, Jorial, Jose & machålek si Mikhael. Each one of you has made an impact in my life during the writing process in your own way. Malago' yu' nai rikonisa si Nate. Para si Nate, tåya sinangan siña eksplika taimanu gråtu yu' para i inatungo'-mami. Hågu umayuda yu' maseha ngai'an hu faisen. Achokka' gi tatalo' puenge, sigi ha umakuentosi ham ya suppote yu'. Tåya nai maleffa yu' todu chine'gue-mu pot guahu. Hagu i ga'chong-hu. Hågu i

4

atungo'-hu. Hågu i che'lu-hu. Saina Ma'åse'. Malago' yu' lokkue rikonisa si Brandon. Todu tiempo, gaige hao para guahu annai hu nesisita hao. Tåya nai maleffa yu' enao.

I would like to thank the Infusion Staff: Regina, Såbet, Justin, Janine, Keila, and Adrayana. You are all such wonderful people. Even though I know you were "just doing your job;" your smiles, kindness, relaxed conversations, panini sandwiches, and extra Kale smoothies, made all six of you unforgettable. To me, Infusion will never feel the same without seeing at least one of you. I also like to thank the Siesta and café Chino staff for their excellent service. I want to acknowledge Prairie for randomly helping me at café Chino. Even though we do not know each other, you decided to help me out of the genuine kindness of your heart. Words cannot express what that meant for me. Hågu kalan i anghet-hu duranten enao na puenge.

I give my deepest gratitude to my family. Thank you, Mom and Dad, for your unwavering support; I am beyond blessed to have such wonderful parents in my life. I am grateful to have the support of mañe'lu-hu si Danielle, si Harvey yan si Joseph yan i subrinu-hu siha na dos si Lucas yan si Ethan. Tan Goro, Tun Raymond, yan Tun Jerry, dångkolo si Yu'os Ma'åse' para fa'nåna'gue yu' put i lina'la' CHamoru. Para tihu Dabit yan tiha Annie, dångkolo si Yu'os Ma'åse' para i todu chine'gue-mu put guahu. Sen gråtu yu' para i gineftao-miyu, guinaiyan-miyu, yan muna'chålek yu' kada manali'e' ham. Hågu lokkue påri Tessie, si Yu'us Ma'åse' para i guinaiya-mu. I prima-hu Animosu, sen hu agradesi hao sa na'estotba yu' annai gaige hao guini, giya Guahan! Gefpa'go i aniti-mu. Para i otro familia sumåsaga gi iya Agana Springs yan California, hu guaiya todu hamyo! Para i nanå-hu biha, si Yu'os Ma'åse' para CHamoruyi yu' achokka' sesso lachi yu'. Sen ya-hu i kombetsasion-mami.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Table

List of Figures

Figures

Chapter 1. I Tinituhon: The beginning

If you were to ask my arrogant (still am) college-sophomore self in 2014 if I wanted to learn the CHamoru language, I would have responded "Hell no!" I then would have proudly explained my reasons: "CHamoru is useless in the modern age!" "It's a backwards language!" "Waste of my time!" Little did I know, five years later, I would find myself writing a graduate thesis on the CHamoru language, that I would be able to speak CHamoru with confidence, and I would end up creating CHamoru language lesson videos and uploading them to the video sharing platform, YouTube.[1] The radical shift in my views of the CHamoru language is part of the larger concept of CHamoru identity politics, re-articulations, and ethnic revival in the latter half of the twentieth century.

Guam is one of fifteen islands in the Mariana archipelago. The Marianas is located in the north-western Pacific region of Micronesia. The indigenous people of the Marianas are the CHamorus. The Marianas was the first island group in remote Oceania to be settled around 1500 B.C. (Carson, 2014) and the first to be formally colonized by the Europeans in the late 17th century. Despite the CHamorus living under changing colonial administrations for the past 350 years, the CHamorus survived and maintained a distinct identity through cultural adaption. In the case of their indigenous language, the CHamorus adapted hundreds of Spanish words and, to a lesser extent, German, Japanese, and English words into their language. Linguist Thomas Stolz (2003), comparing the core vocabulary between CHamoru and Spanish using both a slightly extended 200 word list with synonyms and a 100 word list with no synonyms, finds that 39% of words from the 200 word list and 20% of words from the 100 list word list are of Spanish origin. Although Stolz concluded that the amount of borrowed core vocabulary is nowhere near the

---

[1] My YouTube account name is PulanSpeaks; Please like, share, and subscribe for awesome content related to the Micronesian region!

amount to be considered a mixed language, the influence on the CHamoru language from colonial interaction cannot be understated.

During the first 250 years under colonial rule, the CHamoru were able to maintain the CHamoru language. While some have tried to invalidate the legitimacy of the CHamoru language by questioning the addition, incorporation, or borrowing of words from other languages, CHamorus have "CHamorucized" these foreign words through changing pronunciation and even shifting meaning to fit the CHamoru worldview. For example, the CHamoru word *alåhas* (jewelry) came from the Spanish word *alhaja* (jewelry), which ultimately came from the Arabic word حَاجَة (*ḥāja*, "necessary thing; valuable thing"). Despite CHamorus maintaining the CHamoru language through the Spanish colonial period, the CHamoru language began to experience a massive decline post-World War II. As of 2020, the state of the CHamoru language has only worsened. Currently, it is difficult to find fluent CHamoru speakers, especially among CHamoru Millennial[2] and Generation Z.[3]

As someone who values CHamoru language perpetuation, I am saddened by the lack of fluent CHamoru speakers among my peer groups. The personal realization that CHamoru language is an important unique aspect of CHamoru identity is what motivated me to begin this thesis. Another reason I chose to research CHamoru identity and language was to understand my CHamoru identity and subsequent radical shift in attitudes towards the language. To start out this thesis, I will lay out the key experiences that led to my current conceptualization of CHamoru identity and, it is my hope, that in doing so I can provide a clearer and more focused picture in regard to my positionality.

---

[2] Born between 1980 and 2000
[3] Born between 2000 and 2020

Espipia yu' gi sanhalom i fino' CHamoru: Finding Myself Within the CHamoru Language.

Like many CHamorus in my peer group, I was raised in the typical CHamoru household with typical CHamoru experiences. I grew up with family—both immediate and extended. Several times a month I would meet with extended family at my grandparents' house. My family dragged me to church, novenas, fiestas, rosaries, funerals and *gupot* (party). I *fannginge'*[4] the elders, gave sebetsa (beer) to my older uncles when asked, used paper plates to fan the flies away from the fiesta table, etc.

In regard to language, like most CHamorus in my generation, my childhood largely revolved around the English language. My exposure to CHamoru was limited to hearing it on the radio, from older CHamorus conversing with one another, and occasionally during mass or other church-related events. In many ways, my younger self was unable to realize that CHamoru and English were two separate languages. I never once noticed that my grandma was speaking a different language on the phone, or that I would occasionally use CHamoru vocabulary mixed in with English without realizing that it was from a different language; this lack of awareness applies to my entire childhood—and it is fairly safe to assume that this applies to some CHamorus from my peer group as well. While I was being raised to see myself as a CHamoru, it was not common for me to see the CHamoru language as being an essential part of my CHamoru identity. I identified as CHamoru, not because I felt that CHamoru language was an intimate component of my CHamoru identity, but because my identity was affirmed through my family. Another component of my identity that was strengthened by my family was the notion that, apart from being CHamoru, I am also an American.

---

[4] Fannginge' is the CHamoru word meaning to smell or sniff. It is often used to refer to the smelling of an elders raised hand as a sign of respect.

Like many people in my generation—Millennial or Generation Z depending on the definition—we grew up with some understanding of American exceptionalism. Elders and family members proudly proclaim how lucky CHamorus are to be a part of the most powerful and wealthy nation in the world. Every day in school, my classmates and I would raise our right hands to our heart to pledge our allegiance to the American flag and we would pledge our allegiance to the United States of America[5] without realizing that our homeland of Guam was not actually a part of *those* united states.

During the Second Gulf War,[6] I cheered whenever an image of a US missile would successfully find its target. My view of geopolitics was black and white—or more appropriately, red, white, and blue. In my head, America was the protagonist, and virtually everyone else was the bad guys. While my family certainly shaped my identity at this time, I attribute much of my childhood and adolescent identities to be largely shaped by my schooling. This is also the major distinguishing factor that I experienced from many other people my age—that I went to Harvest Christian Academy for my entire elementary to high school education.

Harvest is an ultra-conservative Christian fundamentalist school that would align on the right wing socially, economically, and politically. When I became more conscious of identities as I got older, Harvest was the institution that greatly shaped my understanding of CHamoru identity. In Harvest, I adopted the ideas that CHamoru people, culture, and the language were inauthentic amalgamations of Spanish, Filipino, Japanese, and American cultures, people, and languages. Being an impressionistic youth, I became convinced that CHamoru culture was

---

[5] United States of America, United States, US, USA, and America all refer to the state or government of the United States of America and are interchangeable. My different usages reflect ways to break the monotony.

[6] The Second Gulf War was the armed conflict between US led coalition forces and Iraqi regular and non-state irregular forces. The conflict began with the US led invasion of Iraq in 2003 and ended with the formal withdrawal of American troops in 2011. The Second Gulf War is characterized by the swift defeat of Iraqi conventional forces and toppling of Hussein's regime, followed by eight years of asymmetrical warfare between the US led occupying force and the insurgency.

backwards and fake. I was conditioned by the environment at Harvest to believe that America

was modern and the right way to progress in the twenty-first century. I viewed CHamoru cultural

activists and language advocates as holding Guam back from modernity. Subsequently, I

dismissed CHamoru identity altogether and began identifying primarily as an American.

Ironically, I would continue to enjoy living as a CHamoru while denouncing it. If I were asked

what it meant to be CHamoru during this time, I would only respond with negativity because I

believed no authentic CHamoru culture existed. Additionally, I actively tried to hide all the

characteristics of being CHamoru. When people would ask me if I knew the *Inifresi*,[7] I would

quickly respond "what is that?" It was not until I began my undergraduate career at the

University of Guam (UOG) where I would undergo another shift in my view of CHamoru

language and identity.

My time at UOG was instrumental in how I currently perceive CHamoru language and

identity. My views on CHamoru language and identity were radically shifted by the education I

received at UOG. Additionally, certain individuals I met at UOG also contributed to my

newfound perspectives on CHamoru identity. During my time at UOG, I experienced culture

shock for the first time—interestingly enough, it was culture shock for the CHamoru culture.

Suddenly, I was surrounded by people who did not hold the same hyper-conservative American

views that surrounded me at Harvest. I was also befriended (and sometimes confronted) by

people with nationalistic views towards the CHamoru language and culture. Observing faculty

passionately teaching about CHamoru culture and language was eye-opening. What was even

more shocking was to see people my age engage in activities and take classes to learn about

CHamoru history and language because I believed those were a waste of time. I found myself

---

[7] The Inifresi is a CHamoru pledge which calls for the protection of the island and culture. It is mandated by Public Law 21-34.

joining various clubs and organizations that involved the liberal arts, the humanities, and most importantly, the perpetuation of the CHamoru language. My experiences at UOG caused me to abandon my skewed view of CHamoru culture and language, and my belief in American exceptionalism.[8] Most importantly, I became an activist for CHamoru political and cultural rights and a language advocate. As a young CHamoru activist and language advocate, I now have a deep desire for my generation to become fluent in the CHamoru language. I want CHamorus from my generation to not only practice CHamoru culture, but to learn the language because I view the language as a distinct means of CHamoru cultural expression. More importantly, I do not view CHamoru language as an end, but rather, I view it as a means. CHamoru language is the vehicle through which CHamorus can explore their identity, and ultimately, develop a collective form of nationalism for the CHamoru people.

Thesis Statement

Political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural, and historical forces have a way of constructing and enforcing particular forms of CHamoru identities by demarcating and policing the boundaries and excluding others from CHamoru identification. The CHamoru language is one such boundary marker that is the focus of this thesis, which reveals how CHamorus negotiate, contest, and resist such forces. By understanding how young CHamorus articulate their CHamoru identity in relation to the CHamoru language, we can understand the processes of CHamoru identity re-articulation and the political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and historical forces that guided and actively shape the boundaries of contemporary CHamoru identity with an emphasis on the CHamoru language amongst the youth. A literature review on

---

[8] While I no longer hold the view of American exceptionalism—that America is unique among all other states, acts with moral fortitude, and destined by providence to be the leader of the international liberal order—I am in favor of maintaining the Western led liberal world order.

the construction of CHamoru identity, indigeneity, language revitalization as well as interviews with young CHamorus informs the thesis. The thesis maps out the relationships among the concepts of language and identity to understand the processes of CHamoru identity re-articulation in relation to the CHamoru language by laying out the various motivating and inhibiting variables that actively influence CHamoru language learning.

The title of this thesis includes the CHamoru word *"Umespipiha"* (searching for) a CHamorized Spanish loan word. The word is significant as it represents CHamoru continuity through the process of adapting customs, values, and ideas to fit within the CHamoru worldview. It also warrants the searching of the CHamoru language among non-fluent CHamorus. With the increasing ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity of contemporary Guam, and with it the minoritization of CHamorus in their homeland, rapid change of society from a subsistence agricultural-based society to a cash economy, globalization and neoliberal multiculturalism, what it means to be CHamoru is changing as it always has, even before colonialism. This thesis will look at how CHamorus are negotiating such changes, and what it means for the CHamoru language.

Research Questions

This thesis seeks to understand the ethnolinguistic identity of young non-fluent CHamorus, the processes of identity re-articulations, and the forces which constructed and actively shape CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity. The results will inform how to move forward with revitalizing the CHamoru language. The following questions guide the thesis.

1. What are the forces that construct and actively shape the ethnolinguistic identity of non-fluent CHamoru Millennial and Generation Z?

2. How are non-fluent CHamoru Millennial and Generation Z articulating their CHamoru identity in relation to language fluency and use?

3. How do CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z understand CHamoru identity?

4. What are the processes of how CHamoru Millennial and Generation Z re-articulate their identity in relation to CHamoru language use?

5. Are non-fluent CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z who emphasize language fluency in articulating their CHamoru identity more likely to learn and perpetuate the CHamoru language?

6. How do CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z use the CHamoru language on social media?

7. What is the relationship between indigeneity and CHamoru activism?

8. Why have efforts to revitalize the CHamoru language failed?

9. How should the CHamoru language revitalization project move forward in 2020?

Purpose

The main purpose of this thesis is to understand how young non-fluent CHamorus view the relationship between CHamoru language fluency and their CHamoru identity and the forces that construct it. I hope this will contribute to further understanding of CHamoru identity and how to move forward with the CHamoru language revitalization project. Another purpose is to sensitize CHamoru language advocates to the qualitative experiences of CHamoru youth. The issue of language fluency is contested within the CHamoru community. There are many CHamorus who claim speaking CHamoru is essential for identifying as CHamoru, and they disparage the non-speaking CHamoru youth as being "fake CHamorus who have lost their

culture." Speaking from personal experience and hearing similar stories from fellow young CHamorus, this attitude is counter-productive in perpetuating the language. It is my hope that this thesis will make older CHamorus understand that the issues surrounding CHamoru youth and their use of the CHamoru language are complex and must be navigated with sensitivity.

The thesis utilizes qualitative data from interviews with young non-fluent CHamorus and content analysis of CHamoru language use on social media. The interviews are analyzed thematically through deductive and inductive coding (see the methodology section for a more detailed description). A theoretical model emerged from the results.

What is Identity?

This thesis examines CHamoru identity. As such we need to understand how people conceptualize identity. Social science theories and popular attention to the concept of *identity* have burgeoned over the past fifty years, in part stemming from the writings of psychoanalyst Erik Erikson in the 1960s, who popularized questions concerning identity development (Edwards, 2012; Griffiths, 2015). Fueling this growing interest in how individuals perceive their place in society are the rapid social and political changes in the post-1960s world— decolonization, indigenous renaissance, national liberation movements, nation-building—which have fundamentally restructured societies. 'Identity,' as sociologist Richard Jenkins (2004) explains, has become a useful, albeit over-used concept:

> 'identity' became one of the unifying themes of social science during the 1990s, and shows no signs of going away. Everybody has something to say: anthropologists, geographers, historians, philosophers, political scientists, psychologists, sociologists...Identity, it seems, is bound up with everything from political asylum to credit card theft. And the talk is about change, too: about new identities, the return of old ones, the transformation of existing ones. (p. 8)

19

Arguably identity has become a buzzword in "many areas of cultural studies" with its "definitional nuances" and "ambiguity" (Edwards, 2012, p. 16).

With identity being used by many different academic disciplines, there are inevitably many different conceptualizations of identity. As Griffiths (2015) describes the wide-ranging and sometimes contradictory use of identity:

> The term [identity] is attributed to both individuals and groups, and can be used to refer to the religious, political, private, cultural, or ethnic realms. Identity is considered a source of both cohesion and violence, and can alternately represent sameness or difference, be an imposition or a choice, singular or fractured, and static or fluid. (para 1)

In *Beyond "identity"*, Brubaker & Cooper (2000) summarizes the many ways scholars use *identity*:

> Clearly, the term "identity" is made to do a great deal of work. It is used to highlight non-instrumental modes of action; to focus on self-understanding rather than self-interest; to designate sameness across persons or sameness over time; to capture allegedly core, foundational aspects of selfhood; to deny that such core, foundational aspects exist; to highlight the processual, interactive development of solidarity and collective self-understanding; and to stress the fragmented quality of the contemporary experience of "self," a self unstably patched together through shards of discourse and contingently "activated" in differing contexts. (p. 8)

As a social science concept, or as an explanatory construct for individual and group action, or as an unstable product of social and political forces, *identity* is the social scientists' multipurpose tool for handling various phenomena. Anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss makes an excellent characterization of identity, "a sort of virtual center (foyer virtuel) to which we must refer to explain certain things, but without it ever having a real existence." (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000, p. 9.).

With the diverse application of identity, what most scholars can agree on is that identity is constructed in and dependent on the social contexts. McGarry (2001) makes the claim that "no modern social scientist dissents from the view that identities are constructed and contingent" (p.

20

129). He then says it is the malleability of identity that is the real debate and "…not between those who think identities are manipulable and those who think they are permanent" (p. 129). This viewpoint reflects the wide social scientists' scholarly acceptance of the constructivist concept of identity. Social scientist Alan Bryman provides a widely accepted definition on constructivism:

> Constructionism is an ontological position (often also referred to as constructivism) that asserts that social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors. It implies that social phenomena and categories are not only produced through social interaction but that they are in a constant state of revision. In recent years, the term has also come to include the notion that researchers' own accounts of the social world are constructions. In other words, the researcher always presents a specific version of social reality, rather than one that can be regarded as definitive. Knowledge is viewed as indeterminate. (2012, p. 33)

Ontology is the study of being and is concerned with existence and reality. Ontologically, constructivism implies the view that social phenomena and meaning do not exist independently from humans. Humans create meaning and that meaning is always changing. For example, a constructivist would assert that there is no objective measure for rudeness. What might be considered rude in one culture or social situation would not be considered rude in another. Constructivists[9] view identity in non-essential terms as constructed, fluid, and subject to change. They generally view identity as the product of social and environmental forces.

In contrast to constructivism, objectivism maintains that social phenomena and meaning are independent from humans. Bryman explains:

> Objectivism is an ontological position that asserts that social phenomenon and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social actors. It implies that social phenomena and the categories that we use in everyday discourse have an existence that is independent or separate from actors. (2012, p. 33)

---

[9] Some people equate constructivism with the belief that no metaphysical truths exist, yet this is a misnomer. Although some radical constructivists certainly hold this view, the majority of constructivists reject this and argue that there are a variety of truths that exist in multiple domains, which are constructed and reinforced by power.

Objectivism informs the essentialist view of identity. Essentialists view identity as fixed, static, and objective that ontologically there is an external reality that exists independent from our conceptualizations. For example, an essentialist view of CHamoru identity would assert that what we observe as CHamoru identity reflects an independent ontological phenomenon that is CHamoru identity. They argue that there are essential characteristics that all CHamorus share that no other group have. Without these characteristics, the group loses the essence of being CHamoru, which can be interpreted as losing the CHamoru identity. Social scientists find essentialism problematic for identity because of its tendency to homogenize, bound, and overgeneralize.

In understanding CHamoru identity, this thesis will look at CHamoru identity from a constructivist viewpoint. It presupposes that CHamoru identity is a contested product of social forces, that there are no essential characteristics unique to CHamorus, and that CHamoru identity is contextual and heterogeneous in that there are several competing views on what it means to be CHamoru, which changes depending on the social context. Political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural, and historical forces have a way of constructing and enforcing particular forms of CHamoru identities over others by demarcating its boundaries, policing the boundaries, and excluding others from CHamoru identification. The CHamoru language is one such boundary marker that is the focus of this thesis, which reveals how CHamorus negotiate, contest, and resist such forces.

What is CHamoru identity?

There are probably as many definitions of CHamoru as there are CHamorus in the world. This is due to the nature of CHamoru identity as a social construct, at least from the constructivist stance that this thesis takes. Although CHamoru identity is constructed, fluid, and

subject to change like all other identities, it does not mean that parameters do not exist or that anyone can self-identify as CHamoru. The construction of these parameters is, without a doubt, influenced by colonial notions of identity. Chief amongst these is the concept of ethnicity, which became entangled in traditional Oceanic models of identity—or more specifically, how CHamorus traditionally made distinctions for identification (Linnekin & Poyer, 1990).

Ethnicity, like any other form of identity, is a complicated concept with numerous definitions. According to Makihara (2010), anthropologists use ethnicity in reference "to a cluster of features or practices that are attributed in some way to a collectivity or aggregation of people, and that is often the basis for socio-cultural organization" (as cited in Garcia, 2012, p. 80). Traditionally, ethnicity was understood from a position of primordialism, which is based on an essentialist outlook that ethnicity is fixed in nature and inherited. Most contemporary social scientists reject this view and consider ethnicity to be socially constructed like any other identity. From this view, ethnic identity can be negotiated, imposed, self-ascribed, transformed, wax and wane, created etc. Yet even today as in the past, ethnic identity is still commonly viewed in primordial terms.

Before the 16th century, Europeans were not as conscious of their ethnic identity, until nationalism brought ethnic consciousness to the people. For example, when Poland regained independence in 1918, there were several Polish peasants that reported to government representatives that they did not realize they were Polish until the government representatives told them they were Polish (Fishman, 1972). Nationalism also conflated ethnic identity and linguistic identity, making language the natural primary marker of ethnic identity (Garcia, 2012; Lytra, 2016). Nationalism encouraged the primordial view that peoples, language and territory were naturally linked, which was to form the basis of a nation; nationalists assert that each nation

had the right of self-determination to form their own independent state (Hannun, 1993; 1998). A national language thus become the goal of nationalists to demarcate their nation from other nations and from their foreign overlords. While it was commonplace that elites or aristocrat rulers spoke a different tongue than the commoners, it now became the nationalist goal to have both the commoners and the state rulers share the same language (Miller, 2003). This common primordialist view of ethnic identity viewed ethnicity as inherited and emphasized blood as the foundational aspect of identity.

This is in contrast with Oceanic cultural identities that privileges "environment, behavior, and situational flexibility over descent, innate characteristics, and unchanging boundaries" (Linnekin & Poyer, 1990, p. 6). Evidently, CHamoru identity was informed by Western theories of ethnicity. Whether this was imposed, utilized by CHamoru elites or a combination of both, it was used to combat perceived political and group marginalization. With the increasing number of immigrants to Guam and long-unresolved political status concerns, CHamorus have become more hypersensitive in terms of their identity, which sustains itself through perceived differences from others. Today, CHamorus are more aware of themselves as a distinct group on Guam as they now feel pressure to authenticate and distinguish themselves from other immigrants, especially those from other Micronesian islands including the Northern Marianas as they are perceived to be more authentic than the *mestizo* CHamorus. As Monnig says "immigration in general has had a tremendous influence on Chamorro identity politics. Chamorros are feeling the push to assert their authenticity at every level of the political spectrum" (p. 352). As a result, CHamorus, informed by Western theories of ethnicity, have transformed their indigenous cultural identities into an overarching ethnic identity for political purposes. This leads to various issues, especially the entanglement of American legalism in attempting to define CHamoru.

The defining of CHamoru and who qualifies as one is a heavily contested topic,

especially in the past two decades as the Government of Guam has made attempts to define

CHamoru for both political and legal purposes such as the CHamoru Land Trust and CHamoru

Registry. The CHamoru Registry defines CHamoru as:

> all inhabitants of the Island of Guam on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily
> absent from the island on that date and who were Spanish subjects [under Spanish
> control] who after that date continued to reside in Guam or other territory over which the
> United States exercises sovereignty and have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or
> acquire foreign nationality; all persons born in the island of Guam, who resided in Guam
> on April 11, 1899, including those temporarily absent from the island on that date who
> after that date continued to reside in Guam or other territory over which the United States
> exercises sovereignty and have taken no affirmative steps to preserve or acquire foreign
> nationality; [and their descendants]. (Public Law 23-130)

Notice how the above definition avoids any form of racial identification as a race-based

definition of CHamoru would be illegal under US federal law.[10] Another definition of

CHamoru— although really termed "Native Inhabitant"—in further attempts to navigate the

federal legal system is the Guam Decolonization Registry for Native Inhabitants on Guam Self-

Determination, which defined "Native Inhabitant" as "those persons who became U.S. citizens

by virtue of the authority and enactment of the 1950 Organic Act of Guam and descendents [sic]

of those persons" (Public Law 25-106). While these definitions of CHamoru attempt to avoid a

basis in race or ethnicity, the Guam census use of the label "CHamoru" is explicitly informed by

the primordial view of race and ethnicity.

In the demographic section of the Guam census, the option of "CHamoru" falls under two

categories: "One Ethnic Origin or Race" and "Two or More Ethnic Origins or Races." In the

latter category, there is the option "Chamorro and other groups." This categorical option of

identifying as part-CHamoru is informed by the ethnic concept of blood being the primarily form

---

[10] In 2015, The Davis v. Guam court case ruling struck down the political plebiscite election law as a violation of the
15th Amendment. The Court found the definition of native inhabitants to be a form of race-based discrimination, and
that ancestry is a proxy for race.

of identification. These codified definitions are problematic as they are politically motivated definitions that attempt to be legally acceptable in the eyes of U.S. law. The definitions do not consider how CHamorus understand themselves as CHamorus, or what CHamorus consider important for CHamoru in-group membership. Yet in my experience it seems to match how *some* CHamorus identify other CHamorus as CHamoru. Whenever I meet new people and they ask me what I am, I tell them I am CHamoru. Most of the time, they have a look of disbelief and will then ask if I am *full* CHamoru or *half* CHamoru due to my light skin color. They perceive that since I do not fit the stereotypical image of CHamoru, then I must be half. Several people whom I will not name deploy a biological model of ethnicity to imply that CHamoru activists such as Miget Bevacqua and Victoria-Lola Leon Guerrero are "half-castes" and not "real CHamorus."

Souder and Monnig are the only authors I have read who attempt to establish parameters for contemporary CHamoru identification. Presumably like most writers, they are wary of imposing a strict definition of CHamoru. Nevertheless, they do propose parameters. They both argue that the main parameter is being of CHamoru blood. Souder states unequivocally: "Being Chamorro is first and foremost being of Chamorro blood" (1985, p. 23), but she explains that being "of CHamoru blood" does not mean "racial purity", where the percentage of CHamoru blood indicates if one is CHamoru. Rather, it is through shared descent together with flexible CHamoru cultural practices and values that is CHamoru identity (Souder, 1985). In line with Souder, one of the CHamoru women recorded by Monnig offered a very useful guideline in conceptualizing the contemporary parameters of CHamoru identity. During a January 2000, public hearing on the CHamoru Registry, a CHamoru woman stated:

> A Chamorro is more than that [the definitions provided by GovGuam]. A Chamorro is a person who has a common lineage with an ancestor who was indigenous. It is not just residence that makes someone a Chamorro. (Monnig 2007, p. 199)

While some may critique Souder's and the unnamed CHamoru women's conceptualization of CHamoru as deriving from primordialism, it appears to reflect the reality of contemporary CHamoru identification. Contemporary CHamoru identity is entangled with the Western concept of ethnicity that privileges blood and descent over Oceanic identities of environment and social behavior, which makes CHamoru identity less flexible.

However, CHamorus did not entirely adopt western notions of identity. Monnig argues that CHamorus have navigated colonial racialization narratives by utilizing the m*estizo* CHamoru identity. The *mestizo* CHamoru identity recognizes that CHamorus are not "racially pure." It is used to circumvent US racial notions of identity, by establishing CHamoru continuity through family, culture, and shared memory of a CHamoru past rather than by blood alone. As Monnig remarked, "Chamorro-ness is about blood, AND it is about familia, which is embedded in forms of relatedness that are not limited to biology, in certain forms of reciprocity, in certain ways of networking within extended families, and the adherence to certain values in I Kustumbren Chamoru" (2008, p. 201). Clearly, CHamoru identity is more than only blood, but includes shared social behaviors and values. Probably no CHamoru, besides radicals, would claim that they are pure CHamoru in a Western racial sense, but they will identify as CHamoru despite having foreign ancestors somewhere in the family tree. The 2010 Guam census clearly shows this. According to the 2010 Guam Census, 9,717 people considered themselves as being "Chamorro and other groups". This is compared to the 59,381 people who self-identified as CHamoru for "One Ethnic Origin or Race". These responses are significant as it indicates that the majority of CHamorus do not view their mixed ancestry a few generations up in the family tree as an obstacle for identifying as CHamoru. However, there are still a substantial number of CHamorus who do not identify entirely in the legally encoded ethnic category of CHamoru. I

suspect this is probably due to them having at least one parent or grandparent who is a non-CHamoru. In other words, the more immediate the generational mixing, the more likely they may identify as "CHamoru plus other" in a census.

Close comparison can be made with the indigenous Hawaiians. Like the CHamorus, Hawaiians have transformed their indigenous cultural identities into an overarching ethnic identity for political purposes. Hawaiians agree that blood and social behavior are indicators of Hawaiian identity (Linnekin & Poyer, 1990). The main difference between Hawaiians and CHamoru is that for political purposes, Hawaiians were defined through blood quantum while CHamorus connected genealogy to a specific date.

There is a level of objectiveness as well as subjectiveness in group membership. This is one of the main features of CHamoru identity that I will interpret through the framework of ethnic identity: the objective vs. subjective indicators of group membership. Objective indicators of ethnicity include linguistic, racial, geographical, religious, and ancestral; this primordialist view is what distinguishes ethnicity from other forms of social identities such as with a sports team. From this perspective, ethnicity is inherited. However, a purely objective view of ethnicity falls short, as within many new generations these objective indicators will probably change as no people are frozen in time.

Ethnic identity requires more than just objective indicators, rather there is also the aspect of subjectivity. According to Max Weber:

> those human groups that entertain a subjective belief in their common descent . . . it does not matter whether or not an objective blood relationship exists. Ethnic membership . . . differs from the kinship group precisely by being a *presumed* identity. (as cited in Edwards, 2012, p. 159)

To Weber, it was the shared belief in a common descent that mattered, rather than there being an actual one. While ethnic identity could be defined both in objective and subjective terms, it

28

appears that ethnic identity represents a combination of objective and subjective elements.

Edwards (2012) provides a formal definition that takes all these factors into account:

> Ethnic identity is allegiance to a group – large or small, socially dominant or subordinate – with which one has ancestral links. There is no necessity for a continuation, over generations, of the same socialisation or cultural patterns, but some sense of a group boundary must persist. This can be sustained by shared objective characteristics (language, religion, etc.), or by more subjective contributions to a sense of 'groupness', or by some combination of both. Symbolic or subjective attachments must relate, at however distant a remove, to an observably real past. (p. 162)

I conceptualize CHamoru identity within this ethnic framework as it satisfies the holistic nature of CHamoru identity. This definition recognizes the fluidity of CHamoru identity in that cultural patterns can change as long as a sense of group boundary is maintained, thus avoiding essentialism. It is the sense of distinctiveness that is important and not the preservation of any specific cultural identity markers such as language, weaving, and religion. These wax and wane, change or even disappear entirely, but as long as there is some awareness of boundaries that are related to the past, then ethnic identities such as the CHamoru identity remain distinct. Furthermore, the definition recognizes that not just any individual can identify as a CHamoru and be accepted as part of the group, even if they share objective characteristics such as the language and religion. There must also exist a shared common descent, either real or believed, and the subjective element of group boundaries.

Contemporary young CHamorus are certainly different from their grandparents. They dress differently than them, eat different foods, live different lifestyles, and no longer speak CHamoru, yet these same young CHamorus identify as CHamoru, rather than Filipino or any other ethnic identity. Despite the traditional CHamoru ethnic boundary markers eroding, thus making the distinctions between young CHamorus and Filipinos born and raised on Guam very difficult to make, young CHamorus cling to their CHamoru identity. This indicates that what is

important for ethnic identity is that there is a subjective sense of distinctiveness between the ethnic groups. This is not to say that ethnic boundary markers such as language or way of dressing are useless, as these are important tangible markers that contribute to the sense of distinctiveness.

Language in particular is considered by renowned sociolinguist Fishman and his colleagues to be the most important marker and aspect of ethnic identity: "from an emphasis on culture, history, purported kinship, patrimony, and uniqueness it is but a short leap to language, the one behavior system that combines, expresses, and symbolizes all these ideas" (1999, p. 448). While there are multiple markers of ethnic identity, language, as Dorian argues, "is the only one that carries actual extensive cultural content" (1999, p. 31). While conceptually speaking, no particular marker, is *essential* for the maintenance and continuity of CHamoru identity, this does not mean that replacement of the CHamoru language with English has no effect on CHamoru culture. As Fishman puts it "The fact that this [ethnic languages can be entirely replaced for corresponding ethnic groups] can ultimately be done does not mean that it should be done or that the cultural significance or role of these acts or events will be identical under both sets of linguistic circumstances" (1994, p. 91). With this being said, I must make it clear, that CHamoru identity can continue to exist without the CHamoru language, although it is not necessarily desirable.

I am not advocating here for a "neutral" view in the language and culture debate, that there exists no relationship between language and culture; nor am I opposing the varying Whorfian views that language affects how the individual perceives reality (Scholz, Pelletier, & Pollum, 2016). While this is an important debate in the fields of linguistics, cognitive science, anthropology, and philosophy, it is outside the scope of the thesis. I use Edwards' framework on

ethnic identity as a conceptual tool for understanding CHamoru identity because I find it fits best with the reality of young contemporary CHamorus and the empirical evidence. The majority of young CHamorus no longer speak or understand CHamoru to any considerable degree, yet they still identify as CHamoru. They are utilizing other ethnic markers whether through display of ethnic CHamoru products or re-created arts to mark their CHamoruness. A few young CHamorus, such as myself, are even reviving and utilizing the traditional marker of language, as we are trying to reconnect CHamoru identity with the CHamoru language.

What is Language?

What is language? People may think this is a nonsensical question and point out that languages are what people speak. And that there are many languages in the world, unique to different peoples and distinct such as English and CHamoru. Throughout this thesis I have used the term "language" several times with this seemingly natural bounded concept in mind. Yet, what exactly do I mean by language and why does it naturally invoke particular peoples and groups? Today, linguists have identified around 6500 human languages, which they categorize on the bases of their genetic relationships, their origin from a common ancestral language; although different methodological approaches in language identification may yield up to 1500 more languages (Hammarström, 2016). Accordingly, language families share common features that distinguish them from other language families. This type of genetic relationship among languages can commonly be seen in the similarities of syntax and vocabulary. Yet, despite linguists' categorization through "objective indicators," language is as much a political construct as it is a linguistic one (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005). From this constructivist view, states construct languages for political purposes.

For much of human history, dialect continuums were the linguistic reality of the world; however, with the advent of nationalism and modern nation-states in the 19th century, standardized languages began to spread at the expense of non-standardized dialects. The creation of a standardized language is a political process whereas a particular dialect or combination of dialects receive political legitimacy and recognition by the state. It almost always involves the language being turned into the national language that is written, with a dictionary, standard grammatical rules, spelling, and syntax (Gellner, 2008; Hobsbawm, 2012). Thus, viewing languages as clearly defined standard categories derives from Western lines of thinking which many peoples around the world have adopted as a result of modern states being the foremost political unit, and ideologies of nationalism that promote modern states. Linguist Max Weinreich's humorous remark explains it the best, "A language is a dialect with an army and navy" (Mchombo, 2009, p. 793).

The CHamoru language comprises of several language variations or what some may call CHamoru dialects within Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands. The standardization and turning of CHamoru, primarily an oral language, for reading and writing is currently an ongoing process and a political one, which attempts to elevate CHamoru alongside English and build a CHamoru nation around their ethnic language. It has resulted in much controversy especially in regard to spelling: one notable example was determining the official spelling of "CHamoru" (Taitano, 2019).

Cultural Anxiety

CHamorus seem to be ridden with anxieties about their CHamoru identity and culture in a rapidly changing landscape, which is manifested in popular phrases such as "the culture is dying," "we must protect the culture" or "we are too American." This is a phenomenon not

unique to only CHamorus but one which all peoples deal with—both minorities and majorities in states all around the world (Grillo, 2003). People feel threatened that their traditions and values will become eroded by modernization, multiculturalism, assimilation, and immigration. In response, nationalism, xenophobia, anti-globalism, and conservatism spring up from peoples. However, cultural anxiety and protectionism is not necessarily always grounded in racism or far right politics but appears across the political ideological spectrum (Grillo, 2003).

Grillo's assertion seems applicable to most young CHamorus. Their concerns about the loss of language and culture, and desire to protect them, is not based on far-right ideologies. Rather, CHamoru concerns are rooted in cultural essentialism: aspects of culture are seen as essential components to a culture and identity. Without the perpetuation of these aspects in their idealized forms, people fear their culture would lose its essence, thereby lacking authenticity or turning into something else entirely. For various reasons, people are embracing these essentialist notions of culture and identity. People believe cultures have distinct boundaries that differentiate them from other people on the basis of culture. The rise of modern socio-political organizations through modern states, nationalism, and nation-building may be the largest contributing factor to the popularity of essentialism (Grillo, 2003; Lytra, 2016). States attempt to build a national culture from the people, often diverse, within its borders, which may cause conflict with ethnic minorities. People, influenced by nationalism, tend to mobilize by ethnic lines as they desire separate states for their own peoples.

CHamorus' commonsense view of culture is in essentialist views. The intense period of Americanization and its associated changes in the 1950s and 1960s and the self-awareness of their colonial history and influenced culture, were a source of great anxiety for CHamorus. In response, cultural protectionist rhetoric and legislature on Guam rose in the 1970s, which is

33

associated with the rise of indigeneity and interest in pre-colonial heritage. The Guam

Legislature passed the first laws, aimed to protect the unique CHamoru heritage of the Marianas

in the 1970s. The Guam Legislature made CHamoru an official language in 1973 and created the

CHamoru Land Trust in 1975. The Legislature also established CHamoru Week through Public

Law 12-71 passed in 1974, to promote the CHamoru heritage: "(b) Those days commencing on

the first Monday of March and ending eight (8) days later of each year are hereby designated

Chamorro Week, a week to examine and reflect upon Guam's beautiful but fast

DISAPPEARING [my emphasis added] culture" (Public Law 12-71). CHamorus were

increasingly concerned about immigration, articulated by CHamoru activist groups. In Guam's

first gubernatorial campaign in the 1970s, candidate Joaquin Camacho Arriola was, according to

Stade, "the first to publicly formulate an anti-immigration political agenda in Guam" (as cited by

Monnig, 2007, p. 104).

The Politics of Language Revitalization: Why Revitalize a Language?

Reviving or using the CHamoru language is not solely for the self-satisfaction of

CHamorus speaking CHamoru but includes a strong political dimension. The CHamoru language

revival went hand in hand with the political and indigenous CHamoru renaissance in the 1980s,

which centered around identity politics. The case study of the revitalization of the Cornish

language in the region of Cornwall, United Kingdom, illustrates the political nature of language

revitalization. In the 20th century, efforts were made to revitalize the Cornish language. Prior to

this, the Cornish language had effectively been a dead language since the mid-18th century, as

Cornish speakers were assimilated into the English language. The revival of the Cornish

language as well as the creation of Cornish literature and music, the adoption of Cornish

surnames, and the national self-identifying as exclusively Cornish etc., reflected the rise of ethnic

consciousness and identity politics amongst the Cornish people in the mid-20th century. The language along with those other ethnic identifiers were used by Cornish nationalists to justify and maintain their distinction as a people separate from the English (Hobsbawm, 1996).

Cornish identity politics have been largely successful. In 2002, the Cornish language was officially recognized by the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. Most significantly, in 2014 under the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, the United Kingdom officially recognized the Cornish people as a distinct Celtic minority in the same status as the Scots, Welsh and Irish (Milmo, 2014). Some Cornish nationalists took it a step further and used the Cornish ethnic revival to aspire for regional autonomy from England. Thus, the Cornish language revitalization reflects the broader ethnic emergence and identity politics to establish differences for political purposes. CHamoru language revitalization efforts is no different.

CHamorus have much to gain through reviving the CHamoru language and a lot to lose if these efforts are unsuccessful. CHamoru language revitalization is a way to mobilize CHamorus to achieve a sense of nationhood and maintain a distinct cultural identity within the organized unincorporated territory of Guam. This of course means different things to different CHamorus. Some CHamorus make it a goal to use the language to build a national identity amongst CHamorus for the explicit purpose of forming an independent state, exercising CHamoru self-determination, or maintaining CHamoru local control of political institutions on Guam. Arguably,[11] for the majority of CHamorus, language revitalization efforts are largely for the purpose of maintaining a distinct CHamoru cultural identity in the face of demographic changes,

---

[11] Anecdotally, I find this to be the most common case. The majority of CHamorus I have spoken to support CHamoru language revitalization because they naturally connect it to CHamoru identity maintenance. They do not necessarily support CHamoru political sovereignty. Analogous to how Hispanic-Americans promote the Spanish language for identity maintenance, but do not desire political autonomy for their Hispanic peoples.

processes of globalization, and colonialism, rather than mobilizing for some form of CHamoru external self-determination. As Weinreich noted, language loyalty does not always accompany strong feelings of nationalism (as cited by Riley, 1975). To be clear, the end goal of language revitalization is different from people to people and individual to individual, but the act itself is always to maintain a distinct form of a collective identity, and perhaps to fulfill some political end.

Even within the CHamoru language revitalization movement there are political disagreements. For example, the idea that the language should be "purified" by purging non-indigenous words is a political effort. My grandparents used CHamoru words derived from Spanish, without making any value judgement that words of foreign origin were somehow not truly CHamoru. Language purists attempt to purge the CHamoru language of foreign loanwords in an attempt to reconstruct a more authentic CHamoru language, in opposition to the colonial influenced contemporary CHamoru identity, and as a way of protecting what in their eyes is the ideal CHamoru language. Such language purism is strategic essentialism at play.

Discourses of CHamoru Language Revitalization

To gain support for language revitalization among CHamorus and non-CHamorus, language advocates connect language revitalization to indigeneity, rectificatory justice and protecting biodiversity (Duchêne & Heller, 2007; Muehlmann, 2007; Patrick, 2007). By tying language revitalization to these three often overlapping concepts, it allows CHamorus to outmaneuver other ethnic groups and efforts at multiculturalism, in order to promote the CHamoru language over other ethnic languages, which helps to maintain CHamoru cultural and political power on Guam. Language revitalization arguments based on indigeneity allow CHamorus to argue that by virtue of being indigenous to the Marianas, CHamorus have special

rights that other ethnic groups do not have on Guam. It taps into the international discourse of indigenous rights and appeals to human rights to make a moralistic argument (Patrick, 2007). Therefore, the Government of Guam, which is also in CHamoru hands, can establish policies and programs to promote the CHamoru language.

Rectificatory justice is another concept invoked in CHamoru language revitalization discourse. Rectificatory justice is concerned with righting injustice (Roberts, 2011). From this perspective, CHamoru language revitalization addresses the historical wrong of colonialism towards the development of the CHamoru peoples and specifically, the historic suppression of the CHamoru language (Patrick, 2007). The last concept that CHamoru language advocates invoke is to understand CHamoru language revitalization in the paradigm of biodiversity. Since the end of the 20st century, endangered language advocates have applied the concept of biodiversity to languages (Muehlmann, 2007). Biodiversity theory, which originated from study of biology, holds that diversity in biology is good for the environment. The threat of globalization to environmental biodiversity is extended to language to make the argument that the same processes that threaten the biodiversity of the environment, threaten the linguistic diversity of the world's cultures. As such, the same biocultural rhetoric is used for language endangerment, in that the loss of a language, no matter the type or number of speakers, is a loss to world culture. This justification is not necessarily based on rectificatory justice for the CHamorus, but rests on an abstract general connection of language, culture, and biodiversity. Some people even contend that each language represents a unique world view and that the loss of a single language means the loss of some unique knowledge (Muehlmann, 2007).

These concepts together with language revitalization politics often represent CHamoru culture in essentialized terms. While essentialism is rejected by social scientists, essentialist

rhetoric can be used strategically for achieving desired political ends. By tapping into people's commonsensical understanding of culture and identity, CHamorus and non-CHamorus are more likely to support CHamoru language revival and other cultural revitalization efforts. From this perspective, common essentialist phrases such as "the culture is dying," "we must protect our culture," "we cannot lose our traditional knowledge," are useful slogans to mobilize people to push for CHamoru language revitalization. It is much easier for non-CHamorus to accept that there are mandatory CHamoru language classes in the public school because CHamoru is the indigenous language of Guam and therefore the language must be protected, than saying that the purpose is to maintain the current CHamoru cultural and political order on Guam, affirm the indigenous distinction between CHamorus and non-CHamorus or even to promote CHamoru nationalism for CHamoru self-determination. Revitalizing the CHamoru language is not solely for the sake of saving a "unique" language from extinction, but for perpetuating a particular form of a collective CHamoru identity.

Reviving the CHamoru Language

Discussions of the decline of CHamoru culture inevitably leads to the topic of the decline of the CHamoru language. CHamorus intuitively know that the language is declining. In response to the decreasing number of speakers, there have been efforts by both private and public entities towards language revitalization. The Government of Guam since the 1970s, mandated teaching of the language in the school system. The requirement of CHamoru language teaching in the public schools is inherently linked to a CHamoru cultural and identity political agenda. In 1973, the Guam Legislature passed Public Law 12-31, which authorized the Board of Education to "initiate and develop a bilingual-bicultural education program emphasizing the language and culture of the Chamorro people" (Public Law 12-31). It would be the first time the Legislature

formally acknowledged in public law that the public schools lacked CHamoru language curriculum:

> The Legislature finds and declares the following:
>
> (1) Traditionally basic language differences in Guamanian schools have been overlooked to the extent that there exists a need for an education program to revive and maintain the language and culture of the people of the Marianas.
>
> (4) There is a definite need for students to learn and preserve that which is unique, beautiful and viable within the Chamorro culture, while at the same time acquiring those attitudes and skills which are necessary for successful competition in mainstream of American life.

The law argued that a bicultural education program was needed to preserve the culture. The funding source would come from a federal grant. The next year, the Guam Legislature passed Public Law 12-132, which made CHamoru an official language. In 1977, Public Law 14-53 mandated teaching CHamoru language and culture in the elementary schools, and as electives for middle and high school, to be implemented by 1980. In 1979, Public Law 15-9 amended the law to provide an extension of time for the implementation of CHamoru language and cultural programs in the elementary schools to 1984. In 1991, Public Law 21-34 mandated CHamoru language classes and the completion of one year of Guam history to be included in the middle and high school level. It required that there be three levels of CHamoru language classes: Beginner CHamoru, Intermediate CHamoru, and Advanced CHamoru. The law mandated a total of six years of CHamoru language coursework in the elementary level, one year in middle school, and another year in high school. The law also mandated that students complete at least one year of Guam history prior to graduation from high school. The Legislature justified the law through a preservation argument: "[The Legislature] finds that it is necessary for the people of Guam to preserve, protect and promote the survival of the culture and heritage of the Chamorro people in Guam." In 2002, Public Law 26-150, mandated a separate CHamoru language

department. In 2011, Public Law 31-45, mandated CHamoru language classes every year in middle school, and an additional year in high school.

Non-governmental efforts include individuals and nonprofits making language learning material available through DVDs, websites, social media and classes. My own efforts provide one example: I started PulanSpeaks in 2017, a CHamoru-based YouTube channel dedicated to providing free language video lessons available on the Internet platform. Another leading language advocate, Dr. Miget Bevacqua, who is a member of my thesis committee, often hosts free CHamoru language classes every Saturday at a coffee shop. Anyone is allowed to attend, and the language lessons are tailored to the group's need.

The nonprofit Duk Duk Goose, Inc. is a media company founded in 2013, which created the first locally produced children's television show in 2014 named *Nihi!. Nihi!,* utilizes local talent, the CHamoru language, skits, and song to instill traditional knowledge and values in children; and to connect them to the land and culture. Duk Duk Goose, Inc. also offers a subscription-based service for a CHamoru comic-style story called ANITI, which is written in the CHamoru language. Finally, Duk Duk Goose, Inc. offers intermediate language classes.

Perhaps the most significant venture is Hurao Academy, a non-profit organization established in 2005, which was funded by the Administration for Native Americans (Rechebei & Chung, 2018). Hurao Academy advertises itself as the first full language immersion program and offers children an after-school program and summer camp that feature CHamoru language, history, and culture. Parent classes are included with their child's admission to either of the two programs. In 2019, Hurao Academy in collaboration with the Guam Department of Education (GDOE) created a pilot language immersion program for elementary school students. It consists of two kindergarten classes that teach social studies, language arts, mathematics, and science

through CHamoru-only classes at P.C. Lujan Elementary School. They hope to expand the

immersion program. One public official invoked cultural protectionism as a justification for the

program; as Senator Tina Muna-Barnes said, "this is the only way so we can protect our island

identity, who we are as CHamorus" (Limtiaco, 2019). She was invoking the special connection

that CHamorus have as indigenous people to the land and language. In 2019, a language nesting

plan was unveiled, which called for the creation of a CHamoru language center, a safe place

where second language learners can utilize CHamoru resources without fear.

The Origins of the Word CHamoru

People often use the word CHamoru[12] without thought to its history or to its suggestion

of a single ethnic group. The term CHamoru is primarily used in reference to the indigenous

people[13] of the Marianas. Before colonization, the term CHamoru had likely never been used in

reference to the indigenous people of the Marianas. The word originated with the arrival of the

Spanish. The first documented use of the word "Chamurres" was by the Legazpi expedition

(Taitano, 2020). There are several theories to the origins of the word CHamoru. One theory is

that it is derived from the indigenous word Chamori, which was the name of the high caste of

CHamorus. Another theory suggests that CHamoru is from the Spanish word Chamorro which

can be translated as "bald" or "shorn". This was from the observation of the hairstyle of

CHamoru men, whose heads were shaved leaving only a topknot (Taitano, 2020). While people

continue to debate the origin of the term CHamoru, what is generally accepted is that over time

---

[12] Unless otherwise stated, my spelling of the word "CHamoru" is interchangeable with the other spellings "Chamorro" and "Chamoru." My use of the spelling "CHamoru" reflects my preference of conforming to the "official" spelling of "CHamoru" by the *I Kumision I fino' CHamoru* (The CHamoru Language Commission).
[13] Another group of people, the Carolinians, are also considered as indigenous peoples only in the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). However, on Guam, only CHamorus are considered the indigenous people.

the term CHamoru was collectively adopted by the indigenous peoples of the Marianas reflecting the emergence of an ethnic and national consciousness.

Construction of CHamoru Identity

Aspects of CHamoru identity have been examined or touched upon by numerous writers. Most conceptualize identity—and CHamoru identity in particular—as constructed, fluid and subject to change (Bevacqua, 2010; Camacho, 2011; Cruz, 2012; Diaz, 2010; Diego, 2010; Flores, 1999; Monnig, 2007; Perez, 1997; Santos-Bamba, 2013; Souder, 1985; Underwood, 1987). These writers emphasize that contemporary CHamoru identity is the culmination of 3000-3500 years of experience, including the last 350 years of colonialism. Many of the issues that CHamorus face today cannot be properly analyzed until contextualized within their 3500-year history. This section provides a brief history of the key experiences and political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural, and historical forces that led to the construction of contemporary CHamoru identity.

The Pre-Contact CHamorus

Prior to colonization, CHamorus probably did not collectively identify themselves under one group in modern ethnic terms. While cultural unity was observed by the Europeans, CHamoru group identification was probably limited to family, clan, village, and island. The singular, modern CHamoru identity that is salient to CHamorus today, was the result of historical processes since Spanish colonization. Nevertheless, it is important to discuss the pre-contact inhabitants for the following reasons. CHamorus today claim common descent to the first inhabitants in the Marianas. They invoke their connection to these early inhabitants whenever

they speak of the *saina', mañaina, guello,* and *guella.*[14] Many of the contemporary CHamoru

beliefs and values are rooted in claims of pre-contact origins. The "pre-contact era" is commonly

thought of by CHamorus today in essentialist terms (Hunter-Anderson, 2011). This period is

used in racialized discourses to inauthenticate contemporary CHamorus as the indigenous people

of the Marianas, and thus undeserving of indigenous rights (Monnig, 2007). Discussing the pre-

contact CHamorus serves four purposes: It makes the reader understand the people to whom

CHamorus connect their historical continuity. It serves to show that pre-contact CHamorus are

dynamic rather than ahistorical. It sets the stage, to contrast how much colonialism has

influenced CHamoru identity. Lastly, it makes the reader understand the contemporary era in its

historical context, which is often politicized by both indigenous and non-indigenous people on

Guam.

The Settling of the Marianas

The Mariana Islands were the first islands settled by humans in Remote Oceania,

sometime around 1500 BC (Carson, 2014). With the nearest inhabited land mass more than

2,000 km away, the Marianas settlement would be the world's most isolated community and

would have required, at the time, the longest ocean crossing voyage in the world. The earliest

Mariana Islanders and their culture did not just spontaneously originate in the Marianas. The first

settlers had skills in pottery, craftsmanship, food preservation and seafaring navigation.

Archaeological and linguistic evidence suggest that the earliest settlers came from the

Philippines (Carson, 2014). These first settlers are part of the greater Austronesian expansion in

the Pacific.

---

[14] CHamorus often use these terms to refer to the ancestors. Although in different contexts the terms can refer to
parents or grandparents. Saina is often used to refer to the Lord in CHamoru Catholic prayers.

The earliest settlers lived in an environment different from today. The sea level was 1.8 m. higher than today, which affected the shoreline, water table, and nearshore ecology (Carson, 2017). The broad sandy beaches and coastal plains, found all over the island today, did not exist in this higher era of sea level. Rather, the coasts were scattered with beach fringes and sandy unstable terrain. The earliest inhabitants settled on the larger southern Mariana Islands, on locations where coral reefs, mangroves, and terrestrial resources all could be accessed (Carson, 2014). Their communities were small and distantly located from each other. Environmental pressures would force the inhabitants to change as the sea levels decreased, reaching today's level around 1000 BC.

The environmental changes impacted the inhabitants which is reflected in the material culture. The archaeological record indicates that these early CHamorus adapted to the changing environment caused by the lowering sea levels. People abandoned the oldest residential sites and began to live in the new coastal landforms that emerged above the lowering sea level and harvested different sea resources in the changing nearshore habitat and made different types of pottery (Carson, 2017). Not much else is really known due to the limited number of early Marianas archaeological sites that have been studied. In fact, this period, known as the pre-latte period from 1500 BC to AD 900, involves less than 10% of all Marianas archaeology (Carson, 2012). The vast majority of Marianas archaeology involves the next significant period for the CHamorus, the latte era from 900 to AD 1700 (Carson, 2012). The classification is based on the emergence of the latte around 900-1000 AD and ends with the conquest of the Marianas by the Spanish.

Latte Period

The latte period, particularly the end phase, is considered in today's popular imagination as the representation of the entire pre-contact CHamorus. This is probably due to the widely available data—archaeology, European accounts, Freycinet expedition—relative to the pre-latte to early latte period and the common essentialist view of culture—this is elaborated in a later section. The archaeological data indicate that CHamorus experienced significant changes during this period. These changes include settlement patterns, agriculture, crafts and arts, colonization of the other Northern Mariana Islands, architecture, and increased social complexity (Carson, 2012; Russell, 1998). Common material culture features that are associated with the latte period and are not found in the pre-latte era include the latte[15], slingstones, agricultural tools, and certain types of pottery. Not only is the material culture from this period well documented in this period, but there also is documentation by Europeans on CHamoru social organization, cultural practices, beliefs, and values, beginning in the 16th century.

CHamoru social organization is usually described as containing three classes: The noble class (matua),[16] a demi-noble class (atchoat) and a low class (mangatchang) (Cunningham, 1992; Russell, 1998). Life was stratified between the low class and the other two upper classes. The low-class people were restricted from certain activities that only were practiced by the upper class. For example, the low class were not allowed to fish in the ocean. They were required to show respect and kneel when speaking to a higher-class person, and they lived inland. The Europeans described them as being browner and smaller compared to the upper class

---

[15] Latte stones generally are conceived as comprising of two elements: stone pillars known as *haligi* and capitals known as *tåsa,* the iconic cup shape stone on top of the *haligi.* It is important to note that Latte stones do not occur in isolation, but rather are always arranged in paired rows to form what is known as a "Latte set." The primary function of the latte is to support house structures, although the specific latte house functions probably varied as residential, communal, storage, ceremonial, or otherwise. Today, the latte serves as an important symbol of CHamoru identity.
[16] Note the three CHamoru spellings of the equivalent classes are based on Cunningham and not the current CHamoru orthography.

(Cunningham, 1992). While this has been the traditional view, propagated by the institutionalization of Cunningham's *Ancient Chamorro Society* book by Guam's Department of Education, recent scholarship disputes the traditional view of CHamoru social classes (Peterson, 2012).

Anthropologist John Peterson (2012) argues that CHamoru social organization was more egalitarian than stratified, similar to matrilineal clan-based social organizations found across Micronesia. From this matrilineal clan-based perspective, CHamorus organized themselves into villages with chiefs being the source of diffused authority. Tracing kinship and land was done matrilineally, and women were heads of the household. Europeans may have misinterpreted the dynamic nature of CHamoru social organization into the confines of rigid "classes" because they interpreted CHamoru society within the paradigm of their own social organizations, when European social organizations were generally rigid and hierarchal. Furthermore, Peterson (2012) argues that the *mangga'chong* class was not even a low class, but according to Underwood's translation, the term *mangga'chong* is more akin to outcasts. The other aspects of latte era CHamoru culture are less contested. This is not intended to be a detailed description of CHamoru culture, but to give a brief description in order to argue that CHamorus were a distinct people who had their own shared beliefs prior to colonialism.

Central to CHamoru culture was *inafa'maolek* or "interdependence" (Cunningham, 1992). Cunningham argues that everything in the CHamoru lifestyle, from religion to social rank, revolved around *inafa'maolek*. Other identifiable values included *chenchule* (reciprocity), *mamåhlao* (shame), and *respetu* (respect). The CHamorus' worldview was that humans and nature were interdependent. Humans are not distinct from nature, but rather are part of nature. Cunningham finds also that CHamorus were animistic; they believed that spirits inhabited the

natural world. CHamorus venerated their ancestors and kept the skulls of their deceased relatives (Cunningham, 1992).

It may be impossible to know how these beliefs and values originated and evolved or the full extent of the material cultural development during the 3,000 years of pre-contact history. What is certain is that CHamorus changed from living subsistence lifestyles in small communities to organizing themselves in complex social systems and building megalithic structures during this period. They had their own dynamic beliefs and values distinct from Europeans. By the time Europeans arrived, the CHamorus would number somewhere in the tens of thousands throughout the Mariana Islands (Farrell, 2011). These people were not frozen in time but changed and adapted to the physical environment. The arrival of the Europeans would be another variable to which the CHamorus needed to adapt.

A Note about European Accounts: Did the Noble Savage Exist?

The start of European contact with the CHamorus would mark a significant change in CHamoru identity. The early European accounts made categorical distinctions between themselves and the various islanders. In addition to viewing CHamoru society within their own societal paradigm, the Europeans perceived the islanders within the concept of the *noble savage*. Cognitive psychologist and linguist Steven Pinker explains, "The concept of the noble savage was inspired by European colonists' discovery of indigenous peoples in the Americas, Africa, and (later) Oceania. It captures the belief that humans in their natural state are selfless, peaceable, and untroubled, and that blights such as greed, anxiety, and violence are the products of civilization" (2003, p. 3). This concept is commonly attributed to French philosopher Jean-Jacque Rousseau, although the noble savage idea is much older.

The Europeans described the CHamoru within the paradigm of the noble savage. Ferdinand Magellan's chronicler, Antonia Pigafetta, wrote one of the earliest accounts of the people of the Marianas in 1521. He remarked that "those people live in freedom, for they have no lord or superior,…" (as cited in Monnig, 2007, p. 61). Father Charles Le Gobien described that the CHamorus live in "absolute freedom and independence" (as cited in Monnig, 2007, p. 61). Father San Vitores thought "Chamorro were free, untamed pagans like innocent children, living in an unenlightened state of nature" (as cited in Monnig, 2007, p. 71). The Europeans were pre-disposed to make such assessments because they had the concept of the noble savage in mind even before observing the people. With this in mind, they saw what they wanted to see in the CHamorus.

Later, historians and colonialists influenced by racial ideology would use these deeply flawed early accounts of CHamorus as "noble savages" to promote the death of the CHamoru, to justify colonialism, and deny CHamoru indigenous rights. However, recent scholarship indicates that the noble savage concept may be a myth in itself. Ter Ellingson (2001) argues that the concept of the noble savage was misattributed to Rousseau, and instead emerged in the mid-19th century, thanks to anthropologist John Crawfurd, to be used as a political tool. The noble savage concept eventually became popularized and took on a life of its own. It may very well be the case, that the early Europeans did not have the concept of the noble savage in mind when writing their romanticized accounts. However, it may still be true that later historians and colonialists interpreted these early European accounts along with their own accounts of CHamorus within the noble savage paradigm which fell in line with the commonly held beliefs in the 19th and 20th century, social Darwinism and racist beliefs.

Spanish Conquest

During the roughly 150 years after Magellan stumbled upon the Marianas in 1521, CHamoru experiences with Europeans were limited mainly to galleons looking to resupply and people who were shipwrecked (Russell, 1998). However, the Marianas would experience a larger permanent presence in 1668, when the Jesuit priest San Vitores established the first Spanish permanent settlement on Guam. He had the goal to missionize all the CHamorus. While many CHamorus initially accepted Christianity, many others soon resisted the Spanish and Christianity because their rules conflicted with the CHamoru way of life. Among these were ancestral veneration and the *guma' uritao*, which the missionaries forced them to stop. A major changing point was when San Vitores was killed by a CHamoru named Mata'pang in 1672 for baptizing his infant daughter without consent. His death brought the Spanish in full conflict with the CHamorus. This period is referred to as the CHamoru-Spanish War, although this is a misnomer, as the CHamorus did not present a united front (Diaz, 2010). Several hundred Christian CHamorus sided with the Spanish and without their contribution, the Spanish probably would not have achieved total victory.

In an effort to control the CHamorus among the islands, the Spanish introduced the *reduccion* (forced relocation). The *reduccion* dramatically changed the people's way of life. It was the Spanish policy that physically aggregated the indigenous peoples from all the Mariana Islands into six *barrios* (communities) on Guam (Russell, 1998). Non-compliance was met with force. The CHamorus would be torn away from their lineage lands and would be forced to live in densely packed villages. The diseases brought by the Spanish proved particularly deadly, causing the majority of CHamoru deaths, especially since CHamorus were forced to live in densely packed communities. When the Spanish arrived in 1668, the total CHamoru population was

estimated to be about 30,000 in the Marianas. 32 years later, the population was 4,500 (Farrell, 2011). By the end of the 17th century, the Marianas was successfully conquered by the Spanish, beginning a new period for the CHamoru people, thus ending the era of the "authentic" CHamoru.

Hispanicization

From the start of the 18th century until 1898, CHamorus would dramatically change under Spanish rule. CHamorus became Catholic, incorporated thousands of Spanish words into their language, lost generational cultural practices—*guma' uritao*, seafaring navigation, ancestral veneration—and incorporated Hispanic customs, dress and dance. Another major change for the CHamorus was the displacement of the matrilineal system in favor of the patrilineal system. The Spanish introduced private land ownership and first-born male inheritance, which conflicted with previous CHamoru ideas of communal land ownership through matrilineal lineage (Rogers, 1995). Throughout this period, intermarriage between CHamoru women and Spaniards were common, resulting in a *mestizo* class. The *mestizos* were able to gain privileged positions by virtue of their European blood (Monnig, 2007). Other peoples intermarried with CHamorus as well. The Spanish frequently relocated Filipinos and *mestizos* from all parts of the Empire to Guam and many integrated within CHamoru society. Their descendants were later self-identifying themselves as CHamoru. This is evident in the census.

Initially, the Spanish classified the inhabitants in *castas* (race). In 1727 the population was reported to be around 2,780 (Driver & Brunal-Perry, 1996). The Marianos which represented the indigenous population, were the majority at about 2,279. The next largest group was the Spanish, numbered 301. Filipinos were the third highest at 186, with about 6 *mestizos* recorded. In 1787 the population nearly doubled to 5,349. The census indicates that the

indigenous population dropped to 1641, while the non-native populations rose significantly. Spaniards and *mestizos* numbered 908. Filipinos and *mestizos* numbered 643. However, it is unclear whether the *mestizo* and Spaniards or Filipinos categories included at least one CHamoru parent or were they newly arrived *mestizos* from the other Spanish colonies. The 1884 census made no distinctions based on mixed blood. The only two categories were Europeans and Indigenous. Indigenous is further broken down into CHamorus, Carolinians and Chinese (Driver & Brunal-Perry, 1996). The later census in 1899 indicated that most of Guam's inhabitants were classified under "Chamorro." While some non-CHamorus may have left the island, it appears that many people from the other categories began to identify as CHamoru. Through assimilation into the CHamoru culture, the *mestizo* classes were counted as CHamoru. The role of the women likely played a large role in the cultural assimilation process (Souder, 1992). Indigenous women married non-indigenous men and the women transferred the beliefs and values towards their children. There may have been an economic incentive as well. Many Filipinos and mestizos started identifying as CHamoru due to favorable tax breaks for the indios[17] in the mid-1800s (Monnig, 2007). Another factor for the mass identification as CHamoru is the emerging CHamoru consciousness encouraged by the *mannakhilo'* (CHamoru upper class) who were influenced by Western ideas of liberalism, nationalism and Filipino nationalists who were brought to Guam as prisoners by the Spanish (Underwood, 2017).

One lasting influence the Spanish would have on the CHamorus was the entanglement of Western ways of understanding identity:

> Spanish colonizing and racializing discourses and practices instituted some new trends of configuring difference - something alien to Chamorro/Pacific understandings of difference. In other words, Chamorros began negotiating some discursive movements which reflected Spanish racial codes: whiteness over darkness, European over

---

[17] A Spanish term referring to the native inhabitants in their colonial empire.

Indigenous, high class over low class, city over jungle, *mestizo* over *Chamoru*. (Monnig, 2007, p. 67)

These Western ways of creating distinctions contrasts with general Oceanic models. Anthropologists Linnekin and Poyer propose that Oceanic identities generally privileged "environment, behavior, and situational flexibility over descent, innate characteristics, and unchanging boundaries" (1990, p. 6). Pre-contact CHamoru society—matrilineal clan-based organizations—probably was more in line with conventional Oceanic models of identity. Due to colonialism, many Western ideas of creating differences in identity became entangled with CHamoru identity, many of which persist today such as the privileging of light skin over dark skin.

Despite the two centuries of "Hispanicization" of the CHamorus, the CHamorus maintained a distinct identity and did not consider themselves Hispanic or some type of hybrid group. Unfortunately, it is the colonizers who have historically defined the indigenous. Colonizers and scholars influenced by racial ideology would contrast the "impure" Hispanized CHamoru with the "pure" pre-contact CHamorus and consider the contemporary CHamorus as "inauthentic" and the "authentic" CHamorus to be dead. CHamorus would not begin to define themselves in the historical and political narratives until the latter half of the twentieth century.

The Inauthenticity of the CHamoru

To understand the argument about CHamoru inauthenticity and how the colonizer viewed the CHamoru people, and how arguments of authenticity are used today, the concepts of authenticity and the key tenet of racial ideology are briefly discussed. The concept of authenticity, similar to the concept of identity is complicated and contested, with a variety of meaning and analytical properties. The commonsensical understanding of authenticity is

informed by objectivism or realism, which understands authenticity "as an inherent quality of some object, person or process" (Vannini & Williams, p. 2009, p. 2). From this viewpoint, authenticity is a static property that cannot be changed. Alternatively, constructivists see authenticity as "socially constructed that shifts across space and time" (Vannini & Williams, 2009, p. 2-3). This view informs modern social science as well as my own understanding of authenticity that I employ in this thesis. Beyond social constructivism, according to Van Leeuwen, authenticity is "ultimately an evaluative concept, however methodical and value-free many of the methods for establishing it may be" (As cited by Vannini & Williams, 2009, p. 3). Authenticity is viewed as an ideal that peoples strive for in the process of change. It refers to culturally agreed upon ideas as to what is considered the ideal. However, as culture changes, then so do the ideas that make up the authentic change as well, making authenticity as Peterson puts it a "moving target" (as cited by Vannini & Williams, 2009, p. 3). Authenticity can be used strategically to privilege a particular quality or view and impose social control. This strategic authenticity was used in racial discourses by the colonial officials to inauthenticate CHamorus and justify colonialism.

The key tenet of racial ideology that must be understood is the idea that the group identity and behavior of a people is largely a product of their biology (Cravens, 2010). These biological differences can be separated into distinct groups, which are known as races. The key point to understand is that race was deemed to determine group identity and individual qualities. Race and group identity were seen as one. Since race determined group identity, it is believed that racial mixture is bad because it dilutes the essence of group identity, thus making the group inauthentic. Therefore, racial purity is essential for being authentic as a group and as an individual. This was the popular thought in Europe and America from the 18th century up until

53

the 1930s through the 1960s, where the combination of the horrors of Nazi Germany's crimes against humanity motivated by scientific racism together with emerging genetic and cultural studies discredited the entire idea that race determines group identity, behaviors and the concept of racial purity and race itself (Cravens, 2010).

Employing this racial ideology, the colonizers believed that since the CHamorus were mixed beyond recognition, then they were no longer authentically CHamoru (Monnig, 2007). Colonial officials presumed that the CHamorus were a mixed race, hence they were docile and easy to control. They believed that European blood in the CHamorus meant that they desired civilization and modernization. Monnig expands on this notion:

> By understanding the Chamorros as watered down, Westernized versions of their "savage," more Pacific islander-like former selves, they were envisioned as completely passive to and accepting of colonial control, pathologically so; a narrative that disregards their identity as Chamorros. (2007, p. 75)

According to Monnig (2007), the narrative of the "inauthentic CHamoru" became rooted in the late 1800s when "the concept of the inauthentic *mestizo* Chamorro was firmly implanted within historical narratives and colonial imaginations" (p. 78). While most people today agree that race does not determine group identity and behavior, since these are all learned through processes of socialization and identity formation, which have nothing to do with the vague concept of race, there is still a residue of this racial ideology that persists up to this day. And part of this intellectual baggage is the belief that racial purity is essential for authenticity. This explains why people invoke the inauthenticity narrative articulated in common sayings such as "No more full-blooded CHamorus," "CHamorus are a hybrid people," "real CHamoru culture doesn't exist," or "no pure CHamorus cause they're all mixed." They still hold certain aspects of this racial ideology, particularly the belief that racial purity equals authenticity. The same narrative of the

54

inauthentic *mestizo* CHamoru would be deployed even today to challenge the idea that CHamorus are the indigenous people of Guam. I return to this later.

At the end of the Spanish-American war in 1898, Guam was ceded to the United States of America. The United States desired Guam as a coaling station (Farrell, 2011). Spain sold the other Northern Mariana Islands to Germany, solidifying a political division between Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands that is present today. By the time of the handover, while scholars and colonists were defining the CHamorus as a mixed race with a hybrid culture, the CHamorus did not perceive their life as revolving around the Catholic Church or Spanish borrowed words as proof of their inauthenticity. Rather, they considered themselves as a distinct people, CHamoru, including their values and customs which are referred to as *Kustombren CHamoru*. This distinct sense of themselves as a unique people became salient due to the influence of European liberalism and nationalism, which had led to the emergence of a national consciousness under Spanish rule.

U.S. Benevolent Assimilation

Since the beginning of the United States' governance of Guam, the US colonial policy was to modernize and Americanize the CHamorus (Clement, 2019; Hattori, 2014; Underwood, 1987; Kuper, 2014). The motive was that of self-interest and benevolent assimilation. The United States desired to remake CHamoru identity to serve their interests of creating a familiar, productive, obedient, and loyal CHamoru body (Hattori, 2004). Colonial racism and paternalism were shrouded behind the language of benevolent assimilation. Naval officials viewed the "hybrid" CHamorus as ignorant disease-ridden children who needed guidance and hygiene (Hattori, 2004). In what they saw as backwards behavior, the naval government banned or regulated several practices of *Kustombren* CHamoru—cockfighting, religious processions,

gambling—that developed during the Hispanicization period. The Naval government enacted

hygienic policies to clean the disease-ridden CHamorus. CHamorus resisted these policies

through many ways such as feigning compliance (Hattori, 2004).

On a political level, some CHamorus, particularly the elites, were not ignorant of the

colonial situation. In 1901, 32 *mannakhilo'* (upper class) CHamorus petitioned Congress for self-

government for the island. In their petition they argued that the military government went against

the principles of equality and liberty of the United States (Rogers, 1995). This act represented the

CHamoru decolonization paradigm that would guide future political appeals (Monnig, 2007).

The US Congress rejected the petition. One major reason why US Congress did not grant Guam

self-governance was racism. The series of Supreme Court cases and opinions from 1901 to 1905,

known as the Insular Cases, legitimized the U.S. establishment of unincorporated territories, and

established the doctrine of territorial incorporation. This means that the full benefits of the U.S.

Constitution apply to incorporated territories (states) and only partially to unincorporated

territories[18] (Joseph & Rosenberg, 2001). Justice Brown's concluding remark in *Downes v.*

Bidwell (1901) gave the justification that because the territories are inhabited by "alien races,

differing from us in religion, customs, laws methods of taxation and modes of thought, the

administration of government and justice, according to Anglo-Saxon principles, may for a time

be impossible" (*Downes v. Bidwell,* 1901). The Supreme Court reasoned that since CHamorus

were a different race that did not have a tradition of liberal democracy, they were therefore

incapable of self-governance within liberal democratic procedures.

One important institution that the colonial government used as an agent of change was

the education system, which was staffed by white Americans, reflected American values,

structure, and educational curricula rather than a Chamorro worldview (Underwood, 1987).

---

[18] Unincorporated territory refers to the territory that is not on the pathway to becoming a state in the Union.

English was the medium of instruction and as Hattori (2014) argues, "one of the fundamental requirements for the transformation of Chamorro society was the use of the English language" (p. 19), as part of the colonial government's project to instill American values and patriotism in the CHamoru psyche.

To promote English on Guam, the American naval administration implemented "no Chamorro" policies (Clement, 2019, para 2). In 1917, the Naval Government Executive General Order 243 attempted to ban the speaking of CHamoru, and "designated English as the only official language of Guam and ordered that Chamorro must not be spoken except for official interpreting" (Clement, 2019, para 2). In the schools, children who were caught speaking CHamoru were penalized; yet despite the colonial government's efforts, CHamoru was still the primary language of the youth, many of whom had little to no knowledge of English (Underwood, 1987). Overall, the results of the modernization and Americanization left US officials unsatisfied, as stated by Vince Diaz:

> Modernization and Americanization didn't have the traction that US officials thought they should, especially among the common folk, who seemed to prefer speaking the Chamorro language to speaking English, and who appeared more interested in their supposedly "sleepy" ways of subsistence farming, fishing, and hunting. (2010, p. 13)

Naval officials attributed their lack of success to the innate characteristics of the "hybrid" CHamoru race rather than to their own unrealistic policy goals, and their lack of cultural awareness, and sensitivity. Their efforts at Americanization and modernization ended abruptly when Japan invaded Guam on December 8th, 1941.

The Rising Sun

After Japan seized Guam, they justified the invasion to the CHamorus by arguing that they had freed the CHamorus from Western imperialism. The strategic reason was to form a

national defense state, infamously known as the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, to secure Guam as part of a defensive line of Pacific islands for the Japanese southern advance into the rich resource areas—Dutch East Indies, British Malaysia, and Burma (Higuchi, 2019; Iwamoto, 1996; Shimizu, 1987). Similar to the goals of the United States, Japan desired to change the CHamoru identity to fit with Japanese interests. They used the school system and laws to impart the Japanese language, customs, and values to CHamorus.

During the occupation, CHamorus from the Japanese-held Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) were recruited by Japan to serve as translators, patrolmen, and other duties. Naturally, Guam CHamorus saw them as traitors, and not all of them were innocent. Some NMI CHamorus were involved in cruel behaviors towards Guam CHamorus such as beatings. These negative feelings contributed to the divide between Guam CHamorus and NMI CHamorus, which was one of the many reasons why Guam CHamorus rejected political unification with the Northern Mariana Islands in 1969 (Camacho, 2011).

The CHamorus responded to the Japanese occupation by identifying with the United States (Cruz, 2012). CHamorus prayed and hoped America would return to save them from the Japanese. These feelings embodied itself in "Uncle Sam," a popular tune created during the occupation containing the hopeful line, "My dear Uncle Sam / Won't you please come back to Guam?" Weeks before the imminent US invasion in 1944, the Japanese became more savage and brutal to the CHamorus; Japanese soldiers massacred dozens of CHamorus for no apparent strategic reason. The most notable massacres occurred at Tinta, Faha, and Fena (Babauta, 2019). On July 21st, the US successfully retook Guam from Japan.

Now We Are Chamorro

Perhaps no other event in Guam history influenced contemporary CHamoru identity more than the CHamoru wartime experience. Due to the horrors, deprivations, and atrocities many CHamorus experienced under Japanese rule, the American retaking of Guam from the Japanese was universally seen as liberation by CHamorus (Diaz, 2010). This perception of Americans liberating Guam from the Japanese sparked a strong sense of patriotism and loyalty towards the United States (Kuper, 2014), or as Diaz puts it "forged feelings of loyalty and kinship" to the United States (2010, p. 13).

CHamorus re-articulated their identity from the experiences of WWII. This articulation process was not neutral because the colonizer played a large role in the CHamoru identity re-articulation process (Cruz, 2012). To use Cruz's distinction[19] between CHamoru and Chamorro, "Chamorro identity" constructed from the experiences of World War II, was reinforced and maintained post-war through the discourses of fear and loyalty, to perpetuate American rule of Guam (2012). The discourses make themselves evident in the way the war is remembered. The memories of the occupation evoke the fear of abandonment and loyalty towards America. These memories were transmitted intergenerationally and institutionalized in the largest public celebration on Guam, Liberation Day, which, intended or not, maintains the current power dynamic between Guam and the United States. Arguably, without the experiences of WWII, the United States would not have been as successful in their construction of Chamorro identity, as Diaz (2010) noted:

> But the "Americanization" of the Chamorros (and the quest for US citizenship) received a
> big boost from the Japanese. The Japanese invasion, and especially Chamorro memories

---

[19] Cruz uses "Chamoru" to refer to "the indigenous people of Guam and their culture and identity," while using "Chamorro" to refer to an "alternate form of identity that has been constructed through as well as in response to American colonization." (2012, p. 3). Note that I use "CHamoru" instead of "Chamoru" to keep my spelling consistent. The two spellings are interchangeable for this thesis.

of the brutal occupation, accomplished in less than three years what US Naval officials could not do in almost fifty, and what took the Spanish padres almost three centuries that is, they fused the Chamorros to their colonial overseer, with religious zeal and cultural prescriptions of gratitude and loyalty. (p. 13)

The effects of the new Chamorro identity led many CHamorus to adopt American exceptionalism. CHamorus believed that America was the greatest country in the world and desired to remain politically with the US. CHamorus have routinely expressed American patriotism through the waving of American flags, viewing the militarization of Guam positively, and desiring to live as Americans. Most significant of all, the CHamoru desire to form an independent sovereign state lost political viability. While many CHamorus desired an end to the status quo either through commonwealth or statehood, few desired outright independence. For example, the 1982 political plebiscite indicated that about 4% of eligible voters who voted chose independence (Quimby, 2019). Despite strong feelings of gratitude, there are certain issues that have rallied CHamorus together in opposition to the United States: Political and indigenous rights, land, and immigration. These are interconnected issues that have influenced CHamorus' identity as they navigated a post-war Guam.

Post-War II; Are We Citizens?

Immediately after the liberation of Guam by US forces, the US seized land to be used for the military. Many CHamorus felt gratitude for the liberation and willingly gave their land to the US. However, some CHamorus resisted. There is an account of one CHamoru named John Unpingco, who stood in front of a bulldozer with a gun in hand (Phillips, 2019). Surprisingly, the military backed off. However, others were not so lucky, and their land was seized with little or no compensation. By the end of the war, about half of the island's land was held by the military, setting the stage for the contentious issue of land and political rights. The US continued to take

land under eminent domain for years after the war. Many CHamorus understood their political relationship with the United States as unequal. The uncompensated land seizures and lack of self-governance led many CHamorus to believe that American citizenship would remedy the unequal treatment. Guam leaders pressured the US for American citizenship and self-governance, which culminated in the Guam congressional walkout in 1949.

The Guam walkout surprised American officials, and to make matters worse for them, the walkout became international news, which drew widespread international and US domestic outrage on the US treatment of Guam. This, more than anything, led the US Congress to pass the Organic Act in 1950 (Diaz, 2010). The US Organic Act granted Guam limited self-governance, US citizenship, and officially designated the political status of Guam as an unincorporated and organized territory of the United States. CHamorus were now US citizens, which they had sought after for years. Contrary to expectations, however, US citizenship did not remedy the land seizures or guarantee equal treatment. During the same time period, CHamorus noticed another major development on Guam.

Losing the Majority

Following the war, large numbers of Filipinos and other foreign workers were contracted by the military to rebuild the war-torn island. Many decided to stay on Guam after their contracts expired. The impact of the foreigners on Guam's demographics was significant. CHamorus in 1940 numbered 20,177 or 91% of the total population of 22,290. By 1950, CHamorus made up 26,521 or 45% of the total population of 59,498 (Pobutsku & Neri, 2018). In the span of one decade, CHamorus went from a super majority to a plurality. The Filipino population increased from 569 or 2.6% of the total population of 22,290 in 1940 to 7,258 or 12.2% of the total local

population of 59,498 in 1950 (Pobutsku & Neri, 2018). In response, CHamorus protested the presence of Filipino and other foreign workers because they competed for jobs. Their protests led to the reduction of Filipino workers. However, Filipinos continued to come to Guam. Unlike during the Spanish era, most Filipinos did not assimilate into the larger CHamoru culture, probably because Filipinos came in large waves and self-segregated themselves. With their numbers, they set up their own communities comprising mainly of Filipinos and often brought their families with them, thus maintaining their identity as Filipinos.

CHamorus would become increasingly concerned about their position in the island in the decades to come. However, during the postwar decade, CHamorus were rebuilding their lives and adjusting to the changing landscape. The military construction projects and newly formed government of Guam gave hundreds of CHamorus for the first time the opportunity to work at wage jobs rather than living by subsistence farming. Many CHamorus did not have a real choice due to loss of land from war time damage and military land seizures. In the following decade, Guam experienced changes on a scale never before seen on the island. These changes proved to have consequences for CHamoru identity.

Take-off!

In 1962, the security clearance was lifted, opening Guam to tourists from the economically booming Japan and other US friendly Asian countries. This brought in massive economic development and construction to the island and, together with military employment, solidified the shift from a subsistence lifestyle to a cash economy. As a result, CHamorus experienced significant changes: many CHamorus sold their land to investors and the English language ideology of success was adopted by the CHamorus. This directly led to the decline of

the CHamoru language as English language proficiency gained importance as a prerequisite for employment. Thus, CHamorus learned English because it was necessary for their success, as Robert Underwood has clearly stated:

> The message of English and occupational success had little application in the subsistence economy of prewar Guam. The postwar occupational picture seemed to validate in dollars and cents the economic component of the ideology of English. (1989, p. 79)

This newfound success came at the expense of the CHamoru language because parents stopped speaking CHamoru to their children in home. However, the reason was out of love and the desire for a better future for their children rather than out of malicious intent (Kuper, 2014). CHamorus desired to be American and adopt the lifestyle, so much so, that some CHamorus perceived other, more "traditional" CHamorus as backwards. CHamorus from the south were looked down upon by CHamorus in the center— (e.g. Hagåtña). Southern CHamorus were stereotyped as backwards with their heavy CHamoru accent and more "traditional" lifestyle.

Meanwhile, the demographics on Guam changed even further due to the booming economy and US immigration reform. In 1965, the US Congress passed the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 which abolished the decades-old policy of heavily limited immigration from non-northwestern European countries. This effectively allowed a surge of immigrants from Asia and the Philippines to immigrate to Guam. Guam served as a steppingstone for Asian migration to the continental United States. While the majority of immigrants moved on from Guam, some decided to stay and make Guam their home.

In local politics, political leaders pushed to elect their own governor and to send a non-voting delegate to US Congress. In 1970, Guam elected its first elected civil governor. A significant event happened in 1969: Guam voters rejected political unification with the Northern

Mariana Islands. This solidified the divide between Guam CHamorus and CHamorus in the northern islands.

In the international political atmosphere, there was a wave of decolonization. The United Nations Resolution 1514 and 1541 ushered in decolonization as a norm of international law (Hannum, 1993; 1998). Decolonization was seen as an imperative by the international community. By the end of the 1960s, almost the entire continent of Africa was decolonized along with other places in the Pacific and Asia; CHamorus took notice. In conjunction with the increasing immigration and desire for decolonization, a new movement began to emerge from CHamorus—a movement based on indigeneity.

Indigenous Dimension of CHamoru Identity

CHamorus are often referred to as the indigenous people of the Marianas. The term indigenous is a relatively recent term that CHamorus adopted in the 1980s (Flores, 1999). This raises questions: Why do CHamorus self-identify as indigenous? What does it mean to be indigenous in the twenty-first century? Is there any significance to claiming to be indigenous? Before, these questions can be answered, the term indigenous must be understood. The term indigenous, once used to refer to plants and animals is now internationally recognized and embraced by many peoples (Clifford, 2013). A report to the UN by Martinez Cobo in 1987 provides the widely cited working definition:

> Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system.

He continues,

This historical continuity may consist of the continuation, for an extended period reaching into the present of one or more of the following factors:
    a) Occupation of ancestral lands, or at least of part of them;
    b) Common ancestry with the original occupants of these lands;
    c) Culture in general, or in specific manifestations (such as religion, living under a tribal system, membership of an indigenous community, dress, means of livelihood, lifestyle, etc.);
    d) Language (whether used as the only language, as mother-tongue, as the habitual means of communication at home or in the family, or as the main, preferred, habitual, general or normal language);
    e) Residence on certain parts of the country, or in certain regions of the world;
    f) Other relevant factors.

He adds,

On an individual basis, an indigenous person is one who belongs to these indigenous populations through self-identification as indigenous (group consciousness) and is recognized and accepted by these populations as one of its members (acceptance by the group). This preserves for these communities the sovereign right and power to decide who belongs to them, without external interference. (p. 29)

The working definition consists of four key components: self-identification as indigenous, pre-colonial historical continuity, distinction from the other peoples in their land, and experiences of colonization and forms of marginalization. Definitions of indigeneity typically have varying degrees of these components, although it is argued that attempts at establishing universal definitions may ignore how indigenous peoples identify themselves; as former Chairperson of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, Erica Daes, noted "indigenous peoples have suffered from definitions imposed on them by others" (Daes, 2008, p. 8). While there are many other definitions of indigeneity, the UN working manual for indigenous rights cites that "the key criterion of self-identification as the expression of the right to self-determination of indigenous peoples is widely recognized today" (2013, p. 7). There are several other terms that express the same idea as indigenous: aboriginals, tribal peoples, first nations, pastoralists etc.

The rise of peoples identifying as indigenous is connected to the post-World War II political agenda of decolonization, push for human rights and an emergence of a new generation of western style educated indigenous individuals. The United Nations, established in 1945, more than any other entity pushed for decolonization and established the norms of international law (Hannum, 1993; 1998). While the UN goal of decolonization was mostly achieved by the 1970s, critics argued that international law was not sufficiently taking into account non-state actors, specifically peoples who experienced common themes of marginalization from state actors. These marginalized peoples identified under the marker of indigenous to create international solidarity as part of the Fourth world. In response to human right abuses, indigenous people argued both domestically and internationally for these violations to be addressed. Indigenous people argued that they had the human right to maintain their way of life within states.

The indigenous rights movement began gather take steam in the 1960s and 1970s, when several non-governmental organizations [NGO] began to expose the discrimination and human rights abuses indigenous peoples face (Asia Pacific Forum of National Human Rights Institutions & The office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2013). The NGOs found that Indigenous peoples around the world shared common experiences of marginalization in modern states as the livelihoods of indigenous peoples were disrupted by the state's economic and political interests. Indigenous people argued that by virtue of being indigenous, they had the human right to maintain their livelihood. Perhaps the most important starting point for indigenous rights was the establishment of the Working Group for Indigenous Populations (WGIP) in 1982 within the UN, to deal with setting the standard for human rights of indigenous peoples. In 1993, the organization drafted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People,

which elaborated the rights of indigenous people. Twenty-five years later, the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People on September 13, 2007.

The Declaration established indigenous rights within positive international law. It elaborated the rights of indigenous peoples and recognized that the human rights of indigenous peoples were collective rights, which are "indispensable for their existence, well-being and integral development as peoples" (UN General Assembly, 2007). The Declaration states that "indigenous peoples have the right of self-determination," mirroring the language of UN General Assembly Resolution 1514. However, the declaration clarifies that the right of self-determination for indigenous peoples is internal as opposed to external, which is given for colonized peoples in geographically distinct territories. Thus indigenous peoples have the right to maintain their own economic, political, and social development within the confines of pre-existing states, but do not have the right of conducting any action that threatens the territorial integrity of the state where they reside, such as forming their own separate state through unilateral secession. The justification for indigenous rights is a moral one to address the historic wrongs and systematic marginalization that indigenous peoples face under states.

The Rise of the Indigenous CHamoru: Ethnic Revival

By identifying themselves as the indigenous people, CHamorus have asserted that as a collective group they are entitled to indigenous rights—the right to maintain their own lifestyle and culture. It is an alternative to American political and cultural assimilation. Claims of indigeneity led CHamorus to politicize, objectify, and traditionalize culture (Flores, 1999). CHamorus used characteristics of culture, for example the latte, as symbols of this emerging CHamoru identity. The latte serves to evoke emotions and to strengthen the collective CHamoru

identity: Certainly, the latte did not have such symbolic meaning in the past, as it functioned as support pillars for buildings, but in the formation of indigeneity within CHamoru identity, it was infused with new meaning in the present.

The claim to indigeneity is a CHamoru response to the demographic changes and liberal multiculturalism that threaten CHamoru cultural and political dominance in their homeland. As Judy Flores stated, "CHamorus are attempting to counter marginalization in their own homeland by reclaiming an indigenous identity that undeniably links them to history of ownership in their land" (1999, p. 132). CHamorus feared being just another ethnic group or indistinguishable from Filipinos[20] on Guam. They desired to maintain their cultural and political position on Guam by asserting indigeneity.

Influenced by the American civil rights movements, Vietnam War experiences, international movements, and regional decolonization movements together with an emerging postwar generation educated in formal schooling, CHamoru activism based on indigeneity emerged in the 1970s. Further fueling CHamoru claims to an indigenous identity are the recent archeological discoveries of CHamoru pre-contact material culture. Archaeological studies to mitigate hotel construction in Tumon revealed an abundance of material culture such as lattes, human remains, spondylus ornaments, etc., which brought CHamoru pre-contact culture to the public consciousness (Flores, 1999).

The Festival of Pacific Arts (FestPac) played a huge role as a stimulus to develop CHamoru indigeneity and serves as a regional arena of indigeneity for CHamorus to compare themselves to other Pacific Islanders (Flores, 1999). Every four years since 1972, Pacific Islanders travel to a single island polity to showcase their traditional arts. While there was only a

---

[20] Filipino is used as the ethnic comparison because they are the second largest ethnic group on Guam at 26% of the population.

single representative from Guam for the very first FestPac, the next FestPac received greater participation from Guam. The Government of Guam did not officially organize a delegation to represent CHamoru indigenous arts, rather the delegation consisted of various groups. Guam's delegation performed what was familiar to them, their colonial-style art forms, much to the surprise of their audience of Pacific Islanders. CHamoru chant master, Leonard Iriarte, who was a teen delegate at the time, recalling the 1976 Guam performances, said:

> Our group represented the mix of cultures on Guam. It was beautiful. Growing up on Guam you never think about [the mix of cultures], unless someone makes you aware of it. When we got to New Zealand, the Niuean delegation was all Niuean, the Tongan delegation was all Tongan, the Samoan delegation was all Samoan. That caught my eye; and also, they had traditional costumes and traditional chants and dance! We didn't. We had nothing. Nothing. Nothing to show that we came from the ancient Chamorro. Absolutely nothing! We even did modern dance, with black tights and lighting. It was crazy – at a cultural festival – crazy. I would look at the faces of the audience when the Guam delegation performed, and they were always puzzled. (as cited in Flores, 1999, p. 202)

The CHamoru delegates became aware of the differences between their "colonial" influenced performances and the "indigenous" performances of other Pacific Islanders. They noticed that their performances did not conform to the other Pacific Islanders. The early FestPac experience pushed CHamorus such as Leonard Iriarte to develop pre-contact indigenous representations of performance arts. FestPac allowed CHamorus who desired to be perceived as Pacific Islanders to model their indigeneity on other Pacific Islanders, and to strive to construct indigenous representations of CHamoru identity while minimizing their colonial heritage. By the 1996 FestPac, the CHamoru delegation successfully adapted to the stereotypic Pacific Island representation of indigenous artforms (Flores, 1999).

FestPac built and reinforced indigenous representations of CHamoru identity, which encouraged a renaissance in pre-colonial CHamoru heritage—seafaring, chants, dance crafts, etc. The renaissance gave rise to interest in learning the CHamoru language. The revitalization of the

language is part of the broader expression of traditional culture and on another level, it was political, which will be discussed in a later section.

CHamoru Activism

A significant moment of indigenous CHamoru activism in the 1970s was the mobilization against the Guam Constitution. In 1977, Guam's constitutional convention drafted a Constitution that was to be put up for popular vote in 1979. PARA-PADA, an acronym for the merging of two CHamoru organizations, the People's Alliance for Responsive Alternatives (PARA) and People's Alliance for Dignified Alternatives (PADA), led the opposition against the Constitution because they believed that political status change must come before a constitution. They argued that if the Constitution were ratified, then the US would justify the removal of Guam from the UN list of Non-Self-Governing territories, thus fulfilling their UN obligation to assisting in Guam's external self-determination. Another argument was that it was not a true constitution because it was limited within the federal framework. When voting time arrived, Guam voters rejected the Constitution, much to the credit of PARA-PADA (Monnig, 2007).

In 1981, several of PARA-PADA members and other people founded the Organization of People for Indigenous Rights (OPI-R). OPI-R's goal was to bring CHamoru self-determination to the consciousness of the public. They were the first group to actively push for the restriction of political plebiscite voting to CHamorus only, but were unsuccessful in limiting the vote to only CHamorus in the 1982 political plebiscites, where Guam voters chose commonwealth as their preferred political status after a run off plebiscite between statehood and commonwealth. When it came time for drafting the Commonwealth Act, OPI-R successfully pushed for protection of CHamorus rights, control of immigration, and more autonomy in Guam's legislative capability

70

with the US. However, the Act never made it through the US Congress. Political scientist Robert Rogers attributes the failure to Guam's lack of compromise with the US and federal "obduracy" (Rogers, 1998, p. 96). OPI-R became largely inactive by the turn of the decade. By the start of the 1990s, a new CHamoru activist organization emerged—one that would be radically different than all the previous organizations.

I Nasion CHamoru redefined CHamoru activism. They, more than any other CHamoru group, invoked their pre-contact CHamoru connection in their image. While OPI-R members dressed in modern clothing and had conventional hairstyles for the time, *Nasion* CHamoru men styled their hair in the top-knot fashion, following early Spanish descriptions of the CHamorus. Another distinction is that *Nasion* CHamoru was made up of less educated, poorer, non-elite CHamorus, while OPI-R was made up of more educated, wealthier, elite CHamorus (Monnig, 2007). *I Nasion* CHamoru was a direct-action group that placed land at the center of their activism. They pushed the Government of Guam to implement the CHamoru Land Trust Act,[21] publicly critiqued the military, and advocated independence and CHamoru rights. *I Nasion* CHamoru fundamentally changed the discourse on CHamoru rights and decolonization. They normalized the conversations on independence, CHamoru rights, and critiquing the US and the military, whereas before, critical conversations on these topics were dismissed because they were perceived as stemming from anti-Americanism and ungratefulness. Because of their efforts, these conversations have become more normalized today.

---

[21] The CHamoru Land Trust was a law passed in 1975, which held public land to be leased at discounted rates to native inhabitants (e.g. CHamorus).

Contested Rights

CHamoru indigenous rights have always been contested. Indigenous rights as laws that specifically favor CHamorus conflict with the principles of liberalism.[22] Liberalism is the political ideology of the United States, and as such it extends to the Territory of Guam. The two underlying principles of liberalism are liberty and equality based on the individual. Guam laws that favor CHamorus go against the principle of equality: that all citizens regardless of race or ethnic origin, must be treated equally. The CHamoru Land Trust, CHamoru recognized as an official language, and a "CHamoru only vote" are perceived to conflict with liberalism. It is argued that these represent positive discrimination or racism because they give institutionalized preferential treatment based on ancestry and promotion of an ethnic culture.

CHamoru assertion of indigenous rights is at odds with liberal multiculturalism. Liberal multiculturalism "looks for a response to the management of cultural diversity as a means of equal inclusion of minorities in the political community" (Kastoryano, 2011, p. 1629). It refers to the concept in that ethnic groups have the rights to maintain their distinct cultural identities in society as opposed to giving it up or assimilating into a supranational identity. As long as the expressions of differences in identity do not threaten the liberal multicultural order, differences are tolerated and even encouraged. However, when these differences become politicalized and used to advocate unique rights or political autonomy then conflict arises. For example, showcasing indigeneity through CHamoru re-creations of pre-contact dances are praised in that they add to the rich cultural diversity of Guam, but advocating that only CHamorus should be allowed to vote in a self-determination referendum is contested because restricting the electorate

---

[22] Do not confuse the overarching political philosophy of liberalism with specific American and European usages of liberalism: Americans usually use liberalism to refer to social liberalism, which is usually associated with the American political left. Europeans usually use liberalism to refer to classical liberalism, which aims for economic liberalization, limited government, and civil libertarianism to a degree.

to CHamorus violates the liberal principle of equality. To assert that CHamorus deserve special treatment from other groups due to their indigeneity may be problematic in a liberal multicultural viewpoint, which indigeneity seeks to navigate.

The CHamoru assertions of indigenous rights on Guam face unique problems and conditions compared to other indigenous peoples in different places for several reasons: Guam remains one of the few UN-designated non-self-governing territories and therefore the people of Guam have the right of external self-determination. This is highly contested between those who interpret the "people of Guam" to mean only the CHamorus, and those who interpret the phrase to include everybody on Guam regardless of ethnicity, to have the right of self-determination. The next unique problem is that Guam has experienced significant demographic changes, yet CHamorus remain culturally and politically dominant on Guam. The last unique problem is that the CHamoru assertion of indigenous rights is contested against the backdrop of Guam being an organized and unincorporated territory of the United States rather than CHamorus being formally recognized as a nation within the state.

These differences make CHamoru assertion of indigenous rights unique from other indigenous peoples within the territories of liberal democratic states. Unlike the CHamorus, other indigenous peoples are minorities in their own land without having significant cultural or political dominance in broader society and government. Furthermore, since these indigenous peoples are within the territories of pre-existing states, they do not have the right of external self-determination by virtue of the "Salt Water Thesis."[23] Rather, they have their indigenous rights formulated through treaties with the state where they may express their indigenous rights in their

---

[23] The Salt Water Thesis also called the Blue Water Thesis, is the UN-recognized view that only territories that are geographically separated by salt water or blue water can be UN-designated Non-Self-Governing Territories and afforded the right of external self-determination. The implication is that internal colonized peoples—native Americans, Tibetans, Australian aborigines, etc.—within the borders of pre-existing states do not possess the right of external self-determination.

own designated autonomous regions, such as reservations. Thus, unlike the CHamorus, these indigenous peoples are able to make policies that inherently conflict with liberalism and multiculturalism within the confines of their autonomous region. However, for the CHamorus, no such treaties (tribal status) granting autonomous status with the United States government have been formulated. Some CHamorus argue against tribal status because it prevents CHamorus from exercising their full indigenous rights as they would have in an independent state.

Surprisingly, despite the CHamoru Land Trust and mandated CHamoru language and cultural classes in the public schools, there has not been a large-scale public outcry from other ethnic groups. Usually, opposition comes from a few outspoken white Guam residents from the United States, or as Monnig termed, "haole" (2007). They use the liberal notion of equality to attack laws that favor CHamorus. Recently, the longtime white resident Dave Davis sued GovGuam. The lawsuit was against the Guam political status plebiscite law that limits the vote to native inhabitants only. He argued it was racist and was against his rights as an American citizen. In 2017, the Davis v. Guam court case ruling struck down the political plebiscite election law because it was in violation of the 15th Amendment. The court found the definition of native inhabitants to be a form of race-based discrimination as the court found that ancestry is a proxy for race.

Another weapon that is commonly deployed to counter CHamoru claims of indigenous rights is the "inauthentic CHamoru" narrative (Monnig, 2007). This argument derives from the classification of CHamorus as a racial identity. American racial ideology applied to CHamorus acted to delegitimize and disempower CHamorus by infusing essentialist racial, cultural, and linguistic narratives within CHamoru identity. Thus, following this ideology, CHamorus were considered mixed beyond recognition, cultural hybrids, and their language was nothing more

than a Spanish dialect and therefore undeserving of the rights for self-determination as the authentic indigenous people of the Marianas (Monnig, 2007). On the other hand, some CHamorus have subverted the *mestizo* CHamoru identity to be used to circumvent US racial notions of identity, by establishing CHamoru continuity and authenticity through family, culture, and shared memory of a CHamoru past rather than by blood.

Millennial Dawn

A new generation of CHamorus entered the new millennium in a vastly different environment than their parents and grandparents. Guam today is more diverse than ever. Based on the 2010 Guam Census, the total population of Guam is 159,358. CHamorus make up the largest portion of Guam's population at about 37% (59,381). Filipinos make up the second largest at about 26% (41,944). Other Pacific Islanders, primarily from the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of Palau make up 12% (19,201) with the largest groups being Chuukese, Palauans, Pohnpeians, and Yapese. Whites make up the next largest at 7% (11,321). There is a sizable Asian population at 6% (9,437) with the main groups being Japanese, Korean, and Chinese. That leaves the rest of the population 11% (18,074) to be comprised of other ethnic/racial/mixed groups.

There are many languages spoken on Guam reflecting the diverse set of communities living on Guam. The language communities usually reflect their ethnic and national groupings. The Filipino community include speakers of Tagalog, Ilocano, Visayan and other Filipino languages. Different Asian communities include Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Koreans, all speaking their national language. Micronesian communities, including Palauans, Chuukese, Yapese, Marshallese and other, all speak their ethnic languages. Americans "Statesiders," as they

are called in Guam, speak English. The CHamoru-speaking community exhibits a fluency gap between older and younger CHamorus, with the older generation comprising the majority of fluent CHamoru speakers. Both CHamoru and English are the official languages of Guam. Despite CHamoru being an official language, however, English is the lingua franca and there appears to be a trend towards increasing usage of English at the expense of ethnic and national languages affecting all groups on Guam.

The Purchasing of CHamoru Identity

Young CHamorus have grown up in an environment of increasing individualism and mass consumerism within a multicultural landscape, which has been entangled with CHamoru identity and indigeneity. For many CHamorus, indigeneity is not consciously viewed as a tool of political mobilization but limited to boundary maintenance from other groups through ethnic consumerism. CHamorus signal their CHamoru identity through their display of CHamoru goods such as tattoos, stickers, and *sinahis*.[24] While the former conventional markers of ethnic differences such as language and ranching have significantly eroded, CHamorus are manifesting their ethnic identity through acquisition and display of ethnic markers. Products are now used to negotiate CHamoru identity. In contemporary society on Guam, this type of commercial expression of CHamoru identity is appropriate as it does not disrupt the multi-cultural landscape and functions well within the commercial landscape. It allows CHamorus to express indigeneity without actively mobilizing the inherent political implications into political action. It lets CHamorus acknowledge their indigeneity while being proud Americans. CHamorus can "rep"[25] their island through displaying Guam flags, wearing the *sinahi* and *spondylus,* and thus claiming the status of being indigenous to the Marianas, while still being patriotic to America. For some

---

[24] A crescent moon-shaped shell ornament worn as a necklace
[25] Among Millennials and Generation Z, 'rep' is slang for 'represent.'

CHamorus, ethnic display may not be enough to fulfill their essentialist authentic notions of CHamoru identity and so they seek other avenues than commercialism.

CHamoru Attitudes Towards the Language

CHamorus both fluent and non-fluent alike generally hold positive views towards their language despite the decline in intergenerational transmission of CHamoru in the home. A 1974 cultural survey of 1,659 elementary students found that 85% of students wanted to learn to speak CHamoru (Public Law 12-31). Furthermore, the same percentage of students agreed that it is important to learn CHamoru, if they are to live on Guam. Of the 1,659 students, 408 were fluent speakers, while the rest could either speak a little Chamoru or none at all. The students' attitude probably reflected the island-wide attitudes at the time towards the language, that the CHamoru language was viewed positively.

Two recent large survey-based studies looked at the CHamoru language. The nonprofit Chamorro Language Assessment Survey (CLAS), conducted by Pa'a Taotao Tano' from September 2009 through September 2010 sampled over 10% of the CHamoru population (6542) and found when generalized to the population, 95% of CHamorus believed knowing CHamoru is an important part of being CHamoru (Pacific Region Compendium [PRC], 2015, p. 39-40). A Guam Community College (GCC) survey conducted in 2007 indicates that the vast majority of CHamorus (96% $\pm$ 4.1%) believe it is important to preserve the language, and (91% $\pm$ 4.1%) wanted to learn to speak the language (PRC, 2015, p. 41-2). An unpublished survey of around 300 CHamoru Millennials conducted in 2017 found the vast majority were interested in learning the CHamoru language (Leon Guerrero, 2017).

A study of attitudes toward language use found that nearly all of the CHamoru respondents indicated that they either agree or strongly agree with the statement "too bad that

more and more Chamorros cannot speak the Chamorro language these days" (Perez 2005, p. 583). The majority of respondents agreed that "Chamorros should return to the 'original' language of the people." (p. 583). This study, however, utilized a small purposeful sampling, and thus cannot be generalized to the general population of CHamorus. However, the data from the surveys clearly indicate that CHamorus generally have positive attitudes towards the language.

Where are the New Speakers?

Despite the governmental and non-governmental efforts, and the overwhelmingly positive attitudes towards the CHamoru language, the decline of the CHamoru language has not been reversed. According to the available census data, Guam is losing more speakers than gaining. The U.S. Census of 1990, 2000, and 2010, showed the number of CHamoru speakers declining from 34,598 in 1990 to 25,827 in 2010 (Eugenio, 2016). My observation supports this assertion as I find that the majority of young CHamorus cannot speak CHamoru fluently. A 2017 survey of around 300 CHamorus between the ages of 18 to 32, found that only 1 out of 10 CHamorus were able to hold a basic conversation in CHamoru, i.e., convey basic thoughts in CHamoru with no further elaboration (Leon Guerrero, 2017). This leaves the rest of the CHamorus with little to no fluency.

There are several possible reasons for the failure to reverse language loss. Mandatory CHamoru language classes did not seem to be effective at increasing CHamoru speaking proficiency. As Monnig (2007) pointed out, while the laws stated that CHamoru classes were mandatory, many school administrators did not make the necessary effort towards CHamoru classes. There was a lack of CHamoru books and teachers and other obstacles such as student-to-teacher ratio, inconsistent teaching methods, and lack of general use outside of class. The CHamoru classes do not seem to be effective even today. In a survey of more than 300

Millennials, there was no statistically significant correlation between high school CHamoru classes and increases in CHamoru fluency (Leon Guerrero, 2017). Young CHamorus who did not take CHamoru classes most likely came from private schools, where the public laws mandating CHamoru classes do not apply. I am one example. I recall that in 2015, when I entered my first college level beginner CHamoru language class, I was astonished to find many of my classmates struggling with the class. I incorrectly assumed that the college beginner class would be easy for them because of the many CHamoru classes they took in the public schools. I remember asking several of my classmates whether their CHamoru classes helped them to speak CHamoru, and they all responded with some variation of "no."

The efforts of Chief Hurao Academy seem to be more successful at producing speakers. Parents who send their children to Hurao are personally invested in the language as they feel it is important enough to pay money for their child to learn the language. These parents are more likely to encourage the use of the language at home. As a result, there are several success stories of fairly fluent speakers emerging from Hurao. Yet for many, Hurao is not enough. Informal conversations with former students from Hurao reveal that a number of them significantly fall back and stop actively learning CHamoru once outside the program. For example, a former student of Hurao, who attended Hurao for her entire childhood, mentioned that she and her two friends from her cohort no longer really use or actively learn the language because they don't have many situations outside of Hurao to use the language (personal communication). The majority of their friends don't understand CHamoru, nor is CHamoru required for economic success, therefore there is no broader social context to use the language. This is anecdotal evidence that even a CHamoru language immersion program may be largely ineffective without a broader CHamoru-speaking community. I fear the Hurao collaboration with GDOE will face

the same issue. Although children will attend classes entirely taught in CHamoru, arguably whether the children will have the opportunities to use the language outside of school will determine the program's success.

Positive valuing does not necessarily translate to non-fluent CHamorus gaining CHamoru fluency. As Robert Underwood (1989) found, since the 1980s CHamorus have valued their language, but the English language ideology of success led CHamorus to emphasize English over CHamoru due to the perceived utility of the English language as a means to economic success. That generation of CHamorus chose voluntarily not to transmit the language, and CHamoru ceased being the language of the home, even though there were more resources available than ever to learn language, including free language lessons and other resources on the Internet, books, language classes, and Chief Hurao Academy. Despite general positive attitudes towards CHamoru, language perpetuation efforts remain difficult. This is not to say that governmental and non-governmental programs, or the generally positive attitudes of the public, have zero influence. Indeed, there are some CHamorus who have begun to actively learn the language and have become quite fluent in CHamoru. Then why is it that these CHamorus decided to continue to actively learn CHamorus, others have not?

Why Few CHamorus Actively Learn the Language When the Majority Don't?

Young CHamorus feel that the language is important, yet why do only a few out of the potential thousands embark on the language journey? Tamar Celis (2017) is the first author to create a theoretical model based on interview data from her three active CHamoru learning participants that maps out the variables that lead young CHamorus to learn CHamoru. She theorizes that most CHamorus are in the phase "valuing of CHamoru," and identifies four variables that contribute to the phase: obligation to youth, interest in sustaining the language,

80

connection with elders, and outsider's perspectives. She then argues that it is "the culmination of characteristics and experiences innate and unique to them," or what she calls "learners' *idiosyncrasies*" that propels CHamorus from the valuing phase to the language learning journey (Celis, 2017, p. 63). She finds two variables that influence "learning CHamoru"—*accompanying passion* and *willingness to speak*—and she argues that the learner acquires CHamoru best alongside a passion, such as music, paddling, art etc. Willingness to speak the language is a less important variable for acquiring CHamoru. From there, she argues that the goal for CHamoru language learners to expand their language proficiency is the "expansion of the circles within which they feel comfortable using Chamoru" (Celis, 2017, p. 64).

Overall, Celis' model contributes to a better understanding of why CHamorus decide to learn CHamoru. She rightfully theorizes that CHamorus are generally in a valuing phase of the language, which the survey data support. She recognizes several variables that contribute to why CHamorus value the language. I agree with her assessment that the goal for active CHamoru language learners is to expand their CHamoru-speaking circles. However, I find her explanation of why CHamorus move from valuing CHamoru to actively learning CHamoru due to "...the culmination of characteristics and experiences innate and unique to them… idiosyncrasies" (p. 63) to be unhelpful. While I do not entirely disagree with this, I find this explanation lacking because it fails to uncover the underlying themes and processes which led up to the individual changing from only sentimentally valuing the language to actively learning the language. She acknowledges that there are probably more reasons than what she identified for valuing the language and contributing factors that lead to actively learning the language. One missing reason is that the language serves as an authenticator of CHamoru identity.

Chapter 2. Methods

This chapter describes the methodological approach undertaken to understand how non-fluent CHamorus are conceptualizing their CHamoru identity in relation to fluency in the CHamoru language. This chapter presents my methodological approach, sampling method, and data collection methods. Lastly, I will discuss ethical issues and limitations associated with this study.

Qualitative Approach

This study employed a qualitative approach. According to Berg & Lune (2012), qualitative research "refers to the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and description of things" and not to their "counts or measures" (p. 3). This research answers how and when a certain phenomenon occurs. Qualitative research follows an inductive process, which involves gathering data, and looking for patterns, so the researcher may generate concepts and theories to explain observed patterns (Berg & Lune, 2012). A qualitative approach was chosen for this research as it allows the researcher to gain deeper understanding based on an individual's experiences with the CHamoru language, conceptualization of CHamoru identity, and their beliefs and feelings.

Method

Kumar (2019) argues that the interview method is the most suitable approach for studying abstract and sensitive subject matter, as the researcher is able to verbally inform, answer questions and concerns from the participant. This study of CHamoru identity and its relationship with language fluency fits well with the interview method as it is an abstract and sensitive

subject. Identity cannot be easily explored using quantitative methods because numbers alone cannot sufficiently describe the participants' conceptualization of CHamoru identity. Additionally, questionnaires assessing the concept of identity limit the responses of participants with closed-ended questions and the limited amount of space on the questionnaire. The goal of this thesis is not to generalize information or conduct hypothesis testing but rather to explore CHamoru identity.

The semi-structured interview was the method used for this study. Semi-structured interviews give participants more flexibility to elaborate on their thoughts, feelings, and answers by allowing the researcher to expand upon the interview guide and follow up on participant responses (Berg & Lane, 2012). Additionally, the topic of CHamoru identity and language calls for me to not be restricted by the interview guide. By cutting off and redirecting the participant when they begin to stray, I may miss what the participant feels is important for CHamoru identity.

Kumar (2019) points out several limitations of the interview method. How the researcher presents himself and interacts with each participant affects the quality of data. Researcher bias, experience, and skill are variables that influence the data. While experience and skill are gained through time, I can control how I present and interact with the participant. I interacted with the participants as consistently as I could. I dressed casually and talked to the participants very casually. This probably put them at ease and allowed them to talk freely without worrying about negative judgement from me. I felt the interviews were more conversational than formal. My researcher bias also affected the data. This is discussed in the positionality statement.

I also gathered data on social media, mainly on the social media platform Twitter. Social media is utilized by the vast majority of young CHamorus and provides additional access to how

CHamoru youth use and view the language. It has the advantage of allowing me to lurk[26] on social media without influencing the behavior of young CHamorus on social media. In addition, CHamoru youth are more likely to be unfiltered on social media, than in a formal recorded interview.

Sampling

A criterion purposive sampling method was employed. The criteria for selection was that the participant must be CHamoru, be either Millennial or Generation Z generation, born and raised on Guam, and be non-fluent in the CHamoru language. Participants were sought through personal contacts.

Measuring Criteria

CHamoru identification of the participants was determined entirely from self-identification. Non-fluency was determined by asking the participants if they are fluent in CHamoru, which all the participants emphatically said no to. Participants were then asked if they were at least conversational in CHamoru. Only two mentioned that while they cannot necessarily hold a conversation in CHamoru, they can "sort of communicate" in CHamoru. The "sort of communicate" was limited to knowledge of basic phrases and words. For the other twelve participants, CHamoru proficiency was limited to a couple of words or phrases. Determining whether the participant was a Millennial or Generation Z was by the cutoff age 35 and above.

---

[26] Viewing but not interacting

Data Collection

Data collection took place in March of 2019. The interviews generally took around 45 minutes to an hour and a half. Participants were informed about the research project in advance and were given the written consent form. The interview began as soon as the form was signed. The interviews were recorded through an Audio-Technica AT2020 USB microphone and an iPhone 6/7. One interview was recorded solely through the iPhone when the USB microphone was not present. Participants did not receive financial compensation for their participation.

Five of the fourteen participants were acquaintances of the researcher; the other nine were recruited through third parties known to the researcher. All of the participants were informed about the nature of the project and participant rights through the cover letter via email. All participants except for four chose to have the interviews conducted at the University of Guam. This was mainly for convenience as all ten of these participants were University of Guam students. For the other four, two had the interview conducted at their residence, one had the interview at a coffee shop, and the last one had the interview at a family gathering. The interview schedule was prepared in advance to aid the researcher with the structure and flow of the interview (see Appendix Two), although as a semi-structured interview, the researcher was flexible. Each participant was presented with a similar set of questions relating to their experiences with the CHamoru language growing up and presently, conceptualization of CHamoru identity, and perceptions of the language. Questions were generally open-ended with a few closed-ended questions relating to demographic information such as ethnicity, age and so on. One example of an open-ended question from the interview prompt is "What does it mean to be CHamoru?" (see Appendix A). Open-ended questions such as these give participants room to answer on their own terms through giving detail and information that they think is important

(Berg & Lane, 2012). Pilot interviews were conducted before the real interviews as it allowed the researcher to gain experience and resolve any difficulties with the wording of the questions, structure, and flow of the interview. For example, in my pilot interviews, I was nervous and heavily relying on the interview script. As a result, the pilot interviews were incredibly short and the responses lacked detail, which provided me with little insightful data. From this experience, I was more relaxed and treated the interview process more organically and less rigidly.

On January 1st, 2020, I began the process of collecting data on social media. While originally, I intended to collect data on multiple social media platforms—Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, YouTube and TikTok—due to time constraints I only collected data on Twitter.

Sample Description

At the time of the interviews the participants' arithmetic mean age was 23, with a range of 18 to 31. Six males and eight females were interviewed. All identified as CHamoru. All were born and raised on Guam for their entire lives. All consider themselves non-fluent in the CHamoru language. One participant is a graduate student at a university in the United States, and another had an undergraduate degree from the University of Guam. All but two of the rest were college students at the University of Guam (see Table 1 for the breakdown of participant characteristics).

Table 1.

Participant Characteristics

Pseudonyms	Gender	Age	Education
Atan	M	28	College student
Bonitu	M	23	College student
Calla	M	20	College student
Donne'	M	20	College student
Ekungok	F	30	College student
Faisen	F	27	College student
Geftao	F	24	College student
Homhum	F	23	College student
Isao	F	20	College student
Jennifer	F	18	College student
Kareta	M	19	High school diploma
Lamlam	M	18	High school diploma
Metgot	F	31	Graduate student
Na'lå'la'	F	27	Undergraduate degree

Note. Names are pseudonyms.

Data Analysis

Once interviews were transcribed, data analysis began by coding the transcribed

interviews. Coding is a fundamental step in qualitative data analysis, as it involves identifying

underlying patterns within the data through the application of a code (Berg & Lune, 2012). The

code gives the researcher an understanding of how key themes or elements are organized within

a sea of data and allows the researcher to develop explanatory concepts and theories. Often, codes are reduced into categorizes in order to organize the information. Themes are the highest forms of conceptualization and consist of categories. Sometimes categories are treated as themes depending on the researcher and coding process. Coding was done deductively and inductively. Deductive coding involves a top-down approach to coding with the codes already in mind as informed by the literature, while inductive coding involves a bottom-up approach generating codes from the data. Inductive coding is especially important as these codes will reveal new insight not discussed in the academic literature.

The deductive themes identified by the literature are: (1) the relationship between CHamoru language and CHamoru identity, (2) authenticating CHamoru in-group membership, (3) reasons for learning the language, and (4) reasons inhibiting CHamorus from learning the language. The data analysis generated three additional themes: (5) common childhood experiences, (6) awakening, and (7) avoiding CHamoru inauthentication. Here are brief descriptions and examples of the coding process for some of the themes.

The relationship between (1) CHamoru language and identity was based on how the participant perceives the CHamoru language to be connected to CHamoru identity. The theme is conceptualized as containing three categories: *CHamoru language is critical to CHamoru identity, CHamoru language is not critical to identity,* and *emotions towards the language and indigeneity.* While the first two categories impose a false dichotomy between the language being either critical or not important to identity, for analytical and organizational purposes it proved very useful. An example of the coding process from the first category is the code *studying the CHamoru language* which was assigned to utterances made by the participants that embody the essence of that code e.g., "I usually try to make an effort to study the CHamoru language for 20

minutes a week." This code encompasses the first category because I reasoned that participants who willingly invest time to study the language outside of mandatory classes probably believes the CHamoru language to be critical to their CHamoru identity. The category *emotions towards the language* contains an array of different emotions towards the language such as *ambivalence, nostalgia,* and *sorrow.* A coding example, is *sorrow,* which was assigned to any phase that expressed that emotion towards the language e.g., "It will be a sad day to see the language stop being spoken here in the homeland." This code was grouped in the category *emotions towards the language* that I determined to fall under the overarching theme (1) the relationship between the CHamoru language and CHamoru identity.

Authenticating CHamoru in-group membership (2) consisted of several categories and codes: *practicing cultural values, knowledge and understanding of cultural values, knowledge of history, blood/genealogy, being raised or living in the CHamoru lifestyle or culture, language ability, living in the homeland, ethnic consumerism,* and *personal feelings of self-identifying as CHamoru.* The three codes/categories: *practicing cultural values, language ability,* and *blood/genealogy* were deductive codes based on the literature (Monnig, 2007; Souder, 1985). The rest of the codes/categories were found inductively. The theme is based on what participants considered to be important contemporary identifiers, which authenticated CHamoruness. An example of the coding process from the first category *practicing cultural values* is the code *respetu.* This code assigned to each utterance of the word *respetu/respect* or phrases made by the participants that encompassed *respetu.* This code alongside other codes— *inafa'maolek, chenchule', respetu, familia*—was grouped in the category *cultural values,* which I determine to fall under the theme (2) authenticating CHamoru in-group membership.

Deductive codes/categories for the theme (3) reasons for learning the CHamoru language are: *authenticating CHamoru identity, passing on the language to future generations,* and *connecting with CHamoru-speaking family members.* This theme deals with reasons participants desire to learn the language. The theme (4) reasons inhibiting CHamorus from learning the language consist of the codes/categories: *utility, difficulty, mamåhlao, access to resources,* and *lack of a language community.*

The inductive theme (5) common childhood experiences consist of several codes/categories, including: *being raised in an English-speaking household, the social group of the participants mainly speaking English, the participant mainly being exposed to the English language in school and social settings,* and the *participant participating in common CHamoru cultural customs such as funerals, novenas, and fiestas.* The inductive theme (6) awakening consists of several codes/categories: *the participants' initial lack of awareness of CHamoru political and cultural issues, awareness of CHamoru political and cultural issues,* and *experiences that cause participants to become aware of CHamoru political and cultural issues.* An example of the coding process from the third category is the code *education at the University of Guam.* This code assigned to any utterance of the phrases made by the participants that encompassed that code e.g., "I took a class with Professor Hattori that my eyes really opened up." The last theme (7) avoiding CHamoru inauthentication deals with the tendency of participants to avoid inauthenticating their CHamoruness. This theme consists of: *participants deemphasizing particular CHamoru identifiers* and *participants emphasizing particular CHamoru identifiers.*

Ethical Considerations

  A research proposal was submitted to the University of Guam Institutional Review Board. Approval was granted by the Institutional Review Board prior to the data collection. Participants were told in advance via email when the interview would commence, and they received a cover letter that briefly described the intended subject, the type of information sought from the participant, the purpose of the research, how the information given would be used, and the estimated time length of the interview. Before the interview commenced, the researcher gave an informed consent form to the participants. They were also verbally told that that they were under no pressure to answer any question for whatever reason. They were also given time to ask any questions they had any about the subject matter, both prior to the interview and afterwards. All participants signed the informed consent form (see Appendix C).

  The ethics of collecting data on social media is not well established compared to other methods. The most significant issue in social media collection is the blurring of lines between private and public. While users, by virtue of usage of most social media applications, implicitly agree to the terms of agreements/terms of services, which allows the users' data to be publicly available and to third parties; research ethics cannot be ignored (Townsend & Wallace, 2016). As such, I only collected data on publicly set profiles and discussions rather than any private profiles or closed groups.

Limitations of the study

  Perhaps the primary limitation is that the great majority of the participants (10/14) sampled were University of Guam students, and the majority of those are either majoring or minoring in the social sciences. This may have influenced the responses of the participants, as

these participants are more aware of CHamoru rights, history, and CHamoru language issues compared to CHamorus who do not attend the University of Guam. Students attending institutions of higher education may be more equipped to articulate responses to abstract concepts such as identity construction than are people who do not actively study or think about these concepts. That is not to say that someone who is not attending college is incapable of articulating or understanding these concepts. However, it is important to address this issue in how the participants for this study were selected.

Another limitation of this study is the number of participants. Although the purpose of this study is not to generalize the data to all CHamoru Millennials and Gen Z, it is significant to note that the small number of participants may be a limitation of the study. The study interviewed a total of 14 participants, which may not be sufficient to provide an exhaustive compilation of perspectives to give deeper insight into how CHamorus articulate identity through language.

The next limitation of the study is the inherent biases of the researcher. I identify as a CHamoru and I am actively learning the CHamoru language—this was a starting point for this thesis. Furthermore, I am also an advocate for other CHamorus to learn the language. Therefore, my position regarding the perpetuation of the CHamoru language may have unconsciously affected my ability to perform objective research methodologies, data collection, and analysis.

Chapter 3. Results

What Young CHamorus Think About Identity and Language?

This chapter will draw upon the main themes and present the findings which arose out of the interview process and subsequent data analysis. The key themes are: (1) the relationship between CHamoru language and CHamoru identity, (2) authenticating CHamoru in-group membership, (3) reasons for learning the language, and (4) reasons inhibiting CHamorus from learning the language. The data analysis generated three additional themes: (5) common childhood experiences, (6) awakening, and (7) avoiding CHamoru inauthentication.

(1) Common childhood experiences, involves how the CHamoru language was exposed to the participants during the early years of their childhood, which includes everything from language use by parents in the household, how the participants were raised, how often the language was used with and around them, etc. (2) The relationship between CHamoru language ability and identity, involves how CHamoru identity is conceptualized by participants. This includes open descriptive answers on what participants think CHamoru identity is. It includes a range of views towards the CHamoru language. (3) Awakening, is the process by which participants underwent occurrences that resulted in a re-articulation of their identity oriented towards CHamoru indigeneity; this re-articulation can result in participants reconstructing their identity to emphasize CHamoru language ability. (4) Reasons for learning CHamoru, involves the personal justifications that non-fluent young CHamoru gave for why they consider the CHamoru language to be worth perpetuating, despite most not currently being active language learners. (5) Inhibiting factors includes the reasons that prevent non-fluent young CHamorus from learning the CHamoru language. (6) Awakening deals with participants undergoing experiences which led him/her to become more aware of CHamoru political and cultural issues.

(7) Avoiding CHamoru inauthentication, involves the factors that the participants considered to either strengthen or weaken a CHamoru person's identity; these factors, as perceived by the participants, were seen as a means to authenticate or prove one's "CHamoruness" to people within the CHamoru ingroup. These themes were analyzed to explain the data collected regarding young CHamorus and their perspectives towards CHamoru language and its relation to CHamoru identity.

Common childhood experiences

The interview data present a consistent picture of a CHamoru childhood. English was the primary language participants were exposed to in the household, social settings, and schools. The participants' peers were usually not fluent in the CHamoru language. The parents as well as the grandparents, even those fluent in CHamoru, spoke to the participants mainly in English. As Lamlam puts it:

> I was only spoken to in English by my mom and dad. I think 'cause they couldn't speak CHamoru but they were able to understand my grandpa and grandma when they spoke to them in CHamoru… my grandma didn't speak to me in CHamoru either.

For Donne', whose parents were fluent in CHamoru, the only times he heard CHamoru from them was when he was yelled at; "I don't get much [CHamoru exposure] as I used to cause I don't get in trouble as much."

Participants followed the usual CHamoru cultural customs and values of church, fiestas, rosaries, novenas, *fannginge'* etc. There was some expected variation among participants: for example, some participants were more exposed to the CHamoru language in their household than others, and some participants attended church more than others. "I would attend church a lot, like every week with my grandma and grandpa" remarked Atan. One participant, Jennifer, was

unique in that she grew up on a ranch and learned a different skillset than the more urban

participants; "I grew up on a farm, I mean a ranch, I grew up helping my mom to fish, knowing

how to clean the fish and distributing it out to family." In addition, her mom, aunties and uncles

and many of their children are fluent in CHamoru. She can understand CHamoru significantly

better than most of the other participants, but she still is not fluent. Her different upbringing

made her an outlier in the study. The significance will be covered in a later section.

CHamoru Identity Articulated as the "Everyday customs and values"

All the participants' open-ended descriptions of CHamoru identity and culture involved

everyday customs and values such as *chenchule'*, church, fiestas, food, hunting, ranching,

respetu, rosaries, novenas, collectivism and *inafa'maolek*. Here is an excerpt from Faisen:

> For me CHamoru culture is, it's hard to explain, 'cause I haven't been exposed to many
> other culture, so I don't know how to compare, but I guess, CHamoru culture is you...
> you know you're Catholic, go to church, baptize your baby you amen your elders, you
> respect your elders, you don't talk back, you help around the house, if you're a girl you
> do a lot of the cooking, cleaning, taking care of the kids, if you're a guy you do the bush
> cutting, the barbecuing I guess a lot of the hard labor... I guess a lot of other CHamoru
> culture things, there's certain symbols I think associated with being CHamoru, the
> hibiscus, the latte stone, different flowers.

Participants of course vary in what they consider important. For example, Kareta focused on

hunting, fishing and family:

> Living off the land and using what the land gives you to provide… fishing, hunting with
> the spear. You know I go fishing a lot, sometimes with rod and reel, but I like to do spear
> fishing you know… you know it's all about family for me also par, fucken I'm willing to
> do anything for my family… I want to help out my family that's why I want to make
> money so I can make sure no one worries.

Interestingly, some of the participants did not bring up CHamoru language use. The omission is a

telling indicator of whether the participant considered CHamoru language ability important for

their CHamoru identity.

95

The Relationship Between CHamoru Language Ability and CHamoru Identity

The participants expressed a range of views about the relationship between CHamoru language ability and CHamoru identity: some participants saw language ability as an unimportant part of CHamoru identity, while other participants viewed language ability as essential to CHamoru identity. Some participants expressed the view that language ability was critical to their CHamoru identity. Here is an excerpt from Homhum:

> For me personally I believe it's essential for my life, although I identify as CHamoru, I feel like there's some part of me that's not genuine CHamoru cause I didn't make it a point to learn the language… I personally think with like the influence of the social environment the fact that no one really speaks it, and I think that's why I was inclined to not learn it cause none of my peers speaks it.

Identifying herself as a CHamoru who did not make a serious attempt to learn the CHamoru language made her feel like an inauthentic CHamoru. She personally blames herself for not learning the language, despite understanding that her social environment did not provide her with learning opportunities. I then asked her to explain what she means by not feeling like a "genuine CHamoru:"

> I don't feel like... I don't know how to explain it, other than that but basically cause I do identify as CHamoru, I practice the customs of CHamoru like you know the practice of *fannginge'* and all that like I grew up with all that, the language portion is where I'm at a standstill, where I haven't entered that language of the CHamoru culture, and the language in the CHamoru culture in general.

It seems as if she cannot confidently identify as CHamoru unless she knows the language, so to her, language ability is necessary to be a "genuine" CHamoru identity. She is expressing the notion that language is linked to CHamoru identity. As a result of lacking CHamoru proficiency, she feels a sense of inauthenticity in her CHamoru identity. Another participant, Ekungok also believes knowledge of the language and Chamorro identity are linked; "CHamoru identity is language, culture, traditions but I also think it's mostly people and language." Her explicit

response makes it clear that she considers the language critical to CHamoru identity. To confirm this, I asked her if that was the case, and she made it very clear that was so:

> Absolutely, I think the first time one of my brothers sang a CHamoru lyric and I said what's the song from, what does that mean, and he said what kind of CHamoru are you if you don't know what that means…and that really tug on to my heart strings... and I mean why don't I know it, I was in high school, I can sing it but I don't know what that means, definitely I think that language is, I think being CHamoru you should know your language you have to, for me I think it's my duty to learn. I don't think I feel well if I went through my life without trying to speak to my dad.

She revealed that an experience from her adolescent years where her brother questioned her CHamoruness because she could not understand the lyrics to a CHamoru song, profoundly shaped her understanding of the relationship between language and CHamoru identity. Before the incident, she never felt like an inauthentic CHamoru due to lacking CHamoru language proficiency; it was not until her brother questioned her CHamoruness that caused her to re-evaluate her CHamoru identity in light of her lack of language ability. Ekungok ended up re-articulating her understanding of CHamoru identity to include CHamoru language as a crucial component. As a result, she felt inauthentic as a CHamoru for lacking language ability. She includes that speaking the language is not just a matter of asserting her identity, but a duty that she must do as a CHamoru. She mentioned speaking to her dad; "When I spoke a little CHamoru to my dad, his eyes beamed up." Speaking to her dad in CHamoru is another goal. She has the goal to make her dad happy by speaking to him in his native language, after seeing his incredibly elated reaction to her few CHamoru words.

Jennifer considers the language vital as the gateway to culture:

> The language is very, very vital and I feel like if I don't know it that's like… cause I know what really drew me in to wanting to know my culture is my language. I wanted to learn more about what it means to… I don't know there's just something about it the language that's like the start what brings you in.

She attributes her views to her mom who told her the importance of the language "You know my mom always said language is very important it's the start." I then asked her if she considers non-fluent CHamorus as CHamorus. She responds with the essentialist notion that language is necessary for CHamoru identity "We can't speak CHamoru then what are we, are not true CHamorus…just Americans." She uses the term "American" as the alternative to CHamoru because it reflects her feelings that CHamorus are becoming too American. I then questioned if she considers herself a true CHamoru as she is non-fluent herself. "Well…I am CHamoru because…wait that's a good question…well I guess I'm not 100% into the CHamoru culture, but I'm getting there. I'm at least trying." My question made her self-reflective of her essentialist view that the CHamoru language is essential to CHamoru identity. As a result, she must come up with an answer that either does not contradict her ideas of language and identity, thus delegitimizing herself as a CHamoru, or to change her viewpoint of the relationship between language and identity. Jennifer does the former and admits that her CHamoru identity is not completely authentic as she lacks language proficiency, and she resolves the possible anxiety by stating that she "is at least trying." Not every participant, however, considers language ability critical to their identity. For example, here is a statement from Calla:

> I think language is just a fun thing to have because at the end of the day language is just communication and when the majority of the people can't communicate in CHamoru it's not an effective form of communication so I don't put it as high as a priority as something like family.

His conceptualization of language as just a form of communication does not give him an intense desire to learn the language for authenticating his CHamoru identity unlike the other participants. He is not suffering from a feeling of inauthenticity as a non-fluent CHamoru because he rationalizes that the language is "just communication" and no longer an "effective form of communication." He prioritizes other more relevant perceived identifiers of CHamoru identity

over language ability. For him, family is the most relevant CHamoru identifier. This seems to be the trend for many of the participants who do not consider language ability critical to their CHamoru identity, which is evident in many of the participants' open-ended descriptions of Chamoru identity and culture. Several participants did not emphasize or even mention CHamoru language use, while they mentioned other identifiers of CHamoru identity such as *respetu*, *inafa'maolek*, *familia*, food and blood, even though my explanation of the purpose of the project would have alerted them to my interest in CHamoru language use. I quickly noticed this omission, so I probed further to find out how CHamoru language ability relates to their conceptualization of CHamoru identity.

Geftao responded to my questioning of her thoughts on the CHamoru language by saying she always felt she was CHamoru while growing up despite not knowing the language:

> I feel like growing up I didn't know the language fully, I know more now, but growing up I still identified as CHamoru, and there are still things I do with my family, and I have that CHamoru identity with my culture… I learned from my family… it was just like little things from cooking CHamoru dishes and everything I learned that from my family… I don't think knowing the language is necessary, but it does help with you appreciating the culture more. You don't need to know the language to identify as CHamoru. What matters to be CHamoru… if you have any ties to the CHamoru culture, if your family is CHamoru, you get to learn your culture.

She acknowledges that knowing the language will help one appreciate the culture more but finds that one can still identify ethnically as CHamoru without being fluent in the CHamoru language. The theme that language ability is not necessary for CHamoru identity, but it gives the speaker more insight into CHamoru culture is a theme repeated by many of the participants. She reaffirms her CHamoru identity and argues that other things such as having a CHamoru family and knowing the culture is more crucial than knowing the language. She later stated that knowing the language is important, but she reaffirmed that knowing the culture is more valuable:

> I do think it's [language] important but I think you need to have the attitude of… you can learn the language but how can you say you have that CHamoru identity, do you know the actual culture, have you spend time where you can confidently say yeah I have this culture. I may not fully know the language, but I know the culture.

She reacted strongly against the idea of a CHamoru needing to know the language to be considered CHamoru. She separates the language and culture as two different entities. To her the "actual" CHamoru culture is not from speaking the language alone, but from knowing the culture, which seems to be everything else she actually does and considers important to CHamoru culture. This seems like an attempt to authenticate herself as a CHamoru who lacks language proficiency by treating language as something different from the "actual culture." I questioned her further with the goal to find out what made her think the way she thinks. Her response:

> Growing up maybe my answer would have changed if I grew up in an environment where CHamoru language was very important to deal with my identity, but I still found the appreciation of learning my CHamoru identity even without the language…my dad isn't CHamoru, my mom is, I teach her if anything more the words but her culture is still there, the way she respects, her everyday values of being CHamoru are still there...we are now millennials, post millennials even though we don't know the language we can still appreciate it we can still feel special it's so interesting to learn about the history… that's why I will say for CHamoru identity for the language that I can still appreciate my Chamoru identity and the culture even though I don't know the language fully.

She attributes her lack of CHamoru language ability to her environment and speculates that maybe she would consider CHamoru language use more important if she had grown up in an environment where the CHamoru language was more valued and possibly used more, which explains why as an adult she does not consider the use of the CHamoru language as an important part of CHamoru identity. Geftao found her mom to be a role model of a non-fluent CHamoru speaker, which reinforced her sense that CHamoru language ability is not necessary for CHamoru ethnic identity. She even argues that the lack of fluency among Millennials and post-Millennials should not deter them from appreciating CHamoru culture. She argues that language

ability should not serve as a qualifier to being CHamoru as that would disqualify her mother, the majority of young CHamorus, and herself from claiming CHamoru identity. These are attempts to reconcile her belief that language is important for CHamoru identity with her lack of CHamoru speaking ability when her CHamoruness is in questioned.

Kareta offers a similar explanation of his lack of CHamoru language ability, owing to the social environmental he experienced growing up:

> I never thought about speaking CHamoru… cause dude I never was spoken to in CHamoru. I mean maybe I was when I was a baby, but I mean like… if compared to English you know cause that what all I heard. Dude I thought English was fucken CHamoru! Cause CHamorus only spoke English.

His claim that he never thought about speaking CHamoru indicates that his lack of CHamoru speaking ability, and his CHamoru identity, have never been questioned. Therefore, he never had the opportunity to tie CHamoru language ability to his CHamoru identity, which makes him echo the idea that CHamoru is an obstacle to his future plans and economic success:

> To be honest, I don't see anyone speaking CHamoru, I mean it's cool and all if you wanting to get more into the culture. But you know I want to start my own business; I want to travel. I want to go off island and live out there maybe in the States for a bit to check it out you know. But yeah, I think culture is important, the language, the fam [family] pride in our island.

Despite implying that learning CHamoru will interfere with his future plans, he claims the language is important in some abstract cultural sense. He does not seem to suffer from any sense of inauthenticity for lacking CHamoru proficiency because he does not perceive the language as crucial to his CHamoru identity.

Another participant, Donne', expressly denied that CHamoru language use is a key element of CHamoru culture due to the perceived rarity:

> There are some key elements [of CHamoru culture] speech is definitely not one of them. Speech I find one of the rarest things we keep today. But just participating in cultural events, doing fiestas, going to CHamoru village on Wednesdays, I don't know, those

things are like very rooted in our culture. Liberation parade everybody loves those. Just participating in events CHamoru events, doing things that promote the culture or learning about the culture.

Despite denying that the CHamoru language is a key element of CHamoru culture, when later asked why he thought the language is not commonly spoken, he brought up his own personal desire for attaining CHamoru fluency:

> The reason why is 'cause it's not being taught so widely that people should know it's not commonplace, some people actually discourage it... I asked my mom once how come you didn't taught me CHamoru. And she said you wouldn't need it to succeed, to go anymore, to her it's kind of like a luxury, like a hobby, and it makes sense cause you don't get anything really out of it, you get more of a cultural touch a cultural depth. It's nice for some people it's nice for something I want to accomplish… it's something I want to strive for. To kind of get that full CHamoru identity. You want to strive for fluency, but yeah, it's not a luxury [to me], it's something we want to get to, and I definitely think it's important to start teaching the CHamoru language. More CHamoru classes. I definitely strive for CHamoru fluency.

To make his view of the importance of language to CHamoru identity compatible with his non-fluent CHamoru identity, he rationalizes that language ability is important but not *essential* for CHamoru identity. He is wary of making language ability a qualifier as it potentially dismisses himself and many people from identifying as CHamoru. By doing so, he is able to claim CHamoru identity while maintaining his pro-language views.

Interestingly, he contrasts his view of the CHamoru language as something more than a "luxury" with his mom's view that the language is just a luxury, in the sense that language fluency is a bonus element of CHamoru identity but not essential. Unlike a few other participants, he does not completely follow his mother's ideas of language and identity. His mother discouraged the learning of the language because she perceived CHamoru language ability as not contributing to economic success. Donne' mentioned that his parents were older (in their 60s) than most of his peers' parents, so his mother grew up during the time when the English language ideology of success reigned supreme, which explains her language views.

102

However, Donne's view of the language reflects the changing generational view of the CHamoru language. He grew up in a generation where the indigenous expressions of CHamoru identity are increasingly valued, which includes the CHamoru language. The English language ideology of success held by his parents increasingly is challenged by the CHamoru language ideology of authentication espoused by his generation.

When interviewed, Metgot struggled to reconcile her belief that CHamoru language ability is important for identity, with her non-fluency in CHamoru:

> [CHamoru culture], I think, it's absolutely those family ties, is I think one of the main essence of what it means to be CHamoru. Growing up, I think my parents did a really good job to do that…make an effort to show me that was important, right. To go to all the family events. To see all our grandparents regularly…so I knew that it was important. And quickly picked that up. Yeah, I still see that as kind of the essence. As you grow, and in CHamoru class. And seeing all the ancient dances. And all these things and of course the language. You see these are like…extra…unfortunately that's what it feels like to me. Is extra things that I don't practice in my daily life, but are still part of the culture. There's like that elemental, based on the family, social relationships, there's all that extra stuff.

Metgot articulates that the essence of being CHamoru is family and social relationships, while relegating the CHamoru language along with re-created CHamoru dances to non-essential cultural expressions of CHamoru culture. She views the perpetuation of these cultural expressions as a positive thing:

> So, it's really beautiful seeing all these young people learning the language, and taking up seafaring, fishing, and all these traditional type of activities. And really incorporating it into their daily life, even like using that as a form of income for some people…so that's what my, would be for there to be more of an integration of these quote unquote "ancient" and older yeah.

When I questioned if she really considers the language as one of the "extra things" classified along with "ancient" practices, she gave the most puzzling response:

> Yeah, I used to think it [language] was extra. In the way I lived my life it was like additional. Going back to this not thinking about being CHamoru, I just am CHamoru, kind of think. And I am Chamoru. I am CHamoru whether or not I speak CHamoru, but I

> would like to learn myself…I hope I'm not coming off as [the language is] extra, as not
> needed. I think it's needed, but we can function without it…

She appears to be struggling to come to terms with the realization that the language is not as crucial to her CHamoru identity as she had thought. She claims that she used to think of the language as just an extra marker of CHamoruness, yet her statements suggest that she still holds that view. Despite her insistence that the language is important, she talked about the language as if it were just one of the "extra" CHamoru identifiers, similar to dance and weaving. Maybe without realizing it, she was expressing her subconscious view that the language is not so important for her CHamoru identity. Her next thoughts are very puzzling, as Metgot declares that she is CHamoru whether she speaks CHamoru or not, while asserting that she desires to learn the language. Then, she makes a point of insisting that she was not at all implying that the language is some "extra" cultural identifier, but that the language is needed, yet she immediately adds that CHamorus can function without the language. I point out to her that there may be a contradiction:

> No, I know, that's a contradiction. I guess it's what that means, which is
> unfortunate…ahh I guess that's what that means. That it's not needed, but even if it's not
> necessary, I still think it's important. That's the fine line, I think.

Like several of the participants, she is struggling to come to terms on the one hand with the belief that language is important to CHamoru identity, and on the other hand, with her own lack of CHamoru ability. Metgot does not want to disqualify herself as a CHamoru, thus she rationalizes that language ability is important but not *essential* for CHamoru identity. After, further thinking she concludes:

> Even though I don't speak CHamoru, I don't doubt for one second, my sense of being
> CHamoru as part of my identity. I don't experience that identity conflict, that questioning
> of who I am. Like that's not there. You know what I mean, it just is.

She rejects CHamoru language as an authenticator for her CHamoru identity and seems

confident that she is CHamoru without the need for CHamoru language ability. She will continue

to maintain the view that language is important for CHamoru identity, just maybe not as critical

as she believed.

Awakening

Many of the participants experienced what I termed an awakening, which is a raised level

of consciousness towards their indigenous CHamoru identity, history, and CHamoru rights

issues, from a previous valueless, ignorant or even hostile state of mind towards these issues. For

example, Atan explains his awakening from being an uncaring CHamoru to being more aware:

> For most of my life I really did not care about CHamoru related issues. Like if you asked
> me in high school what does it mean to be CHamoru, I would have just told you it
> doesn't matter to me. I was more worried about other things in life than that. I didn't start
> caring and thinking about CHamoru rights issues until till like a couple of years ago. I
> attribute this to several things, individuals namely Bevacqua and Dr. J. [Johnson], they
> had such a profound impact on my thoughts and understanding. Cause honestly, I would
> not have given a shit about CHamorus and local issues.

Up until his education at the University of Guam, CHamoru issues were not a value to Atan. He

attributes a large portion of his change to the UOG professors, Dr. Bevacqua and Dr. Johnson, in

shaping his thoughts. He adds that he did not consider the language critical to his identity until

recently:

> It wasn't till late last year to the start of this year that I started understanding the language
> to be more than just an aspect of CHamoru culture. Cause in the beginning when I
> became more aware of CHamoru issues such as decolonization, the Dave Davis case, I
> was of course you know thinking that yeah, the language is important, but I didn't need to
> speak it to be CHamoru. Or to feel CHamoru. That's what I thought at the time. And in
> fact, I would even talk shit about CHamorus who feel that the language is such an
> important thing to preserve and perpetuate among CHamorus. Because I know that
> CHamoru culture is not dependent on speaking CHamoru. Culture is not static it's
> supposed to be flexible. Which means language is not essential to CHamorus but it is of
> course important. That's at least how I justified it. And I know several CHamorus who
> held those same thoughts.

I questioned him further to find out what changed his view, and he brought it back to individuals and education:

> There were many things that caused my shift, and again I will go back to that it was more on the individuals Bevacqua, Dr. J., Anne Hattori. Their influence on me was substantial. The education I received particularly from classes from them also. Cause I learned so many things about Guam, Micronesia this region that I wouldn't have learned otherwise. It wasn't necessarily the University of Guam, but those individuals cause I'm pretty sure a business major isn't going to experience an awakening.

As a result of the awakening of his indigenous CHamoru identity, he began to construct his CHamoru identity to further include the importance of CHamoru language ability. This would be a common experience for many of the participants. They described in some way or form an awakening which led to them to re-articulate their CHamoru identity with greater consciousness towards their indigeneity. They became more aware of indigenous issues of land rights, representation in history, and language revitalization. The importance of education is key factor in this process. Similar to Diego's (2010) finding, education is an important influence for causing an awakening among the participants. Participants were exposed to pro-American education and their family members reinforced these pro-American narratives up until they started taking classes at UOG. Experiencing for the first time, articulated counter-canonical narratives must have been a shock to them. Similarly, Bonitu says education at the University of Guam made him more conscious:

> In high school I learned about my language and history in classes. But like it wasn't until UOG, when I took a class with Professor Hattori that my eyes really opened up. I learned so much about Guam, the history, how we were colonized. These issues of land is so important. CHamorus shouldn't sell their land, they must keep it to pass it down for their grandchildren. The language is dying, and we are not doing enough to stop it. And it's all cause of the damn colonizers. We must protect the land, culture and language because it is the heritage of ancestors. We can't just throw it away.

Bonitu attributes specifically Professor Hattori as the individual who helped him experience an awakening. The fact individuals mentioned certain professors and classes, means that it probably

depends on what type of education the participants received for having an awakening. For example, participants probably would not experience an awakening if they took classes in the environmental science or agriculture programs. However, education at the University of Guam is not the only pathway for participants to experience an awakening. Some participants experienced an awakening at relatively younger ages during high school.

Calla explains that he started becoming aware of indigenous issues early in high school: "I've been aware of the indigenous issues at a young age, maybe like beginning of high school." He credits his parents for his awareness, "I was really exposed to counter-canonical views of CHamoru culture from both my parents, who were both very active in the practicing of CHamoru culture." He remembers how he was so indignant at how people were so accepting of the colonizers' narratives of history, "I remembered thinking a lot of the situations that we were in as a result of our history was unfair and I also didn't particularly like how so many people just accepted and believed a history that was told to them by previous colonizers." Calla's narrative attributes his awakening to his parents and reinforces the argument that particular individuals are the catalysts of awakenings. Another participant Na'lå'la' shares her experience of becoming awakened:

> You know what, Melvin Won Pat Borja is an amazing like word smith. And so, what he did, he's a teacher, he was a teacher at Southern High when I was there, and I took him for creative writing. So, he would actually…when the military buildup started happening he would bring these articles to class and he would ask us questions like how do you feel about this. This is affecting your generation…here I am I'm 27 years old and this is 10 years later and I'm looking at how much Guam has changed when I was 17. And he was right. You know, he was saying that if we don't do something now, if we don't keep fighting for what's ours, for what's right you know what's going to be left of the CHamoru people.

Na'lå'la' attributes her awakening to the influence of her high school teacher, Melvin Won Pat Borja. This was a common experience for many of the participants. They variously described an awakening, which led to them to re-articulate their CHamoru identity with greater appreciation

107

for their indigeneity. They gained increased awareness of indigenous issues of land rights, representation in history, and language revitalization. Embracing their indigenous identity made them feel the full emotional impact of colonization, at least initially.

Although some began to consider language ability as integral to their CHamoru identity, other CHamorus however, as mentioned earlier, experienced an awakening but did not follow the same path to language learning or adopting the CHamoru nationalists' positions on immigration and self-determination. Interestingly, a CHamoru can experience a heightened sense of their CHamoru identity, but then experience another change that makes them question the importance of CHamoru language fluency for their renewed identity. Calla embodies this:

> In the early onset of the journey to discovering my CHamoru identity I held language fluency as a high priority. It wasn't until later that I realized that while learning CHamoru is a priority, it means nothing if I don't practice the values that my CHamoru culture perpetuates first.

While initially Calla believed language ability to be an important part of his CHamoru identity, a later experience probably made him reevaluate the role the language plays in CHamoru identity. He eventually came to see that practicing CHamoru values is more critical than the language alone.

These young CHamorus are able to feel a sense of indigeneity and CHamoruness within Guam's multicultural society, without fully endorsing immigration control and CHamoru self-determination. While these young CHamorus do not perceive their advocacy of the CHamoru language and culture as violating the multi-cultural order, some perceive immigration restrictions or the CHamoru-only vote to be a form of discrimination, thus violating the multi-cultural liberal order.

Desiring the Language

Regardless of the participants' ideas about the relationship between CHamoru language ability and CHamoru identity, all the participants expressed the desire to learn CHamoru. There were common reasons invoked for desiring to learn the language: authenticating CHamoru identity, passing on the language to the future, and connecting with CHamoru-speaking family members. In one interview exchange with Donne', when I asked why he thought the language is not as commonly spoken, he brought up his own personal desire for attaining CHamoru fluency:

> The reason why is 'cause it's not being taught so widely that people should know it's not commonplace, some people actually discourage it... I asked my mom once how come you didn't taught me CHamoru. And she said you wouldn't need it to succeed, to go anymore, to her it's kind of like a luxury, like a hobby, and it makes sense cause you don't get anything really out of it, you get more of a cultural touch a cultural depth. It's nice for some people it's nice for something I want to accomplish… [CHamoru fluency] it's something I want to strive for. To kind of get that full CHamoru identity. You want to strive for fluency, but yeah, it's not a luxury [to me], it's something we want to get to, and I definitely think it's important to start teaching the CHamoru language. More CHamoru classes. I definitely strive for CHamoru fluency.

Donne' believes that the ability to speak CHamoru will allow him to attain a "full CHamoru identity." He is espousing the idea that the CHamoru language is an authenticator of CHamoru identity and that somehow knowledge of the CHamoru language makes one more legitimately CHamoru. This idea of language as an authenticator of CHamoruness is a common idea. It is derived from the commonsensical essentialist understanding of culture, which views language as naturally linked to culture, ethnicity, and even history. Participants commonly connect language ability to various degrees of CHamoru identity authentication.

> I don't think knowing the language is necessary, but it does help with you appreciating the culture more. (Geftao)

> To be honest, I don't see anyone speaking CHamoru, I mean it's cool and all if you wanting to get more into the culture. (Kareta)

Talking in CHamoru, chanting, you know… feel, become really CHamoru through all that stuff. (Lamlam)

The language is very, very vital and I feel like if I don't know it that's like… cause I know what really drew me in to wanting to know my culture is my language. (Jennifer)

CHamoru identity is a puzzle piece, and the language is the big center piece that completes the puzzle. (Isao)

Although I identify as CHamoru, I feel like there's some part of me that's not genuine CHamoru cause I didn't make it a point to learn the language… (Homhum)

Geftao, Kareta, and Lamlam seemed to give more weight to CHamoru language fluency as a marker of authentic CHamoru identity, than do the other three participants. Those first three participants maintained their stance that the language is critically important for their CHamoru identity throughout the interview, while another participant, Metgot, changed her view of the language by the end of the interview. It appears the participants' views of the language as an important authenticator of identity is related to their emotional and sentimental feelings about the language. Isao, for example, made this emotionally-laden statement about the language:

It's important, I can't explain it other than I know it's important for our culture. CHamoru has been spoken here in the Marianas for what over 3000 years only to see it dying. And it makes me really emotional because we going to lose it. I'm frustrated at this and I know that not everyone would agree with me on this, but the language is such an important part of who we are, and to connect with the CHamoru spirit.

Her statement is driven by her belief that the language "is the big center piece that completes the [CHamoru identity] puzzle." Desire to pass on the language to children is another reason why participants value the language. Faisen expressed this sentiment:

I really don't want to see the language to die… I think it's really a sad thing to see the day come when no one can speak CHamoru. I do want to learn the language, to pass on something to my kids. If I do have kids one day, I want to pass them on the culture, the language.

As mentioned already, her feelings of preventing the death of the language comes from the common essentialist ideas of culture and language, which hold that the CHamoru language is

naturally linked to CHamoru culture. Her last sentence supports this idea as she uses the term culture synonymously with language. By letting the language die, it follows that an essential part of CHamoru culture is gone. In the latter half of her statement, Faisen desires her future kids to know the language. This is a common sentiment amongst several participants, which again reflects the view that language is naturally linked to culture. Participants believe that the language will make their kids more authentically CHamoru than if they were non-fluent. Na'lå'la' is the only participant with a child, and she wants her child to know the language. While she does not believe the language is critical for her own CHamoru identity, she views the language as important enough for her child to learn:

> I know that language is extremely important and that's why I want my son to go to Guahan[27] Academy… because I want him to be submerged. That's what they say is the best way to learn a language, to just submerged yourself completely with the language. That's what I want him to do (Na'lå'la').

Several participants mentioned connecting with CHamoru-speaking family members as a reason why they desire to learn CHamoru. For example, Homhum makes CHamoru fluency her goal in order to converse with her grandparents before they die, "before I turn 30 one of my goals is to become fluent with the hope of carrying on a conversation with my grandparents before they pass on." This is motivated by the idea that speaking to a person in their native language is like speaking to their heart; also, because it will make her grandparents happy. Another participant, Ekungok, shares a similar goal with her CHamoru-speaking father. She mentioned speaking to her dad: "When I spoke a little CHamoru to my dad, his eyes beamed up." She has the goal of speaking to him in his native language, because she saw how incredibly elated he was when she spoke a few words to him. "I don't think I feel well if I went through my life without trying to speak to my dad." For Ekungok, the combination of her belief that the

---

[27] Na'la'la' probably meant to say Chief Hurao Academy rather than Guahan Academy because Guahan Academy is not a CHamoru language immersion school, while Chief Hurao Academy is.

language is critical to her CHamoruness and her wish to make her father happy were the two primarily reasons why Ekungok desired to learn the language.

Factors Inhibiting Learning CHamoru

There are several factors invoked by the participants that inhibited the learning of CHamoru: utility, difficulty, *mamåhlao*, access to resources, and lack of a language community. Many participants questioned the usefulness of learning CHamoru:

> I think language is just a fun thing to have because at the end of the day language is just communication and when the majority of the people can't communicate in CHamoru it's not an effective form of communication so I don't put it as high as a priority as something like family, something I engage with every day because the CHamoru language I will only really need it if I'm talking to my parents or someone older than me like a manamko and with that it's not high on my priority list because it's not used as much but if CHamoru was used more often then it becomes more of an intense and keystone part of the culture because that's what you need in order to get to your ends. (Calla)

Calla does not prioritize the CHamoru language because he does not use it often. He does not perceive the language to be useful. The fact that as mentioned before he experienced an awakening demonstrates that it does not necessarily always lead to believing the CHamoru language to be critical to identity. Another participant Kareta, believes the language is important, but does not find it useful for his goals:

> To be honest, I don't see anyone speaking CHamoru, I mean it's cool and all if you wanting to get more into the culture. But you know I want to start my own business; I want to travel. I want to go off island and live out there maybe in the States for a bit to check it out you know. But yeah, I think culture is important, the language, the fam [family] pride in our island.

In his mind, the language will not help him in achieving his goals. I probed further to find out how his thoughts would change if more people started speaking CHamoru:

> If more people started using the language, I would take pride from that. Keep the culture alive, that would be awesome you know to hear CHamoru more used than it is now… if my cousins, friends, everyone was using CHamoru I would try to speak it as well. Cause

I think it would be cool if say I went to Kings [Restaurant] and you know I ordered in CHamoru and they took my order in CHamoru.

Kareta makes it clear that a big motivator would be if he saw people around him using the language. Difficulty is another reason expressed. Kareta states:

You know, prim, CHamoru is hard to learn, I remember back when I was taking CHamoru classes in school and I didn't understand it you know. And even the teacher would sometimes not understand what she was teaching as well.

He recalls the difficulty he had learning CHamoru in a class setting and noted that the teacher struggled as well. Kareta mentions that he does not have enough time to learn the language, "Par… I'm just so busy man, I work fucken every day, and I'm going to school, and I got to do all the family shit, I honestly don't have time right now." Saying that he lacks the time to learn CHamoru indicates that the language is not a priority. Kareta does not want to explicitly admit that the language is not a priority, so he saves face through the excuse of claiming busyness. If the language were a significant priority in his life, he would make the time for it. But it is not, because learning CHamoru is not useful to achieve his goals of opening a business. When I asked him if he had more free time would he learn the language, he responded "fuck yeah." There was probably no point in asking this question because every young CHamoru would answer affirmatively.

Several other participants use busyness as an excuse for viewing the language as a non-priority because it is not useful in their lives:

I'm so busy with my schoolwork, it's all I've been focusing on. (Faisen)

I have to admit that there's so much going on in my life right now… from family… school… work… I really do want to speak CHamoru though. (Geftao)

My life is a mess right now and I would like to get everything sorted out before take learning CHamoru seriously. (Lamlam)

113

Participants also expressed *mamåhlao* (shame) as an inhibiting factor. Participants felt

anxiety at even attempting to speak CHamoru in front of a native CHamoru speaker, especially

older strangers. Here is an excerpt made by Bonitu:

> I'm learning CHamoru, and I know that I'll only retain or actually learn the language if I use it. Cause there's a saying if you don't use it you will lose it. So, I try to use CHamoru as often as I can especially if another person speaks CHamoru. But I find myself always hesitating to try to speak to someone in CHamoru because I start feeling tense, I'm not sure how to describe it, like it's like before you ride a roller coaster, you feel all this jitters in you. And I'm only like this really with speaking to CHamorus who are older than me and who I don't really know. When it's with other people my age who are learning the language, you know I'm good with that. Even if it's my grandparents I'm at ease too because I grew up with them.

Some participants mentioned a lack of language learning resource as an inhibiting factor.

Homhum made this point:

> I wish there was more CHamoru material out there. Like books in CHamoru, maybe movies in CHamoru because I use 'Learning CHamoru' [website], social media, dictionary but you know those aren't enough to fully become fluent in CHamoru.

They perceive that there is a lack of available material. Lack of a language community is another

inhibiting factor. Faisen articulates this:

> Of course, my grandma and grandpa know CHamoru, but it's different to speak to them than people my age. I wish there was a way to get people my age to speak it. You know, I be more comfortable speaking CHamoru with people my age, but there's not that I know of any CHamoru youth clubs. I mean of course UOG has the CHamoru club, but they don't really speak CHamoru in there, it's not specially meant for the language learning. What I wish for is to have people my age to speak in CHamoru.

Expressing CHamoru identity through other avenues

Participants expressed their CHamoru identity through other avenues than language. For

example, Kareta feels the most CHamoru when he is fishing:

> When I'm fishing, I feel like I'm in more in touch with my culture and the ancient CHamorus. You know I read that they were master at fishing. Like that they can dive in the water and hold their breath. Whenever I spear fish, I like to imagine myself like in the ancient times.

Since it is commonly noted that the pre-contact CHamorus were good at fishing, Kareta connects his fishing practices to the pre-contact CHamorus. Lamlam pointed to his sinahi and said "This shows everyone, the whole world that I'm CHamoru. And I'm proud to be CHamoru even if I can't speak CHamoru." The sinahi is a contemporary symbol of CHamoru identity which functions as an ethnic boundary marker, thus Lamlam is able to express CHamoruness without the need for the language. Faisen also expresses her CHamoru identity through ethnic self-ornamentation and consumerism:

> I do feel like I'm CHamoru without the language. I guess by like certain things that I wear, by supporting local, I support local brands, I buy Guam brands, Chamoru things with patterns, bamboo bracelet you know those jewelry stuff.

She personally associates expressing her CHamoruness through wearing presumably CHamoru jewelry and patterned clothing, as well as through the act of supporting local businesses, artists, and fashion. Faisen can show off her CHamoru identity to other people this way. Geftao feels that she is expressing her CHamoru identity through the everyday customs and values:

> We don't necessarily need the language to show that we are CHamoru. We do it already every time you amen an auntie, showing respect, help a relative out at a fundraiser like a bar night or carwash to fundraise for someone's medical bill who needs to go off island. And… when you help cook for parties and all that. I think the language is one aspect of that CHamoru identity, but our generation doesn't know the language cause our elders didn't teach us. So, you, I don't like it when the older CHamorus put blame on our generation for not speaking when they didn't speak it to us. So, it's not our fault we don't have that aspect of CHamoru identity. But being CHamoru is more than speaking CHamoru, it's everything that we do.

Geftao articulates that language is only one expression of CHamoru identity. Through everyday actions one also expresses that they are CHamoru. This was implied by several other participants, the idea that they are consciously or unconsciously expressing their CHamoruness through their everyday actions. Atan mentions that he expresses his CHamoru identity through photography:

Even though I do think language is one way to express cultural identity, cause I wasn't raised with the language prior to actively learning the language I found through art, specifically photography, I can express my cultural identity. I express that one of the reasons why I look for other avenues. Language was absent in my upbringing.

Since the language was absent in his upbringing, he uses photography as a vehicle to express his CHamoru identity, presumably through taking photos of CHamoru people and cultural objects. Jennifer believes when she is ranching, she expresses her true CHamoru identity:

I feel the most CHamoru when, I know…I am working on the ranch. There's something that's just pure, when, I don't know how to explain it, it's like a feeling, it's hard to put it in words. When I start to grow tinanom [plants]. Fishing, you know all those stuff etc.

CHamoru Language on Social Media

A scroll through the social media platforms, Instagram and Twitter, reveals the incorporation of CHamoru words in biographies and usernames of young CHamorus, which signify their CHamoru identity to everyone on social media. Examples of Twitter handles include: @minatatnga, @sipution, @pulanhu, @kiridagrel, @youngbiha, @cheludude_670, @taotaomunya. Examples of Twitter usernames include: MESNGON, Bonita, MATATNGA, ANITI, Guinaiya, Masakåda, Pulan (me). These young CHamorus use the CHamoru language, more specifically usernames with CHamoru words, as a form of ethnic self-identification online because it makes their indigenous identity known, on social media, which has several advantages. Their posts about CHamoru political, social, and cultural issues are more legitimized in the eyes of other young CHamorus. There is a feeling of solidarity among other fellow CHamorus. Their identity as CHamorus is authenticated online. Lastly, there is much social capital to gain. There appears to be an trend among young CHamorus to claim and embrace their indigeneity, which the 2016 Guam FestPac further energized, in which ethnic consumerism and

116

recreated CHamoru art forms are increasingly popular methods of signaling CHamoru identity, and where awakenings to indigeneity and knowledge of the colonial history are more frequent. These indigenous online users are capitalizing on the currency of indigeneity and gaining immense social capital through social media likes, retweets, followers and influence.

Although I did not do a quantitative analysis of the differences in users posting about CHamoru and general indigenous issues, between those who use CHamoru words in their social media profile and those who do not, my impression is that social media users with CHamoru words in their usernames are more likely to have posted about CHamoru indigenous issues. For example, here are several Twitter posts from the popular (2,000-plus followers as of 2020) young CHamoru Twitter profile @youngbiha:

> Indigenous Chamoru feminism is not the patriarchy run by women (Chan freska, 2020).

> Can all diaspora Chamorus do us non-voting Marianas Chamorus a favor and please not vote for any more war-mongering imperialist leaders in the states? If you can't make it home pls at least help us to protect our land and waters from rapid militarization. SYM love y'all [heart emoji]. (Chan freska, 2020).

> I've spent the last 10 years fighting against it. From Pagan, Litkyan, Magua and Tailalo to Tinian and Pagan. I will continue to fight for our land, water, and [sic] dignity, peace and safety of our people. We deserve so much more what the EIS laid out for us. (Chan freska, 2020).

It appears the use of the CHamoru language online is the next evolutionary step for the CHamoru language. On social media, the CHamoru language has great utility for young CHamorus. Young CHamorus do not actually need to become proficient in the CHamoru language to benefit from the use of it, as it only requires minimum knowledge to put CHamoru words in their profile username or biography. Based on the brief anecdotal information I collected, a comprehensive analysis of online use of the CHamoru language would be valuable, but beyond the scope of the thesis research.

Expressions of Indigeneity

Throughout the interviews, all the participants invoked claims of indigeneity in some form, connecting the language and people to the land. Here are some instances by the participants:

You know our language is the language of our island. (Lamlam)

We can't find CHamoru [language] anywhere else in the world, but only on Guam. (Isao)

It [The CHamoru language] is a unique cultural heritage by the CHamorus. (Geftao)

Our [CHamoru] language has been spoken for thousands of years in the Marianas islands. (Jennifer)

We [CHamorus] are the original people of the Marianas, our language is special to our people. (Ekungok)

There is recognition by the participants that CHamorus have a unique connection to the land that no other ethnic groups can claim. As a result of this unique connection, several participants expressed to some degree a conviction that the CHamoru culture and language should be revived, protected, and perpetuated on Guam:

The language is dying, and we are not doing enough to stop it. (Bonitu).

Of course, we should protect the CHamoru language! Why the hell wouldn't we? CHamoru is the native language of the CHamorus who are the original people of the Marianas. (Lamlam)

I definitely think it's important to start teaching the CHamoru language. More CHamoru classes. (Donne')

I think more efforts should be made by the people to preserve our culture. (Ekungok)

It will be a sad day to see the language stop being spoken here in the homeland and CHamoru in general…we definitely need to protect our language from dying. (Homhum)

When I asked some of the participants whether Filipino languages and culture should have the same institutionalization and privilege as the CHamoru language and culture on Guam, all

118

disagreed with Filipino language and culture meriting the same treatment as the CHamoru

language and culture, based on Filipinos' lack of indigeneity:

> Why should we learn Filipino par? This is Guam you know not the Philippines. (Kareta).

> That seems really unfair that CHamorus should be taught Filipino, when we can barely speak our own language. I'm not trying to be racist or anything but this is Guam the land of the CHamorus…the Filipinos already have their land and language. (Bonitu)

> I'm not sure if Filipino should be on the same level as CHamoru for the simple fact that they are not the indigenous people of Guam. (Donne')

> Hell no! The Marianas is home to the CHamorus not home of the Filipinos! (Atan)

> No…Filipinos are not the indigenous people of Marianas, they chose to come here, unlike the CHamoru people who are the indigenous people. (Calla)

> I don't think Tagalog should be taught in schools, like as in having classes in Tagalog like CHamoru…we are already having a hard time speaking CHamoru why should we now add Tagalog. (Jennifer)

I asked Jennifer if it is fair that young Filipinos and other ethnic groups must take compulsory

CHamoru classes in the public schools. She responded with an argument of cultural assimilation:

> CHamoru is the language of Guam, and the whole Marianas. Isn't it common sense that if you move to another country you're going to have to learn the language of the people there? If I live in Japan, I'm of course going to learn Japanese. People need to understand that the CHamorus went through so much trauma from colonization, so at least help us learn our language again.

She espoused the commonsensical idea that the native language of the geographic area is what an

immigrant must learn in order to live in the area.

Overall, participants argued that because Filipino languages are not indigenous languages

of the Marianas, they should not have the same privilege as the CHamoru language and culture.

Participants recognized the CHamoru language as deserving a special status on Guam, different

from other ethnic languages. These young CHamorus argue that because CHamorus are the

indigenous people of Guam, the CHamoru language should either be protected, revived, and

perpetuated on Guam. Land is another issue that many participants say is important to CHamorus because of indigeneity:

> Check out that white guy man, he was able to sue, sue, this white freaking man…Damn Dave Davis…real talk how dare he come over to our land and claim hey how come I'm not CHamoru and I don't get land, I don't know cause you have 51 fucken states that you can go get land. Dude, land is so scarce what are we going to do, just try to give it out for free. You don't see me going to the Philippines and asking for freakin land…we are a minority in our own homeland. So especially with being a minority why is it so hard to give us what's rightfully ours. (Na'lå'la')

While she did not give the specific name, Na'lå'la' was describing the lawsuit against the CHamoru Land Trust, in which Dave Davis, a non-CHamoru, sued the Government of Guam on the grounds that the Land Trust gave racial preferential treatment to CHamorus. Na'lå'la' disagreed for reasons of indigeneity as she naturally connected the land to the CHamoru people. Furthermore, she is enraged because she knows that CHamorus are a minority in their own homeland, so she finds the lawsuit to add further harm to the precarious position of the CHamoru segment of the population.

How CHamorus View Immigration and CHamoru Self-Determination?

Participants believe that the indigenous people of Guam are the CHamorus; therefore, CHamorus' language and culture ought to be recognized and protected. While arguments from indigeneity were used for the issues of cultural protectionism, I sought to find out if these arguments were espoused for immigration control and CHamoru self-determination to understand the ideological forces between the connection of CHamoru nationalism and indigeneity. Immigration and CHamoru self-determination are contentious issues on the island and participants' feelings and positions on these issues may reveal their latent ideologies.

Many of the participants appeared generally unaware of the CHamoru nationalist position on how potential demographic changes in Guam could impact the political position of CHamorus on Guam. For example, when I asked Homhum what she thought about the demographic shift and what it could potentially mean for CHamorus on Guam, she asked me to explain what I meant by this:

> Interviewer: Some CHamorus believe that immigration is leading to CHamorus becoming the minority on the island, well I mean they are already the minority. I believe the 2010 census said that CHamorus are now 37% of the population on the island. So, some CHamorus say that this is leading to a weakening of CHamoru cultural and political institutions on Guam as CHamorus become less and less. So, the argument goes that CHamorus needs to take control of its immigration to protect the CHamoru culture and political power.

Her subsequent response shows that she is unaware about the issue.

> Homhum: This is the first time I really heard something about it. Or other people coming to Guam being put in the context like how you're putting. I really don't have a response to what you're saying.

Another participant, Ekungok, also appeared unaware of the CHamoru nationalist concern on immigration, when I explained it to him: "I don't know what to think because I never heard about this, but it's really concerning. It's a lot to take in." While for most participants it was the first time someone confronted them with these questions, as they developed their thoughts during the course of the interview, some of them responded by describing CHamorus as a welcoming people:

> We are a warm and accepting people. What do they call it, the hafa adai spirit, though really it's inafa'maolek this cultural idea that we are helping each other and being very welcoming. We can't stop people from coming over to Guam, that's just wrong. So many people call Guam their home and made it their home. (Isao)

Isao connects the cultural value of *inafa'maolek* to the idea that CHamorus are a welcoming people. As a result of her reasoning, accepting immigrants is an extension of *inafa'maolek*. In addition, she finds it morally wrong to deny immigrants the chance to make

121

their home on Guam. When I explained the nationalist reasoning that CHamorus may lose their cultural and political power on Guam, she did not seem too concerned:

> We will continue to be CHamoru you know, even if we are the minority on the island. As long as we keep up the culture and understand who we are. It's not [un]til we forget who we are…our culture, our values, the language, then we will just be American identity.

To Isao, what is important is the maintenance of the collective CHamoru identity. She does not seem overly concerned about the demographic shift and what it may mean to the contemporary CHamoru socio-political order on Guam. Perhaps it is because she is ill informed about what exactly the consequences may be. More likely it is because of her acceptance of American liberalism, which causes her to have a strong association between immigration control and her perception of the cultural value of *inafa'maolek*.

One participant had a particularly strong reaction to the idea of controlling immigration. "What are we going to do?" exclaimed Bonitu. "We can't just kick off the Chuukese and Filipinos off the island. This is also their home! The nicest people I met are Filipinos! I don't want to make CHamorus on top at the expense of everyone else you know." His gut reaction to the CHamoru nationalist position on immigration was connecting it to ideas of CHamoru ethnic superiority and ethnic cleansing of non-CHamorus. When I explained to him the position does not necessarily mean CHamoru superiority, ethnic cleaning of non-CHamorus, or a complete immigration halt, he insisted either way it was not right:

> Well okay, glad they don't want to kick people off the island…but still it's not good, man, to stop people from wanting to make Guam their home. They want to better their lives, let them…if it starts becoming a problem for the CHamorus we'll deal with it.

Bonitu's position stems from living in a multi-cultural society and is influenced by a particular interpretation of American liberalism, where discourses of controlling immigration are viewed as un-American and racist. However, not all the participants opposed the CHamoru nationalist view

of controlling immigration. Atan found the issue of immigration to be a serious concern for

CHamorus:

> CHamorus should be gravely concerned about their lack of say in Guam's immigration policy…Not having the ability to regulate immigration means we don't have a collective say regarding who comes and goes in Guam and the subsequent effects that migrants play in our community. Do I have Filipino or Micronesian friends? Yes. Do settlers positively contribute to our community? Yes, however, immigration is a separate issue altogether. More specifically, the lack of immigration control and the ability to regulate immigration is what concerns me.

Interestingly, Atan felt the need to add that he has non-CHamoru friends and to recognize non-

CHamoru contributions to Guam. He says this because he does not want to appear racist, in light

of the decades of American liberal influence that pushed the idea that control of immigration is

racist and anti-American.

Many participants disagreed with the idea that only CHamorus or native inhabitants

should be allowed to vote in a self-determination referendum. The underlying reason is their

adherence to the liberal ideal of equality. From this perspective, limiting the electorate to one

ethnic group on a decision that affects the entire community would be considered discrimination.

Participants reasoned that since Guam is also home to non-CHamorus, all groups should have the

right to participate in a decision that affects everyone:

> If we decolonized from the US, this is a decision that affects everyone, so everyone should be allowed to vote. (Donne')

> I think it's pretty discriminatory that only CHamorus can vote. Guam is home to other communities who also pay taxes and contribute to our island. Why would we want to leave them out? (Lamlam)

Other participants agreed with the CHamoru nationalist position on self-determination. They

expressed that only CHamorus should be allowed to vote in a self-determination referendum. For

example, Calla felt that the right of self-determination belongs to the CHamorus because they are

the indigenous people:

Self-determination the right to choose your own political status, is a right that belongs to the indigenous people of Guam.

When I asked him if it would be unfair to non-CHamorus, he said:

Well that's one way to look at it, but you need to understand that when their parents or grandparents came here, they should have known. They came here as a result of the colonial status because they wanted to better their lives. You say it's unfair to people who are non CHamorus, but is it fair to CHamorus?

Calla's argument is commonly espoused by CHamoru nationalists. He flips the fairness argument upside down by applying it to the CHamorus. He questions whether it is fair that other settlers have the right to self-determination when they came to Guam because of the colonial status. A similar answer was unsurprisingly echoed by Atan:

I support CHamorus having the right to choose. CHamorus were willing to compromise by allowing the native inhabitants clause as opposed to a CHamoru only vote which opened CHamoru self-determination to non-CHamorus.

These participants, Calla and Atan, reason that the right of self-determination belongs to the CHamorus as they are the indigenous people of Guam who experienced colonization, unlike the other people living on Guam. Other participants did not have an opinion because they were uninformed and did not feel like they were able to give their opinion. For example, Faisen said: "I want to be honest, I don't want to say anything because I don't have a firm understanding of the topic." Another participant Jennifer expressed a similar sentiment as Faisen: "Hmm. I have no idea what to say. Please teach me."

Although the participants argue that the indigenous people of Guam are the CHamorus and the culture and language ought to be promoted and the land protected, the majority of them do not connect it to the CHamoru nationalist position of controlling immigration and a CHamoru-only vote on a self-determination referendum. The majority find the current multicultural model and ethnic diversity a normal reality of Guam. As a result of the influence of

American liberalism and the multicultural ideology, many participants connected the CHamoru

nationalist positions on immigration and self-determination to inequality and discrimination.

When confronted, participants tap into these equality discourses that they are familiar with,

because they are generally unaware or uninformed about the nuances of the nationalist position

on immigration and self-determination. Participants do not want to appear racist in the face of

prevalent equality discourses on Guam. The equality discourses and fear of appearing racist are

so powerful that even Atan, who argued for control of immigration, had to navigate these

discourses carefully by saying he had non-CHamoru friends and talking about non-CHamoru

contributions to the community. Atan clarified that "most people would consider [his] rhetoric as

racist because people assume anything involving immigration policy means excluding one group

based on race." He went on to add:

> Immigration policies and race issues, while connected, are distinctly separate issues. One can be concerned with his ethnic group's shrinking demographics due to limited control of immigration policies without holding discriminatory views about settler groups present in Guahan. Furthermore, I think CHamorus should concern themselves more with the reality of such open-door immigration policies and the implications of these policies in regards to the future of CHamoru presence in Guam's government and elsewhere. Again, it's not that I don't value the friendship of my non-CHamoru friends. However, CHamorus as a collective group need to be aware of the realities of not having control of immigration policies on Guam

Claims to CHamoru In-Group Membership

Participants invoked nine attributes for authenticating CHamoru in-group membership:

(1) blood/genealogy; (2) practicing cultural values; (3) knowledge and understanding of cultural

values; (4) knowledge of history; (5) being raised or living in the CHamoru lifestyle or culture;

(6) language ability; (7) living in the homeland; (8) ethnic consumerism; and (9) personal

feelings of self-identifying as CHamoru. The participants either invoked, emphasized or

deemphasized one or several of these concepts in their understanding of CHamoru in-group membership. Blood/genealogy connection to the Marianas appears to be the minimum requirement in claiming to be CHamoru:

> If you have CHamoru blood, then you are CHamoru hands down. (Jennifer)

> I self-identify as CHamoru because by blood I know that I'm CHamoru. (Faisen)

> You can be CHamoru by blood. (Donne')

> Well I think blood is important, being ethnically CHamoru. (Ekungok)

> My entire family is from here, bro, I think that's significant in being a CHamoru, having family from here. (Bonitu)

> Both my mom and dad are CHamoru, I guess that makes me CHamoru. (Kareta)

> I'm from here and I have bloodlines going back to the Spanish era, like I am CHamoru, for that, for me to know where you come from and stand your ground. (Na'lå'la')

Participants expressed the idea that one can identify as CHamoru as long as the individual has CHamoru blood or their genealogy is traceable to the Marianas. However, for the majority of participants, blood/genealogy is not enough to be considered as an authentic CHamoru or referred to by the participants as real or cultural CHamoru. The real/cultural CHamoru is conceived by participants on a spectrum of authenticity, where someone can be considered more CHamoru than another, depending upon how many of the other eight attributes a CHamoru has. Participants emphasized or deemphasized which attributes they believe are important for CHamoru authenticity. For example, Jennifer considers the lifestyle of ranching to be the prime CHamoru authenticator:

> If you have CHamoru blood then you are CHamoru hands down, but you are not CHamoru [Emphasis on CH]... You can be ethnically Chamorro [intentionally spelled Chamorro], but to be CHamoru in a cultural sense you need to live the lifestyle. I have Tagalog blood but I don't know about it [Tagalog culture], I'm ethnically CHamoru…To be culturally CHamoru I guess knowing what it's like to be raised in a ranch, going fishing, hunting, family, know the lifestyle.

126

While she acknowledges blood as a claim to be a CHamoru, Jennifer finds that blood alone does not make one culturally CHamoru, but rather the lifestyle of ranching does. She considers the lifestyle of ranching as important for CHamoru authenticity because she is reflecting her own life experiences as a CHamoru growing up on a ranch. Her answer may also contain elements of a broader CHamoru romanticism and nostalgia for the past CHamoru lifestyle, when ranching was prominent amongst CHamorus. Anecdotal evidence from my own experience supports this idea of a CHamoru pastoralist past: my uncles and aunties, aware of my great interest in CHamoru culture, occasionally tell me that if I want to be really CHamoru, then I should stop reading and go to a ranch or into the jungle.

> Faisen emphasized blood and being raised in the culture on Guam:
>
> I self-identify as CHamoru because by blood I know that I'm CHamoru. Then I was also born and raised on Guam within a CHamoru culture, so that's what I guess being Chamoru by blood and CHamoru culture makes you CHamoru.

While Faisen places equal importance on blood and culture, Bonitu deemphasizes blood and emphasizes being raised in the culture:

> While blood is super important to have if you're CHamoru. It's not really everything. Take Ray Tenorio for example, he's not CHamoru by blood, but he's CHamoru in the mind. He was poksai in the CHamoru culture and way of thinking. I'm not going to say he's not CHamoru.

Bonitu uses former Lt. Governor Ray Tenorio as an example. Tenorio is a Caucasian male, who was adopted from the United States and raised on Guam by CHamorus. Bonitu was making the point that although Tenorio lacks CHamoru blood, he is an authentic CHamoru because he was raised by CHamorus in the CHamoru culture and way of thinking. Bonitu perceives these facts to take precedence over blood. Another participant, Isao, considers blood to be of least importance compared to the seven other CHamoru concepts:

127

> There's so many CHamorus that don't practice their culture, and I wouldn't even consider them CHamoru. Like, especially CHamorus in the mainland, this is not to offend anyone, but there's CHamorus that may be ethnically CHamoru, you know where their parents are CHamoru and they might say they are CHamoru but are they really CHamoru? They are American in spirit. Because they don't practice the culture, and they're not… they don't know where they come from, where they are rooted. They don't have a care about where they come from. Sure, they can say they're CHamoru, but at the end of the day they don't have the CHamoru spirit.

She views ethnic CHamorus who do not exhibit certain concepts such as practicing the CHamoru culture or knowledge of their lineage and lands, as being CHamoru by blood but ultimately having lost their CHamoru authenticity because they lack these important attributes. I asked Isao to explain what she means by the CHamoru spirit, in the hope that she would reveal what she considers important for CHamoru authenticity:

> The CHamoru spirit, it's, it's…it's hard to explain you know. It involves having an understanding of your culture. Your values. Your history. Your people. Your language. Where you come from. It's not as simple as putting a tattoo of a latte stone on your arm and saying that you're CHamoru. It's pretty funny as well cause those people are putting Polynesian tribal designs, so ridiculous. Do you have the values of a CHamoru? Do you give chenchule', do you practice *inafa'maolek.* Do you even care about the island?

To Isao, CHamoru authenticity is derived from blood/genealogy, practicing cultural values, knowledge and understanding of cultural values and history, and being raised or living in the CHamoru lifestyle or culture and language, all of which she collapses under the umbrella term "CHamoru spirit." Interestingly, she felt the need to question certain CHamoru tattoos as an authenticator of CHamoru identity, and she is not alone in expressing skepticism towards tattoos. In fact, several participants considered particular forms of ethnic consumerism in certain contexts—mainly certain tattoos and clothing brands such as Fokai and Crowns—to be illegitimate authenticators of CHamoru identity. For example, Homhum mentioned this about ethnic consumerism:

Wearing a Fokai tank-top isn't going to make you all of a sudden CHamoru. You can wear all the Fokai, Crowns hats, socks, but what does that all matter if you can't speak the language?

To clarify, she was not saying that Fokai and Crowns clothing brands were bad but finds CHamorus deriving their authenticity mainly from wearing these brands problematic. Jennifer expressed the same view:

I find the state of CHamorus in bad shape right now. We are forgetting our culture our language. It's really bad. Now a days, I really hate how, people think their CHamoru cause they have a tattoo, or they are decked out in Crowns gear, you know that stuff is super expensive. Like we need to get back to our roots. Who we are as CHamoru.

Interestingly, none of the participants questioned other ethnic wearable symbols, whether relatively recent popularized indigenous symbols such as the sinahi and spondylus, or older colonial-inspired articles such as the mestiza (dress) and gold bamboo bracelets. The likely reason is because in participants' understanding of CHamoru culture, these indigenous symbols are perceived as "traditional" and therefore considered more authentic than the modern mass consumerist Fokai and Crowns brands. The participants may also associate these brands with "uncultured" or "fake" CHamorus due to the brands' mass popularity with many CHamorus, so they may know several "uncultured" CHamorus who coincidently wear these brands. The same logic applies to CHamoru tattoos. Tattoos are popular among many segments of the CHamoru population, so the participants may associate tattoos with "uncultured" CHamorus. By "uncultured or fake," I refer to CHamorus who may not have any of the other eight attributes of authenticating CHamoru membership besides blood and ethnic consumerism. On the other hand, despite the recent explosion in popularity of the sinahi and spondylus, these symbols usually are worn by a certain demographic segment of the CHamoru population who places more value on their indigeneity. Therefore, the symbols may be associated with CHamorus who are more conscious of cultural and political issues such as identity markers, language revitalization, and

129

decolonization. Focusing on the language, many of the participants deemphasized language ability as an important authenticator:

> I feel the CHamoru language is important maybe as a visual representation of what it means to be CHamoru but at the end of the day what really makes a person CHamoru or makes a person into the culture isn't really visual representations of how they appropriate their own culture its more the underlying things the reasons for why they do the things they do. (Calla)

> You don't need to know the language to identify as CHamoru. What matters to be CHamoru… if you have any ties to the CHamoru culture, if your family is CHamoru, you get to learn your culture. (Geftao)

Many participants deemphasized the CHamoru language because they are not fluent in CHamoru and do not want to delegitimize themselves as CHamorus. This is not to say that these participants believe that CHamoru language fluency is useless or not important, for they all mentioned the importance of the language, but rather they do not base their CHamoru authenticity on their language ability. Their ability to speak CHamoru is not critical to their CHamoru identity. For some of these participants, this conclusion about language fluency was developed during the course of the interview, when the importance of CHamoru language use to CHamoruness, and their own lack of CHamoru proficiency was questioned. However, other participants mentioned language as an important authenticator for CHamoru identity:

> For me personally I believe it's essential for my life, although I identify as CHamoru, I feel like there's some part of me that's not genuine CHamoru cause I didn't make it a point to learn the language. (Homhum)

> People often say that I'm CHamoru because I feel CHamoru, if we take that liberal view then anyone can be CHamoru and anything is CHamoru. It's a convenient excuse to not do anything or take learning the CHamoru language seriously. Language is essential to CHamoru identity. And I'm very aware that I don't know CHamoru. So yes, I acknowledge I'm doing a disservice to my people. (Atan)

> CHamoru identity is a puzzle piece, and the language is the big center piece that completes the puzzle. (Isao)

These participants believe the CHamoru language proficiency is an important part of their

CHamoru identity and as a result feel a sense of inauthenticity in their CHamoru identity when

their CHamoruness is questioned. Interestingly, participants viewed CHamoru-accented English,

which was often referred to as being chaud or part of chaudness, in similar variety of ways.

A few participants felt that their CHamoru-accented English identified them as CHamoru

to others, especially, if they were a non-stereotypical looking CHamoru. Na'lå'la' is one such

example:

> It's important to me because when I look into the mirror, I don't look exactly CHamoru. I
> look like I'm from freaken Tumon, I look like I took the wrong turn like "excuse me
> ma'am what are you doing in Agat, what are you doing in Yona, Tumon is the other
> way." And you experience it too. People be like "excuse me, why are you speaking
> CHamoru, like why are you wearing CHamoru jewelry or like CHamoru clothing like
> who are you." You know they think we are Haole. A lot of the time people don't
> understand that… I'm not being chaud, I am CHamoru, I was raised CHamoru. So, like
> when my accent comes out, they're like "oh you're so chaud." I'm like no, this is just
> who I am. And so sometimes that's how people figure out that I am CHamoru. Through
> my accent.

She was not exaggerating her non-stereotypical CHamoru features. Na'lå'la' is the lightest

skinned CHamoru I have ever seen in my life. At first glance, I never would have guessed she

was CHamoru. However, her accent gave away her CHamoruness, which is how some people

can identify that she is CHamoru. The fact that I am also a non-stereotypical looking CHamoru,

made me relatable with her, as she indicated by saying, "you experience it too" and "you know

they think we are Haole." This may have made her more comfortable to share these experiences

with me.

Due to her non-stereotypical CHamoru features, Na'lå'la' probably experienced more

questions about her CHamoruness throughout her life than any other participant. As a result, she

may have felt that she had to prove her CHamoruness:

Yes… it's interesting how people identify me. Cause they're like "oh you're very mestiza." I don't consider myself mestiza because I wasn't raised Spanish. I wasn't raised Espanot. I was raised CHamoru. So, I think for me identity is very important because when people ask me about my history, I can tell them right off the bat. Like I hate it when people say, "you know, you're not CHamoru 'cause you don't know your language." No, no, no, no, no, I am very much CHamoru. I was with We are Guahan [activist group], I got signatures signed so that way our racetrack, only racetrack wouldn't be turned into a gun range. You know etc., I went to the Legislature a couple of times, telling them that we did… I was 17 when I was first testifying, I did not want the military buildup to start.

For Na'lå'la', her sense of authenticity derives from her CHamoru accent, knowing CHamoru history, and from her participation in CHamoru activism. Through these specific attributes, Na'lå'la' is able to signal her CHamoruness to other people. Interestingly, she does not consider CHamoru language fluency as a critical authenticator of CHamoruness. In fact, she reaffirms her CHamoru identity without deployinglanguage as a marker. This is surprising because it goes against the finding that non-stereotypical looking CHamorus are probably more likely to use the CHamoru language to signal their CHamoruness. Another participant also claims that her chaud speaking signals to other people that she is CHamoru:

I don't know, sometimes my chaud just comes out, like in high school people would point out I get so chaud you know…I don't know why I'm the CHamoru one in my family. (Isao)

For Isao, her use of chaud is unintentional, and other people pointing it out signals her CHamoru identity. Although she self-identifies as CHamoru, the fact that one of her parents is Filipino sometimes calls into question her CHamoru authenticity. For example, she tends to question why, among all of her siblings, she "acts" the most CHamoru, "My sister is very western like Americanized, my brother is very Filipino, but I'm very CHamoru. I always ask myself why I am the CHamoru one." She seeks to learn the CHamoru language perhaps as a way to authenticate her CHamoruness because of her mixed heritage. By contrast, some participants downplayed the significance of CHamoru-accented English, such as Jennifer:

132

Like we need to get back to our roots. Who we are as CHamoru. And I see effort on the part of CHamorus. I see several friends wanting to be CHamoru, and I mean really CHamoru. To be true CHamoru. Not like those posers with sleeves [tattoo covering the arm] who speak so very chaud. But actually, knowing the culture. Speaking the language.

Jennifer privileges CHamoru language ability over chaud speaking. The social media site twitter reveals interesting "discussions" from young CHamorus about CHamoru authentication. For example, a young Chamoru, with the username Makaveli tweeted:

Bruhhhh Chamorro's raised in the states are ANNOYING [hands up emoji] y'all can wear as much Guam gear as you want but if your foot never touched the island, your soul never felt her. like get outta[sic] here w[sic] your wanna[sic] be "islander" ass [roll eyes up emoji] [skull emoji]. (Makaveli, 2020)

Her tweet targeted diasporic CHamorus basing their islander authenticity on only ethnic consumerist items. She was criticizing diasporic CHamorus who claim "island" identity, but have not set food in Guam. For Jennifer, living in the indigenous homeland of the CHamorus is a critical authenticator of islander "identity." Whether she is using "islander" synonymously with CHamoru is unclear. However, what is clear is that she is presuming to judge claims of cultural authenticity in ways that invalidate some continental US CHamorus' sense of their own cultural identity who do not meet her CHamoru authenticators. The tweet was quite popular, with over 600 likes and 155 retweets. This means that around 600 mostly young people likely agreed or sympathized with the message, and about 155 of those people probably agreed strongly. For example, Chan freska retweeted it with the reply:

Not to come for any diaspora Chamoru, but there is truth to this tweet…you can have Chamoru heritage but being an islander comes from living in an island lol [Laughing out loud]. There is kana connection that can only be felt here. Up to you how important it is to have that connection yourself. (Chan freska, 2020).

Of course, not everyone agreed such as Mydas, in reply to Makaveli's tweet:

It's sad the "real" islanders want to shame people who have chosen to live in a different place. My son's [sic] have Chamorro blood running through their veins and that makes them as much Chamorro as any "real" islander. (Mydas, 2020).

Mydas finds Makaveli's authenticity criteria wrong because it dismisses her son's islander/CHamoru identity. She argues that real authenticity comes from blood and not geography. With 102 likes and 4 retweets, many CHamorus agreed with Mydas' sentiment. The interviews and this brief Twitter exchange indicate that CHamorus have a diverse range of views on CHamoru in-group membership. CHamorus emphasize attributes (that they usually have), which they believe are important for CHamoruness, and they deemphasize attributes that they usually lack. In general, CHamorus do not want to inauthenticate themselves as CHamorus. There are many other CHamoru identity battles raging on Twitter and research questions that warrant answering, but they are beyond the scope of this thesis.

Conclusion

The young CHamorus I spoke with revealed how they understand CHamoru identity and how CHamoru language use relates to their sense of their identity. As the narratives have shown, young CHamorus have a range of views towards CHamoru language ability. Some CHamorus consider CHamoru language ability critical to their identity and they suffer from feelings of inauthenticity owing to their limited knowledge of the CHamoru language. Other CHamorus see CHamoru language ability as of little importance for their CHamoru identity,and as a result, they do not experience feelings of CHamoru inauthenticity. All the participants, however, regardless of how they articulate their identity, appear to value the CHamoru language and desire to learn it to some degree, and for similar reasons. Young CHamorus invoke indigeneity and recognize themselves as the indigenous people of the land. From this perspective they argue that CHamoru culture and language deserve to be promoted. However, this position does not necessarily endorse CHamoru nationalist policies of immigration and self-determination. Participants

134

question these positions from their American liberal understanding of equality, which views these policies as discrimination against other non-CHamorus.

Participants expressed a range of views on what authenticates CHamoru in-group membership. They articulated eight attributes for authenticating CHamoru in-group membership: blood/genealogy, practicing cultural values, knowledge and understanding of cultural values and history, being raised or living in the CHamoru lifestyle or culture, living in the homeland, language, ethnic consumerism and personal feelings of self-identifying as CHamoru. The participants either invoked, emphasized or deemphasized one or several of these attributes in their understanding of CHamoru in-group membership.

However, only two participants were actively learning the CHamoru language at the time of the interview. All participants noted similar factors that discouraged them from actively learning the language. As highlighted in the literature review, positively valuing the language does not translate into action. On a side note, some of the participants involved in this study told me that they learned a lot about themselves as CHamorus from the interview, and two of them claimed that they will start actively learning CHamoru.

Chapter 4. Discussion

The main objectives of this study were to explore how non-fluent CHamorus understand the relationship between their CHamoru identity and their command of the CHamoru language, how they conceptualize CHamoru identity, and their views on CHamoru activism. This chapter provides a discussion and interpretation of the results. This chapter also discusses how the findings are relevant to the research questions and relates the findings to other research on these issues.

Common childhood experiences

As expected, the participants had typical CHamoru childhood experiences in terms of their exposure to the CHamoru language and CHamoru cultural practices. All the participants reported that English was the primary language used in their household, social settings, and schools. The participants' peers were usually not fluent in the CHamoru language, and CHamoru-speaking parents as well as grandparents and other family members spoke to the participants mainly in English. The participants' parents usually worked regular 8-to-5 jobs. All the participants experienced normal school education either in public or private schools. These common childhood experiences for these participants were influenced by the major historical processes shaping contemporary Guam society, especially WWII and the US liberation of Guam that cemented CHamoru bonds of loyalty to the US, and the postwar American-guided modernization on the island.

The postwar generation of CHamorus experienced rapid changes that transformed Guam from a subsistence agricultural lifestyle to a cash economy. No longer did CHamorus need to commit their lives to subsistence farming as they were able to work for wages from Federal jobs,

an emerging private sector, and the Government of Guam. However, not all CHamorus were able to attain employment, as access to these jobs required a rudimentary knowledge of the English language. CHamorus rationalized that they must primarily speak English to their children, as English was considered the language of success because it provided access to employment and education (Underwood 1989). There were no official language policies during the postwar years to promote the CHamoru language or halt its decline. Widespread linguistic misconceptions, such as the idea that learning two languages would cause mental confusion or conflict, exacerbated the pressure against learning CHamoru. Thus, the socioeconomic and sociolinguistic context of postwar Guam advantaged English-only language learning, to the detriment of continuing the inter-generational transmission of the CHamoru language.

This proved consequential for the learning of the CHamoru language by Millennials and Gen Zers. Modernization also led to mandatory schooling and a large percentage of parents working 8-to-5 jobs. Guam is in the top quartile of developed countries or polities, according to the Human Development Index, and is the third[28] most-developed Pacific island. The residents of Guam have high levels of education, life expectancy, and standard of living. This means that the overwhelming majority of CHamoru children attend school and most parents are employed in a wage job.

The participants followed the usual CHamoru cultural customs and values of church attendance, fiestas, rosaries, novenas, *fannginge'* and so on. Nearly all CHamoru youth attend these cultural practices, as Guam is a small and socially cohesive island, CHamorus are the sole indigenous people, and they share a collective colonial history. There is of course variation among participants. For example, some participants were more exposed to the CHamoru language in their household than others, or some participants attended church less frequently

---

[28] Hawaii and New Zealand are ranked higher based on HDI (Hastings, 2009).

than others. However, there was one participant whose childhood appeared dissimilar. She grew up on a ranch and she claimed to have lived a more traditional lifestyle than her urban peers. The significance of this individual's experience is discussed in a later section.

The language fluency of participants' parents appears to be the greatest contributor to participants' exposure to the CHamoru language in the household. If parents are fluent in CHamoru then at least some of the participants' uncles and aunties are usually fluent in CHamoru as well. When they speak to each other in CHamoru, participants are exposed. Exposure also occurs when parents speak to the participants' grandparents in CHamoru. Perhaps the most endearing experiences of language exposure is when parents were angry at the participant, since they tend to yell in CHamoru. If parents were not fluent in CHamoru, then most of the uncles and aunties usually were also not fluent in CHamoru and therefore did not speak CHamoru. Still, for those participants who had this increased exposure to CHamoru in the household, they were not fluent in CHamoru, as they were still primarily spoken to by their parents, grandparents, and relatives in English.

CHamoru Identity Articulated as the "Everyday customs and values"

CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z expressed a diverse range of views on CHamoru identity, which reflects the heterogeneity of the cohort. Participants articulated CHamoru identity as the "everyday customs and values" such as Catholic ceremonies, cooking*, chenchule'*, church, fiestas, food, hunting, ranching, language, rosaries, novenas, collectivism, *inafa'maolek*, and *respetu.* These aspects reflected the participants' life experiences and taught cultural values from their childhood. Some emphasized certain practices more than others, depending on what is more relevant and valued in their lives. For example, one participant who enjoys hunting emphasized

this practice more than participants who do not hunt. *Inafa'maolek* was also frequently mentioned, which is in a large part due to Cunningham's popularization of the term from his book, *Ancient Chamorro Society*. Interestingly, some of the participants either did not bring up CHamoru language use or mentioned it only briefly in their initial articulations of what CHamoru identity means to them. This indicates that the CHamoru language is not as significant in their lives as are other identifiers such as food, which was mentioned and described in initial greater detail by these participants. This is unsurprising as these CHamorus grew up in an environment in which CHamoru identity without CHamoru language proficiency was the norm for their generation. As such, they always understood themselves as being CHamoru, and their articulations of what it means to be CHamoru reflected this—the relevant "everyday customs and values." For these participants, CHamoru language ability is not as relevant to their identity as practices such as church attendance and *fannginge'*.

Another interesting finding is that social drinking was surprisingly not mentioned, despite drinking and partying being prominent practices by young CHamorus and CHamorus in general. This is probably due to the perception of alcohol as either an obvious negative or foreign import or some combination of both. Especially in recorded interviews, people might avoid discussing cultural aspects of their own people that have obvious negative connotations. Furthermore, CHamorus may have a culture of silence whereby they do not like to openly talk about social problems such as alcoholism, addiction, and molestation. Another reason may be that alcohol is perceived as a "foreign import" and is not conceived as a cultural element of CHamoru identity.

How CHamorus View the Relationship Between Language and CHamoru Identity

Young CHamorus have various views about the relationship between CHamoru language ability and CHamoru identity, yet all claimed that language is important to CHamoru identity to some degree. What explains this? Perhaps participants were telling me what I wanted to hear. After all, participants were informed that the interview was designed to explore their views on CHamoru language and identity, and probably none of the participants wanted to be perceived as opposing the CHamoru language. Yet throughout the course of the interviews, all the participants, at one point or another, claimed that the language is important for CHamoru identity, despite many of these same participants reaffirming, wholeheartedly, that they are CHamoru without the need for CHamoru speaking ability. This leads me to conclude that they genuinely value the language, which reflects an underlying ideology.

Non-fluent young CHamorus' attitudes about the importance of language to CHamoru identity derives from an ethnolinguistic essentialist ideology: in the minds of the participants, the CHamoru language is naturally assumed to be linked to CHamoru identity. Central to the relationship between CHamoru language and identity is the Western essentialist understanding of authenticity; in the ontological process of becoming[29] there is an ideal CHamoru identity to strive for, which changes as cultural ideals change. The contemporary ideal CHamoru identity, which naturally linked language to CHamoru identity, was largely influenced by 18th and 19th century European nationalism, the saliency of ethnic consciousness, and the prevalence of modern nation-states as the political unit. European nationalists connected language, people, and territory in their ideas of a nation, which was to be the basis for a state (Miller, 2003). Thus, language, particularly a national language, became important politically to demarcate boundaries between nations and for building a sense of nationhood. Since language is a political and linguistic

---

[29] "Becoming" is a philosophical concept that deals with change over time.

construct, nationalists used the state to construct and legitimize a standardized language based on a single or combination of dialects of their given territory. Nationalism also awakened ethnic consciousness, or in other cases ethnogenesis, which was linked to language and territory to fulfill political goals.

This is not to say that before the advent of nationalism and modern states, people did not value the language they spoke, but rather people did not consider the European concept of language as an important marker to the overarching essential concept of ethnic identity or nationhood. In effect, nationalism cemented the link between language and ethnicity. In the transformation of CHamoru identity into a modern ethnic identity, the CHamoru language became an important link to an authentic CHamoru identity in the twentieth century. This essentialist thinking that language is naturally linked to people is not unique to CHamorus, but widely held by most people in the world. People around the world naturally claim that their ethnic language is important to their ethnic culture and identity. For example, in South Africa, Rudwick (2008) finds that Zulu identity is firmly grounded ethnolinguistically. She documents that Zulu people believe the Zulu language is necessary to be considered ethnically and culturally Zulu, even amongst the English-speaking youth (Rudwick, 2004; 2008). Rudwick explains that the common expression made by Zulu people throughout her research was "How could one possibly be Zulu if s/he did not speak Zulu?" (Rudwick, 2018, p. 5). Even peoples who no longer speak their ethnic tongue naturally link language to their ethnic identity. In Ireland, despite the majority of ethnic Irish not being fluent in Irish, surveys indicate that the vast majority of Irish desire knowing the language, and view learning their ethnic language as important for their identity as Irish.

With an appreciation for how widely people make natural ontological claims about the linkage between language and ethnic identity, we can better understand the ethnolinguistic assumptions of non-fluent CHamorus. Non-fluent CHamorus generally can hold these two paradoxical positions without experiencing conflict: that the language is fundamental to CHamoru identity, while also affirming their own CHamoru identity. However, when these two contradictory positions are questioned, participants may take one of two possible courses of action. One, they may accept the logical flaw in their beliefs about language and identity, and as a result feel somewhat inauthentic as a CHamoru due to their lack of CHamoru fluency. Or, as a second option, participants may deemphasize the role of language as a critical part of CHamoru identity, which allows the participant to maintain their CHamoru authenticity despite lacking CHamoru language ability.

Participants who follow the first option generally view the language as critical for their CHamoru identity. They admit that they feel inauthentic as a CHamoru because they lack CHamoru speaking ability. The degree of their feelings of inauthenticity as CHamorus for lacking language ability probably correlates with the degree to which they view the language as an important authenticator. These feelings of inauthenticity are especially salient during certain contexts: someone speaking to them in CHamoru, someone questioning their CHamoruness, someone interviewing them about the topic of CHamoru identity and language (e.g., my interviews), or hearing other ethnic groups speaking their languages etc.

On the other hand, for participants taking the second option, they rationalize that the CHamoru language is not as important or really necessary for CHamoru identity. From this perspective on CHamoru identity, which deemphasizes CHamoru language use, these participants do not suffer from strong feelings of CHamoru inauthenticity, at least not to the

142

degree that the other participants do. They do not entirely derive their sense of CHamoru authenticity from the language, and they rationalize the limited role of the CHamoru language with the oft-repeated statement I heard from participants, "The CHamoru language is important but not necessary for CHamoru identity." In this way, they can maintain their belief that the language is important to CHamoru identity, while accepting their own lack CHamoru proficiency without deflating their sense of CHamoru identity.

These participants often made utilitarian and majoritarian arguments to justify their stance on the CHamoru language. They claimed that the language is important to CHamoru identity because using the language helps to give speakers a more authentic CHamoru identity, but actual speaking ability is not at all necessary. This leads me to assume that they reconcile their lack of language ability with their identity as CHamorus by asserting that the language is not widely spoken anymore or used, therefore it is not as valuable as other CHamoru identifiers. These justifications—or some call them excuses—are means to an end, deployed to sustain their sense of themselves as CHamoru. People who self-identify as CHamoru, in general, do not want to be disqualified as CHamorus due to lacking attributes that other people claim are necessary to CHamoru identification.

My interviews with the participants demonstrated this process, as these questions potentially threatened their sense of their CHamoru identity. For these participants, there was a struggle between upholding their own CHamoru identity and their personal belief that language is important for identity. However, for other participants who had already experienced previous challenges to their sense of identity, and who had already firmly rationalized their understanding about CHamoru identity and language, the interview may have solidified their position that the CHamoru language is not a critical authenticator of CHamoru identity. Hence several of the

participants expressed the conviction that they are CHamoru despite lacking language ability. They are not troubled by self-doubts or self-reflections about their identity. Other than the occasional moments when their CHamoruness is questioned, as mentioned above, they live their lives without worrying about how their lack of CHamoru language proficiency might invalidate their CHamoruness.

The process I have described is not clearly distinguishable between CHamorus who see the language as critical and those who do not. This indicates that there are varying views on the importance of language to CHamoru identity. The more one feels that the language is important, the more inauthentic one feels as a CHamoru. To make it clear, every participant makes the natural connection between language and CHamoru identity. What varies from participant to participant is how personal this connection feels.

Awakening

Many of the participants experienced what I term an awakening—a raised level of consciousness towards their indigenous CHamoru identity—which may or may not include language, history, and CHamoru rights issues, from a previous position of disregard, ignorance or even hostility towards these issues. Participants hold these views due to the common ideological viewpoint in Guam under US colonialism. Since the liberation of Guam, an ideology of Americanization has been a powerful inhibitor to the development of a CHamoru nation. These ideas were intergenerationally transmitted, when the older more pro-American generation that experienced the postwar "liberation" of Guam, transferred these ideals to their children. Although these ideas are changing today, the media promotes the status quo through pro-American messages and by ignoring the issues that CHamoru nationalists are concerned about.

144

Many of the participants were made aware of CHamoru political and cultural issues primarily through education. Education is an important stimulus to awakening among young CHamorus, especially instruction from particular individuals who pushed counter-narratives to the common hegemonic pro-American ideology. For example, a History of Guam class taught by Professor Hattori was cited as a reason for an expanded indigenous awareness. It is not only college instructors who can awaken students, but high school teachers as well. Both the subject matter and the particular professor are important for awakening young CHamoru to the importance of these issues.

Other factors and influences may contribute to an awakening. Parents are especially important in this regard; if the parents are ideologically aligned with the CHamoru rights movement, their children will probably hold similar views. The 2016 FestPac was another important influence, which led to the rise of CHamoru pride, and identification as indigenous. CHamorus also became more conscious and emotionally connected to indigenous issues of land rights, and representation in history, language, and culture. However, not all CHamorus will articulate their identity in the same manner. For example, a young CHamoru can embrace a CHamoru identity that prioritizes the importance of CHamoru activism for land rights, while not holding language preservation to be critical. The reverse can be true as well: a CHamoru can believe that the ability to speak CHamoru is critical, while ignoring the dimension of land rights.

While I used the term awakening many times, it is important to note that identity re-articulation is a life-long process. My use of the term, awakening, is only meant to describe the initial shock and beginning stage in the CHamoru identity re-articulation process. This process of a CHamoru going through a paradigm shift or identity crisis before having a raised level of consciousness towards CHamoru cultural identity and political issues has been documented by

researchers and experienced by many CHarmoru scholars. For example, Dr. Mary Cruz describes this ongoing identity crisis in her dissertation:

> this identity (re)search is not only significant for a general level of understanding; it reaches a strong personal level as well. Identity (re)search has been somewhat discomforting for me but has also helped to defamiliarize many of the longstanding assumptions I had about colonization as I hope it will do for many others. It seems that many Chamorus, including myself, continue to battle with the disconnect between, on the one hand, an identity that has been cherished through generations, is inherent in the Chamoru culture, and is in many ways a result of a nostalgia for a part of the past that has been lost and, on the other hand, an identity that is a result of hundreds of years of colonization and, in the last century, a result of the struggle to be American or not. (2012, p. 10)

Desiring the Language

CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z generally share common reasons for why they want to learn the language: authenticating CHamoru identity, passing on the language to future generations, and connecting with CHamoru-speaking family members. These reasons are not mutually exclusive and often overlap as multiple motivating factors. The language is viewed as an authenticator of CHamoruness by the participants. While probably few young CHamorus believe that speaking CHamoru can either make or break your identity as a CHamoru, the majority do see it as a way of fully "becoming" CHamoru, and.that the act of speaking CHamoru can make the speaker more culturally competent, more connected and in touch with the essence of CHamoruness. The language is seen as a step towards reaching the authentic or ideal CHamoru identity. Undoubtedly, this is from the influence of Western notions of authenticity. More evidence for this view is that some participants were not able to articulate in words why they consider the language important or felt such an emotional attachment to the language; they described the language as important because "it just is." These young CHamorus expressed emotions of sadness at the current state of the language and the idea that the language can

146

possibly die. They all expressed the general desire to perpetuate the language and the hope that the language will be spoken by the next generation.

As I have explained, this desire for the perpetuation of the CHamoru language stems from essentialist tendencies to link language with identity. Especially with the rise of indigeneity, cultural protectionism by the Government of Guam, nationalism, and the rise of language revitalization concerns internationally as part of biocultural and linguistic human rights, participants were expressing the common view that language and CHamoru identity are connected, even if they self-identify as CHamorus who lack language ability. To be clear, not every CHamoru feels such an intense and emotional connection to the language. It is CHamorus who view language as critical to their identity that tend to feel an especially intense and emotional connection to the language.

Another important motivator for young CHamorus to learn the language is to connect with CHamoru-speaking family members. The family members that young CHamorus want to converse with in CHamoru are mainly their grandparents. Some young CHamorus believe speaking CHamoru will facilitate communicating with their grandparents as they age. They believe speaking CHamoru to their grandparents will allow them to speak to their grandparent's heart. Also, speaking CHamoru to family members is primarily for selfless reasons, to make the CHamoru-speaking family member happy, or care for them, rather than to attain an authentic CHamoru identity on their own behalf.

Factors Inhibiting Learning CHamoru

There are several factors mentioned by young CHamorus that inhibited their learning of CHamoru: language utility, learning difficulty, *mamåhlao*, access to resources, and lack of

147

CHamoru-speaking language community. Similar to the pro-language learning factors described in the previous section, these inhibiting factors are not mutually exclusive, and often overlap as multiple inhibitors. These inhibiting factors also were found among all young CHamorus, no matter how important they believed the CHamoru language to be. The most significant inhibiting factor is the perceived inutility of the CHamoru language. English functions as Guam's lingua franca and as an international language, hence it has significant socio-economic value for young CHamorus to achieve educational and economic success whether on Guam or in the United States. In contrast, the CHamoru language lacks this socio-economic utility. In addition, the language lacks basic communicative aspect. Since the vast majority of young CHamorus and a smaller but still significant percentage of baby boomers cannot speak CHamoru, it has limited social utility. Several young CHamorus that I interviewed rationalized that because the language is not widely used even amongst CHamorus, nor is it necessary to know in order to live on Guam, it is not a priority for them. This viewpoint seemingly contradicts my earlier survey results in 2017 of around 300 young CHamorus, which found no statistical relationship between the perception of the language utility and their desire to learn the language (Leon Guerrero, 2017). Yet saying something and doing it are two different things. As I have reiterated in this thesis, positive attitudes alone towards the language does not necessarily lead to actively learning the language.

Another common reason for not learning CHamoru is busyness, which is related to utility. Young CHamorus assert that they would love to learn the language, but unfortunately, as they claim, they are too busy with school, work, family, etc. Since the participants perceive the language as lacking functional utility, they prioritize using their time for things that have utility and relevance for their lives, such as school, work, socialization, sports, etc. Some young

CHamorus are reluctant to state outright that the language lacks relevance in their lives, so they invoke busyness to save face or to rationalize their non-fluent CHamoru identity with their belief that the language is important.

The lack of resources is another inhibiting factor. Although I coded this as a separate theme, it overlaps very much with the factor of utility. Several of the participants claimed that there is a lack of CHamoru language learning resources, and that they would readily learn if they had the resources. While I do not doubt that participants genuinely believe there is a lack of CHamoru language learning resources relative to other languages on Guam, there are more resources now than ever before, including compulsory CHamoru classes in the public education system, books, flashcards and even the Hurao Academy. There are many free materials as well, such as the website www.learningchamorro.com, Dr. Michael Bevacqua's language classes every Saturday, and my YouTube channel, PulanSpeaks,[30] which offers high quality free language lessons in addition to general Micronesian educational content. However, the greatest CHamoru language resource of all are fluent CHamoru language speakers. Most young CHamorus probably know at least one individual who is fluent in CHamoru. These usually are grandparents, parents, or older family members. However, due to the age gap, negative learning experiences, and their ascribed status as parents or grandparents, many young CHamorus feel may feek discouraged to actively learn from them. The same reasons apply to young CHamorus trying to learn CHamoru from older CHamoru-speaking strangers. There is an element of *mamåhlao* (shame) as well for young CHamorus because they fear making mistakes and being corrected in a non-constructive manner. While I am probably less *mamåhlao* than the average young CHamoru, I do occasionally become intimidated when speaking CHamoru to older

---

[30] Subscribe, like and share those videos!
https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCF2PEL18ghNHP_HcKMz8LBQ

strangers. This makes it all the more important for aspiring young CHamoru speakers to engage with a CHamoru language community or fluent speakers.

While there are indeed many CHamoru language speakers, there is a lack of a language community that can support young CHamorus trying to gain fluency. A language community is crucial to developing CHamoru speaking proficiency, as languages are best learned socially within a community, especially one with fellow motivated young CHamorus who can learn the language together. Many participants expressed the wish that they knew people their age who spoke the language, despite their older family members being fluent, because a contemporary would have more in common with them and be less intimidating than an older person.

Arguably, even if young CHamorus had access to all the language resources they wanted, and an active CHamoru language community, only a minority would become long-term active learners because the language still lacks socio-economic utility. While people cite Hawaiian and Māori language revitalization as success stories, those successful programs can be attributed to unique sociopolitical histories, which led to a stronger indigenous identity and national aspirations. Hawai'i had the advantage of being an independent state where the Hawaiian language was already nationalized to an extent during the Hawaiian Kingdom era. The Māori have a degree of internal self-determination through the Treaty of Waitangi, which stipulates that the New Zealand nation has an obligation to promote the welfare of the Māori. CHamorus on Guam unfortunately lack these advantages. I know several young CHamorus who have access to language resources, and they consider the language important, but regardless they do not actively learn CHamoru.

For example, one of my thesis committee members, Dr. Mary Cruz who is part of generation X[31] is a political science professor at the University of Guam. Without a doubt, she has access to the best language learning resources such as educational materials and CHamoru language experts. She probably could audit any college level CHamoru language class for free if she really wanted to. Best of all, her husband is a fluent CHamoru speaker. Despite all this access to language resources and speakers, she does not actively choose to learn the language. When we had a nice chat one day in late January, she told me that one day she will learn the language. When that day will come, I do not know; but I do know that if the language had significant utility in her life, she would put in the effort and make it a priority to learn the language. For instance, if her University of Guam tenure required at least a moderate proficiency in the CHamoru language, Dr. Cruz would utilize all her language resources and become moderately proficient in the language within a month. I use this example not only in the hopes of pushing her to learn the CHamoru language, but to highlight that utility is the most significant inhibiting factor for young[32] CHamorus. She very well knows the cultural and political importance of the CHamoru language and what is at stake if CHamorus no longer speak the language, yet she still decides to postpone learning the language. Perhaps my pushing her to learn the language may have the opposite intended effect and reinforce her identity as a non-fluent CHamoru.

Expressing CHamoru Identity Through Other Avenues

All the participants mentioned various ways in which they express their CHamoru identity through other avenues than language. Many participants rationalized their CHamoru identity, despite their lack of speaking ability, by redefining CHamoru identity to exclude

---

[31] Born between 1965-1980.

[32] This is the only time I use "young" to include a CHamoru in generation X. Every other instance of "young" was strictly to CHamoru Millennials and Gen Zers.

CHamoru speaking as an important authenticator. They affirm their authenticity as a CHamoru through avenues such as knowledge of CHamoru history or taking care of their family, rather than speaking the language. They still may view the language as important, but that it is not seen as a priority or source from which they derive their authenticity as CHamorus from. I do not blame any young CHamorus for thinking this way, because they are products of historical processes. They grew up in an environment where the English language was their mother tongue and the lingua franca of Guam. Young CHamorus have adapted to the non-fluent CHamoru reality and find meaning as CHamorus through other avenues.

Young CHamorus and Indigeneity

Besides the feeling of group belonging, it allows them to maintain a group identity in a changing environment. Psychological reasons aside, there is a political rationale to identifying as CHamoru. Young CHamorus recognize that they are the indigenous people of Guam and the Marianas, and they naturally invoke indigeneity as the basis to argue that the CHamoru language, culture, and land should be protected or perpetuated by the government and community. Young CHamorus' use of the term and self-identification as indigenous reflects the international rise of indigeneity beginning in the 1960s and taking off in Guam in the 1980s. Within the past decade, indigeneity has become mainstreamed, as CHamorus at younger ages are beginning to understand themselves as indigenous to Guam and the Marianas.

More recently, Guam's hosting of FestPac 2016 probably did more than anything else within the previous decade[33] to cause a surge of indigenous pride amongst CHamoru youth. This was visibly expressed on social media, where posts by young CHamorus in the CHamoru

---

[33] 2010-2020

language—about CHamoru activism, awakenings, ethnic consumerism, CHamoru pride and CHamoru nationalism—flooded my social media accounts on Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat and Twitter. I witnessed several young CHamorus become newly interested in dance, carving, seafaring, activism etc. I also dived into this CHamoru cultural surge with a renewed sense of ethnic pride as a CHamoru.

Young CHamorus usage of the term "indigenous" appears identical to "native." While the term "indigenous" is more politically loaded and associated with the Fourth World than the term "native," for young CHamorus the terms are semantically similar, along with other common synonyms—"native, aboriginal, first people, bush people" etc.—which imply the rights to perpetuate their lifestyle, language, and culture in their own land.

These young CHamorus regard land as an important aspect of CHamoru culture, although they also understand the reality of private land ownership, and the fact that a large portion of Guam land is no longer owned by CHamorus. Many of the participants explicitly mentioned that Guam is the "land of the CHamorus" and expressed concern that less and less land on Guam is owned by CHamorus. Indigeneity upsets the multi-cultural order by providing the moral basis for promoting the CHamoru culture, language, and land, over other ethnic groups on Guam.

Although young CHamorus may acknowledge that CHamorus are the indigenous people of Guam and the Marianas, and therefore deserve pro-CHamoru language, culture, and land policies, many either were unaware or/and seemingly accepting of the changing demographics and its potential political implications for the position of CHamorus on Guam. When I brought up the nationalists' arguments for limiting immigration, several participants responded that Guam was welcoming. The value of *inafa'maolek* was invoked as a reason to justify the immigration: "We are a warm and accepting people." Although the participants acknowledge

that the indigenous people of Guam are the CHamorus, they argue that what makes Guam, Guam, is the diversity. They grew up in an environment where diversity is the norm. Young CHamorus were brought up with the ideology that Guam is some type of melting pot.

The media have promoted this pervasive ideology on Guam, and the media have downplayed the potential negative side-effects of immigration for CHamorus' status on Guam. The media, and the American discourse of equality, tend to promote a pro-American liberal outlook, which equates the indigenous rights position with discrimination, and which accords moral superiority to the view that all ethnic groups should have equal status on Guam. Likewise, American liberalism is hostile to arguments for the CHamoru self-determination vote.

While American liberalism and multiculturalism seem to negatively influence issues of immigration control and CHamoru self-determination, it does not seem to be effective at inhibiting young CHamorus desiring to promote the language, culture, and land. While I acknowledge that the argument implied by the concept of indigeneity contradicts the American liberal democratic ideology, I argue that the recent ideological shift in how the United States deals with the multiple ethnic and national groups within the country, has played a significant role. Before the 1960s and 1970s, the United States promoted an assimilation-based approach for dealing with ethnic groups. However, there was a shift in the 1960s and 1970s to multiculturalism, with the US Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 and the Ethnic Heritage Act of 1974 solidifying this philosophical shift. This shift was probably due to the political atmosphere of the civil rights movement and cold war geopolitics—the US feared that recently independent African states would align with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics [USSR]. As a result of the paradigm shift in how the United States deals with multi-national and ethnic groups, ethnic and cultural diversity is celebrated as the American cultural norm, rather

154

than the assimilationist image of a melting pot. Ethnicity became more visible and prominent as a feature of the American national identity. This means that cultural identity maintenance became normalized in the American multicultural order. CHamorus on Guam embraced this multiculturalism, which made displays of ethnic pride more acceptable, and protectionist sentiments for the language and culture as compatible with the US equality ideology. However, while showcasing ethnic pride through dance and language was acceptable, the "CHamoru only vote" for self-determination and immigration control is considered as a negative and even racist because it overtly violates the multicultural order. This was demonstrated recently on the social media platform Facebook when a user posted in the largest CHamoru social media group Chamorro people on Facebook:

> Dave dumbass Davis wants to sue Guam for Chamorro month saying it's discriminatory. Chadananamu[34] Davis [laughing face emoji].

Every comment subsequently posted criticized Dave Davis and defended the right of Guam to have a CHamoru month. In contrast, Facebook posts in 2017 about "CHamoru self-determination" registered much criticism and negative comments from CHamorus, who decried the post because they perceived it as discriminating against non-CHamorus.

Claims to CHamoru In-Group Membership

For CHamoru Millennials and Gen Zers identifying as CHamoru allows them to feel a sense of belonging to a collective group and values, beliefs, and culture such as *inafa'maolek*, *chenchule'*, *respetu*, Catholicism, *familia*, and the CHamoru language. This contributes to the individual's psychological well-being (Molix & Bettencourt, 2010; Smith & Silva, 2011). There were nine attributes that participants used as authenticators of CHamoru identity: blood/genealogy; practicing cultural values and customs; knowledge and understanding of

---

[34] Considered a serious insult, which literally translates to "Your Mothers' eggs."

cultural values and customs; knowledge of history; being raised or living in the CHamoru lifestyle or culture, CHamoru language ability; living in the homeland; ethnic commodity display; and personal feelings of self-identifying as CHamoru. Young CHamorus either invoked, emphasized or deemphasized one or several of these attributes in their understanding of CHamoru in-group membership and authenticity. Young CHamorus' decisions on what is emphasized or deemphasized are driven partly by the desire for CHamorus to not exclude themselves and others from CHamoru identification and from what they were socialized to believe is important.

For example, despite not speaking CHamoru, non-fluent young CHamorus intuitively understand language to be important for CHamoru identity, which is based on the widely-held view in the 21st century that language is the primary marker of identity, a view promoted by nationalist rhetoric and essentialist ideas of authenticity linked to ethnicity. Yet in an effort to not invalidate their own CHamoru identity, many CHamorus rationalize that the language is less important for CHamoru identity than it is commonly thought to be. They derive their sense of authenticity as CHamorus from other attributes that they usually can claim, such as practicing cultural values and customs, being raised or living in a CHamoru lifestyle, etc. An example of this argument was displayed on the social media platform Twitter, when a young CHamoru female tweeted that many diasporic CHamorus were not "true" islanders because they did not live on Guam or make an effort to visit Guam and the Marianas. This popular tweet received over 600 likes and 100 retweets. However, there were several rejoinders to her tweet, which decried this "islander" qualifier that made living on or visiting the island a necessity for claiming islander ethnicity. In one well-liked reply, a CHamoru mother argued against the notion that only by living on Guam or making efforts to visit Guam can one claim authentic islander identity; she

156

asserted instead that blood authenticates identity. She put forth this argument in an effort to legitimize the islander identity claim of her own diasporic CHamoru children.

Some CHamorus have even critiqued certain types of ethnic consumerism because it does not fit with their definitions of authenticity. They pointed out certain types of CHamoru tattoos, particularly tribal patterned ones, and certain CHamoru clothing brands such as Crowns and Fokai, are not authentically CHamoru. Yet these same individuals did not question re-created indigenous jewelry such as *sinahi* necklaces and objects made from *spondylus* shell as inauthentic, even though these re-creations appeared only recently, as part of the CHamoru ethnic and indigenous revival in the 1980s. Perhaps these particular young CHamoru were ignorant of the origins of these ethnic arts; nevertheless, their beliefs are rooted in the ethnic revival and insurgence of interest in indigeneity among CHamorus. They disparage these brands because it does not fit with their romantic sense of CHamoru culture; the brands are tainted with mass consumerism. These individuals seem to believe that these re-created ancient items are authentically CHamoru, and they associate the use of these items with indigeneity and CHamoru activism. This trend was driven by CHamorus who desire to perpetuate a particular form of CHamoru identity for political purposes. While I did not interview CHamorus with CHamoru "tribal" tattoos, or the owners and employees of Crowns or Fokai, or anyone with a vested interest in those brands, I doubt they would agree with those young CHamorus' assertions that these forms of ethnic consumerism are not valid markers of CHamoru identity.

These different views on CHamoru authenticity reflect CHamoru heterogeneity. Yet everyone evidently agrees that the more of these attributes an individual has, the more authentic the individual is in the eyes of other CHamorus. An individual with all nine attributes would probably be perceived as an "authentic or ideal CHamoru" to most young CHamorus. However,

it is important to note that while CHamorus believe that one can be "more CHamoru" than another CHamoru, many young CHamorus felt that the absence of particular attributes would not disqualify someone from claiming CHamoru identity if they personally self-identify as CHamoru and have CHamoru blood/genealogy. Most participants prefer inclusivity for CHamoru identification and felt uncomfortable invalidating other CHamorus for lacking certain CHamoru attributes.

CHamoru identity has become more individualized and personalized, as many participants expressed the feeling that a personal self-identification as CHamoru is enough. This may be due to young CHamorus' reluctance to invalidate their own or others' CHamoru identity. While young CHamorus certainly resisted liberalization and the replacement of ethnic identity by a globalized individual human identity, they have infused liberal multiculturalism and notions of global citizenship with CHamoru identity. Young CHamorus appear to value tolerance, inclusion, and cultural relativity. While the average young CHamoru conceptualizes ethnic boundaries in essentialist ways, many seem to take a more fluid approach. Young CHamorus probably do not want to disqualify themselves as CHamoru or play gatekeeper to who can be considered CHamoru. This of course does not mean that all young CHamorus take an anti-cultural fundamentalist view, as two of my participants claimed that CHamorus are not "real" CHamorus if they cannot speak the CHamoru language. Furthermore, the social media data clearly shows that several hundred CHamoru youth agreed, at least in spirit, with the statement that living on Guam is necessary for being an "islander." Evidently young CHamorus hold diverse viewpoints, as several other CHamorus disagreed. It also suggests that context influences viewpoint: when I spoke directly to young CHamorus in a recorded interview, they may have been less prone to reveal their more radical thoughts on CHamoru identity, if they had any. On

social media, however, CHamoru youth may feel less inhibited, and can express their thoughts as candidly as if they are writing in a diary.

Anecdotally, I have spoken to a few CHamoru cultural fundamentalists and all of them were older than the arbitrary millennial cut-off point of around 35 years of age. These older CHamorus' primary critique is that young CHamorus suffer from a deficit of cultural authenticity because they lack particular CHamoru attributes. What I can say for certain is that the majority of non-fluent CHamoru youth in general do not consider CHamoru language ability to be a necessary qualifier for CHamoru identity. This affirms previous studies looking at CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity. For example, a study by Riley found that about two thirds (67.72%) of CHamorus surveyed (194) did not consider CHamoru proficiency to be necessary to be CHamoru (Riley, 1975).

Language as an Authenticator of CHamoru Identity

Assertions that the CHamoru language is an authenticator of CHamoru identity are inherently political. It implies that the language is an integral part of CHamoru identity through the essentialist notion of authenticity. The language was probably not consciously thought of by CHamorus as a primary marker of CHamoru identity until it became a political tool to demarcate CHamorus from immigrants and non-CHamoru Americans in the 1970s. The language serves to invoke indigeneity by tying the speakers to the ancestors of the land, and thus promoting the indigenous rights that CHamorus are entitled to by virtue of being indigenous.

The idea that the language authenticates CHamoru identity is prominent among CHamorus. Anecdotal evidence from Monnig (2007) revealed that young CHamoru college students who wanted to learn CHamoru believed speaking CHamoru was integral for CHamoru

identity. She concluded by saying "They were expressing the nationalistic discourse which professes that language is one of the many authenticating determinants of Chamorro identity" (p. 303-304). Speaking CHamoru is an authenticator of CHamoru identity and is considered an "authentic" and "tangible" aspect of CHamoru-ness, which allows CHamorus to make distinctions between themselves and other ethnic groups, and which makes the speaker feel more authentic as a CHamoru. With the erosion of traditional identity boundaries, and display of identity through ethnic ornaments and commodities, the language serves as an objective boundary marker. Every CHamoru would probably agree that speaking CHamoru can immediately signal CHamoru identity from an individual who otherwise lacked any distinguishing identifiers from any other ethnic group.

For *mestizo* or CHamorus who do not fit the stereotypical view of CHamoru—brown-skinned, having a common CHamoru last name—speaking CHamoru especially serves as an authenticator of their identity to not only other ethnic groups but to other CHamorus (Monnig, 2007). Many non-stereotypical CHamorus probably faced situations where their identity as CHamorus were questioned by their fellow CHamorus. In my experience, when I meet older CHamorus, their entire demeanor changes once I start speaking CHamoru. For them, hearing spoken CHamoru from me, a non-stereotypical looking CHamoru, immediately makes them identify me as CHamoru. While older CHamorus view the language as an authenticator of CHamoru identity, young CHamorus are no longer using CHamoru fluency to establish their identity.

For the majority of young CHamorus, it appears that they are redefining CHamoru identity to no longer include fluency in the CHamoru language, but expressing identity through other ways, as stated by Monnig (2007): "the younger, less-fluent generation of Chamorros is

160

establishing a form of Chamorro identity which at once highly values and is desirous of Chamorro language fluency, but is also expressing Chamorro-ness through Chamorro code-switching and Chamorro-accented English" (p. 305).

Social Media: The CHamoru Language and the Battle for Authenticity

Several young CHamorus are using CHamoru words in their social media usernames and biographies. There are several reasons why young CHamorus decide to do this. It signals one's CHamoru identity to everyone on social media. While in real life, CHamoru identity can be signaled through means such as accent and dress, on social media the use of CHamoru words is probably the most overt way to signal CHamoru identity. Much like how ethnic jewelry can signal the user's identity as a CHamoru for relatively little effort,[35] the use of CHamoru words online functions in a similar fashion. Therefore, for those who take great pride in their CHamoru identity, the usage of CHamoru words on social media is the best way to signal their CHamoruness on social media.

It may also be partly driven by the desire to accumulate social capital. While the CHamoru language lacks significant economic and social utility in society, it has significant social advantages on social media for little to no effort. Young CHamorus do not actually need to become proficient in the CHamoru language to benefit from the use of it on social media, as it only requires minimum knowledge to put CHamoru words in their profile username or biography. With the embrace of indigeneity amongst CHamoru youth, young CHamorus may be capitalizing on this surge of ethnic pride to gain social capital through social media likes, retweets, followers and influence. Social capital is the new online currency, which gives young

---

[35] This is referring to the idea that jewelry can be instantly purchased by cash and not to the process of making jewelry, which requires great effort.

CHamorus influence, power and validation amongst their contemporaries. Young CHamorus with CHamoru words in their social media biographies or usernames are more likely to post about CHamoru indigenous issues. A few of them in particular are perceived as part of the new wave of indigenous activist and are looked up to by many young CHamorus.

Social media platforms, in particular Twitter, are proving to be a battleground for CHamoru authenticity. Most young CHamorus probably have social media accounts and frequently use social media. Every now and then a topic dealing with CHamoru identity goes viral.[36] Once this happens, CHamorus begin to negotiate the meaning of CHamoru identity with other CHamorus. While the use of the CHamoru language may decline or disappear in the broader society, the use of the CHamoru language online may be the next arena for the CHamoru language.

The Accent

CHamoru speakers hold a variety of views towards CHamoru-accented English. Some young CHamorus do not consider CHamoru-accented English to be a convincing marker of CHamoru identity, especially when compared with actually speaking the language. However, the interviews seem to indicate that CHamoru accented English serves as a marker of CHamoruness whether the individual intended to or not. The accent creates a linguistic demarcation between CHamorus and non-CHamorus. The thicker the accent, the more CHamoru or "chaud" the individual is perceived by people, and depending on the context, this can be advantageous or disadvantageous.

---

[36] To go viral means that the social media post has become popular.

162

Generational Views Regarding Language and Its Connection to Identity

My uncle always tells me "the CHamoru language is the umbilical cord of the CHamoru people and culture." The analogy reveals his view that one's linguistic ability with the CHamoru language determines their CHamoru identity, which reflects his generational view of the language. However, there seems to be a disconnect between young CHamorus and the CHamoru language. While young CHamorus perceive CHamoru language ability to be a significant aspect of CHamoru identity, they do not consider speaking CHamoru to be essential for CHamoru identification. Young CHamorus are aware that CHamoru language use is declining, and they desire to perpetuate the language. However, the majority do not hold the view that CHamoru identity is only achievable by speaking the CHamoru language. While the CHamoru language is no longer a necessary authenticator for probably the vast majority of young CHamorus, it is still inherently linked to CHamoru identity and considered valuable.

A Note About Attitudes Towards English

Interestingly, the young CHamorus that I interviewed did not express explicit negative attitudes towards the English language. Although I never directly asked a participant about what they thought about the English language, it is nevertheless telling that no participant voluntarily brought up how the English language is a colonizer or a white man's language. This attitude contrasts with other people such as the Zulu; Zulu youth recognize the socio-economic utility of English but considered it as the "white man's" tongue (Rudwick, 2004). The CHamoru attitude towards English interestingly reflects prevalent language and ethnic ideologies on Guam. I believe it relates to a weak CHamoru national identity, a high level of Americanization, and the replacement of CHamoru with English. CHamoru youth in general do not perceive English

negatively because it is their native language. In retrospect, I also did not consider English a "white man's" or colonial language. I was never bothered by it, until I was radicalized in my undergraduate years and I became more ethnically conscious.

Final Remarks on How Young CHamorus View the Language and Identity

While one social scientist concluded that the Zulu's defining expression is "How could one possibly be Zulu if s/he did not speak Zulu," which suggests a grounded ethnolinguistic identity (Rudwick, 2018, p. 5), for young CHamorus I find that their defining expression is "The CHamoru language is important, but not necessary to be CHamoru." This statement and its variations suggest that young CHamorus have redefined their CHamoru identity so that CHamoru language fluency is not a critical authenticator. They do not want to undermine their own sense of CHamoru identity and that of other non-fluent CHamorus. However, the first part of the phrase "The CHamoru language is important," and their ardent belief that the language is an authenticator, reveal that young CHamorus still hold an attachment to the CHamoru language, whether they claim it is or is not necessary for their CHamoru identity. These young CHamorus constantly made the natural connection between CHamoru language ability and CHamoru identity, whether they realized it or not, and they expressed the view that CHamoru language ability makes one more authentically CHamoru. Furthermore, they experience a sense of anguish when they consider the potential loss of the language. Even those participants who claimed that they are CHamoru without speaking the language, acknowledge that the CHamoru language is important to CHamoru identity and desire to perpetuate the language.

Language Revitalization as Part of the Larger Battle on Guam

CHamoru language revitalization is inherently a political process, and for CHamoru nationalists, language revitalization is part of a political effort to mobilize CHamorus to become an independent state. Arguably, the majority of language advocates are not nationalists and they desire to promote the language for identity maintenance to fulfill a psychological desire due to the adoption of essentialist notions of authenticity towards a CHamoru ethnic identity. As Weinreich noted, language loyalty does not always accompany strong feelings of nationalism (as cited by Riley, 1975). In other words, language revitalization projects are not always associated with desires for self-determination. Probably the majority of CHamorus support language revitalization for cultural reasons; they sincerely believe that they will lose an essential piece of CHamoru culture if the language is no longer spoken. Other reasons include preserving the linguistic diversity of the world's cultures and supporting linguistic human rights. Whatever reason or combination of reasons motivate the efforts to revitalize the CHamoru language, it is impossible to deny that identity politics are involved in language revitalization.

Since the 1970s, the Government of Guam has been involved, bestowing official status on the CHamoru language and allocating resources to language revitalization efforts in order to preserve the unique CHamoru identity and heritage on Guam, and foster a stronger sense of ethnic pride and unity. If CHamorus want to maintain their socio-cultural and political place on Guam, then they must continue to perpetuate the language as language revitalization efforts reflect the overall political health of CHamoru identity. In defining themselves as the unique ethnic group that is indigenous to Marianas, CHamorus are entitled to the political and cultural rights through the United Nations Declarations on the granting of rights to indigenous peoples.

CHamoru Identity Language Articulation Model

In order to better understand the relationships among the sea of data, I created a network of semantic linkages amongst the relevant codes, categories and themes to visualize the processes of CHamoru identity articulations with the CHamoru language which may lead to language learning (see Figure 1). The model is by no means a comprehensive understanding of all CHamoru identity articulations as it focuses on the relationship of CHamoru language knowledge to cultural identity. The model was produced using the qualitative data analysis and research software, ATLAS.ti 7. For ease of understanding, I breakdown the model into different parts and explain the logic behind each part separately.

Figure 1.

CHamoru Identity Language Articulation Model

The model begins with the theme (1) "Typical CHamoru childhood" (see Figure 2), which incorporates several common features of CHamoru childhood: These CHamorus grew up in what I would consider as the typical CHamoru family environment in terms of language and culture. English is the primary language they were exposed to in their household, social circles, and institutional contexts. At school, their friends and classmates were also non-fluent. Their parents worked typical 8-5 jobs, and their families participated in the "everyday customs and values" (e.g. fiestas, novenas, church, etc.). Participants who experienced a typical CHamoru childhood develop a sense of identity I have labeled (2) "Typical CHamoru identity articulation," expressed by most non-fluent CHamoru Millennials and Gen Zers, as an identity not dependent upon language fluency; CHamoru language ability is not considered critical to their everyday experiences as CHamorus.

These CHamorus grew up in an environment in which CHamoru identity without CHamoru language fluency was the norm for their generation, hence it can be considered as the "Typical CHamoru identity articulation." CHamoru identity for them is grounded in the "Everyday customs and values" such as *chenchule'*, church, fiestas, food, hunting, ranching, respect, rosaries, novenas, collectivism, *inafa'maolek,* etc. In its logical form:

Figure 2.

(1) "Typical CHamoru childhood" **is the cause of** → (2) "Typical CHamoru identity"

↑

(2a) "Fluency not critical for identity" **is a property of**

168

Although CHamoru language ability is not considered critical to CHamoru identity, these CHamorus desire to learn CHamoru for three primary reasons: in order to authenticate their CHamoru identity, to pass on the language to future generations, and to connect with CHamoru-speaking family members (see Figure 3). The CHamoru essentialist beliefs about cultural identity lead CHamorus to want to authenticate their identity through the speaking of CHamoru and to perpetuate the language. However, this expressed desire does not usually lead CHamorus to reach the goal I have labeled (3) "Actively learning CHamoru" for several reasons: the perceived inutility of the CHamoru language, the lack of a language community, the lack of language resources, and feelings of *mamåhlao*. These reasons act as inhibiting factors, which prevents or slows down CHamoru language learning. In its logical form:

Figure 3.

(1) "Typical CHamoru identity"

↑ **is a property of**

(1b) "Reasons for learning" **is the cause of** → (2) "Desire to learn CHamoru"
- "CHamoru identity authentication"
- "Language perpetuation"
- "Connecting with CHamorus speakers)"

↓ **is the cause of**

(3) "Actively Learning CHamoru"

↓ **is inhibited because of**

(4) "Factors inhibiting learning CHamoru"
- Perceived inutility of the CHamoru language
- Lack of language community
- Lack of language resources
- Feelings of *mamåhlao*

So far, this part of the model offers an explanation as to why many typical CHamorus do not actively learn the CHamoru language, despite their claims that language is important to identity. The next parts of the model visualize the process of a CHamoru experiencing an identity re-articulation away from the typical CHamoru identity to incorporate other CHamoru identity attributes. It may explain why these CHamorus who are more aware of CHamoru cultural and political issues and perceive the language to be critical to their CHamoru identity, actively learn or not learn the language.

The CHamoru re-articulation process begins back to the (1) "Typical CHamoru identity" (see figure 4). Some of these typical CHamorus may experience an increase realization of their indigenous identity, which I have labeled (3) "Awakening." It is defined by an intense emotional response that leads to a paradigm shift or an identity crisis. This awakening is caused by life experiences that increase awareness to CHamoru political and cultural issues. This may be anything from education at the University of Guam or high school, participation as an audience member or performer at FestPac, joining a cultural dance group and so on.

As a result of the awakening, these CHamorus begin the process of identity re-articulation where he/she is developing new understandings of himself/herself as CHamoru that I have labeled (4) "CHamoru identity re-articulation." CHamoru identity re-articulation is a fluid process, influenced by the person's life experiences. This results in many possible understandings of CHamoru identity. One such possibility is that CHamoru language fluency becomes critical to his/her understanding of CHamoru identity. Since this study focuses on the CHamoru language, I created a specific node labeled (6) "CHamoru identity articulated with language as critical," to highlight language proficiency as a necessary attribute of this particular form of CHamoru identity.

170

However, this is only one possible identity re-articulation among the many other CHamoru identities. In addition, CHamoru identities are not mutually exclusive to only one attribute of CHamoruness but may include multiple. For example, a CHamoru who understands his/her CHamoru to incorporate language fluency is not limited to the language but may express his/her CHamoru identity through other avenues e.g. music, dance, writing. I created a node labeled (6b, 7a) "Other expressions of CHamoru identity," to emphasize this point; and I created a node labeled "Other possible CHamoru identity articulations," to stress that there are many other CHamoru identity possibilities besides only language.

CHamoru identity re-articulation is not a one-time process but is a re-occurring process. CHamorus are not stuck in one sense of their ethnic identity; it can shift, as different life experiences occur causing individuals to re-articulate their identity. It is possible for someone to rearticulate their CHamoru identity, shifting from a position where they consider the language as a critical part of their identity, to a position of not considering the language as important at all. I added dual arrows to the connection between the two nodes (6) "CHamoru identity articulated with language fluency," and (7) "Other possible CHamoru identity articulations" with (4) "CHamoru identity re-articulation," to indicate that it is a two-way relationship: the duals arrows highlight that CHamoru identity articulation is a re-occurring process that is contingent on life experiences. In its logical form:

Figure 4.

(1) "Typical CHamoru identity"

  ↓ contingent on experiences

(3) "Awakening   **← is the cause of**   (2) "Experiences"
                                                                  Education
  ↓ is the cause of   FestPac
                                                                  Cultural groups
(4) "CHamoru identity re-articulation"

  ↕

contingent on experiences ↔ (7) **"**Other possible CHamoru identity articulations"

  ↕   ↑

(6) "CHamoru identity articulated with language fluency"   **← is a property of**
                                                              ↑
                                                  (6b, 7a) "Other expressions
                                                   of CHamoru identity"

  ↑ is a property of

(6a) Fluency critical for identity

Another avenue that leads to the nodes (2) "CHamoru identity articulated with language

fluency," or (3) "Other possible CHamoru identity articulations" is growing up in a (1) "Non-

typical CHamoru childhood" (see Figure 5). It is characterized by different childhood

experiences compared to the "Typical CHamoru childhood," which leads to non-typical forms of

CHamoru identity at a young age. For example, CHamoru who grew up in a household

environment where the parents or family members spoke to the youth primarily in CHamoru,

may consider the CHamoru language an integral part of their identity at a young age. Or if the

individual grew up in a prominent CHamoru activist household, they may consider indigeneity

and activism critical parts of their identity. These differences in childhood experiences compared to a typical CHamoru childhood, effectively bypass the awakening stage. In its logical form:

Figure 5.

    (1) "non-typical CHamoru childhood"

                 ↓ **is the cause of** → (3) "Other possible CHamoru identity articulations

    (2) "CHamoru identity articulated with language fluency"

CHamorus who have articulated their identity with language fluency amplify the desire to learn CHamoru for three primary reasons: in order to authenticate their CHamoru identity, to pass on the language to future generations, and to connect with CHamoru-speaking family members (see Figure 6). However, the amplified desire does not usually lead CHamorus to reach the goal I have labeled (3) "Actively learning CHamoru" for several reasons: the perceived inutility of the CHamoru language, the lack of a language community, the lack of language resources, and feelings of *mamåhlao*. This indicates that the inhibiting factors that prevent or slow down the (5) "Typical CHamoru identity" from active CHamoru language learning also inhibit the node "CHamoru identity articulated with language fluency." In its logical form:

Figure 6.

(1) "CHamoru identity articulated with language fluency"

↓ **amplifies**   ↑ **is a property of**

(1a) "Reasons for learning" **is the cause of** → (2) "Desire to learn CHamoru"
- "CHamoru identity authentication"
- "Language perpetuation"
- "Connecting with CHamorus speakers"   ↓ **is the cause of**

↓ **is a property of**

(5) "Typical CHamoru identity"   (3) "Actively Learning CHamoru"

↓ **is inhibited because of**

(4) "Factors inhibiting learning CHamoru"
- Perceived inutility of the CHamoru language
- Lack of language community
- Lack of language resources
- Feelings of *mamåhlao*

In conclusion, the model illustrates that young CHamorus' desire to learn the CHamoru language for similar reasons; they are also inhibited for similar reasons. While CHamorus who included language fluency in their articulation of CHamoru identity with language fluency may be more motivated to actively learn the language compared to other CHamorus, the factors that inhibit learning CHamoru significantly impede them from actively learning the language.

174

Chapter 5. Implications and Conclusion

Implications for CHamoru Language Advocates and Policymakers

This thesis has several implications for CHamoru language advocates and policymakers. To begin with, CHamoru language advocates and policymakers must clarify their ideological goal for the CHamoru language. Assuming that English will remain the common language of Guam, is the goal to make the CHamoru language a second commonly-spoken language of Guam, where it's use would be at the same level as English? Is the goal to encourage non-CHamoru Guamanians[37] to learn the CHamoru language? Or is the goal only that CHamorus learn their ethnic language, for the sake of knowing their language or for identity maintenance? Or is the goal to use the language to promote nationalism amongst CHamorus as a means towards gaining CHamoru self-determination? Whatever the goal, the policy makers must provide ideological clarity so a united front can be presented, and policy can be effectively applied to the chosen goal. I suggest that the ideological goal should be to establish a CHamoru multilingual ethnolinguistic identity for a small, dedicated speaking community, for reasons of psychological well-being as well as to maintain the linguistic status quo. More on this will be said later.

A Word About CHamoru Language Hardliners

For some CHamorus, language and identity are intrinsically linked. They subscribe to a hardline view of linguistic determinism that without the CHamoru language, the ethnocultural continuity of CHamorus may not be possible. However, many non-fluent speakers may not consider the language as necessary for CHamoru identity. Some hardliners consider these non-

---

[37] While Guamanian used to refer to CHamorus on Guam in the few decades after WWII, Guamanian is now commonly used to refer to anyone living on Guam regardless of ethnicity or race; although, there are probably a few CHamorus who still use Guamanian in the former sense.

fluent CHamorus to be lacking the essence that makes one CHamoru and may attempt to shame them into subscribing to their point of view. This is problematic as it invalidates many CHamorus of their claims to CHamoru identity. Robert Underwood makes the point; "If the [CHamoru] language were used as a definer of Chamorro identity in the 1980's, major numbers of Chamorros would have very little Chamorro identity" (1987, p. 339). Besides the possible psychological anguish that comes from discounting the CHamoru identity of non-fluent speakers, it creates divisions between fluent and non-fluent CHamorus. This division in the long term will cause serious political consequences for CHamoru maintenance of cultural and political power on Guam.

CHamorus are redefining what it means to be CHamoru by not including language fluency as an essential marker. There are many peoples in the world—such as the Scots, Welsh, and Irish—who lack fluency in their native tongue due to political impositions. Despite the majority of these peoples no longer being able to speak their native languages, they continue to identify with their ethnic groups. The hardline essentialist view fails to consider the empirical evidence that ethnic identity may continue without the language, and people may hold on to their ethnic identities despite not having "essential" elements of language. This viewpoint also fails to recognize that identity is a contested process, dynamic and subject to change. However, I am certain that some who espouse this view on Guam already understand this but are using linguistic essentialism strategically to promote their vision of CHamoru identity for political and cultural goals.

Why Has the CHamoru Language Revitalization Project Failed?

While the English language is the lingua franca for Guam's multilingual residents, and an avenue for socio-economic success, the re-assertion of the CHamoru language serves to perpetuate a re-articulated collective CHamoru identity that is linked to language ability as part of the broader ethnic CHamoru identity revival. Yet, the language revitalization project which started in the 1980s did not stop the language shift to English, despite government and private efforts that sought to protect the identity of CHamoru. What explains the failure?

In order for language policies to be successful, according to linguist Garcia (2012), "A strong link between ethnic identity and language identity; that is, a strong ethnolinguistic identity, is a necessary pre-requisite for language policies to support the efforts of an ethnic community that performs its identity languaging in certain ways" (2012, p. 88). The desired identity languaging I recommend for CHamorus is a multilingual ethnolinguistic identity that includes both English and CHamoru, and this is because English is already the lingua franca and an international language. Furthermore, Garcia argues that the "link [between ethnic identity and language identity] is insufficient if the group does not have, nor is it supported by external authoritative powers whose language ideologies facilitate, rather than disrupt, the language practices of the speech community, and that develop favourable language managing arrangements" (2012, p. 88). Historically, the United States has been the external authoritative power that has implemented Americanization policies and language ideologies that disrupted the CHamoru speech community, which together with Guam's territorial status and the creation of the Chamorro identity has resulted in a weakened CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity and CHamoru national identity. While today, the United States no longer has policies that

177

intentionally disrupt the CHamoru speech community or prevent Guam from enacting language management policies, the damage has already been done.

Successful to moderately successful language maintenance or revitalization programs appear to always include strong language management policies that strengthen the existing ethnolinguistic identity, while unsuccessful programs have weak language management policies which did not reverse the language shift or endangerment (Garcia, 2012). Since language policies are inherently political, they require a significant degree of political power to allocate resources and provide protection and promotion by the state. For example, the Luxembourgish[38] speech community of some 300,000 speakers has been maintained in the small country of Luxembourg, despite the influx of foreign immigrants,[39] the pressure of French and German languages,[40] and globalization, because the Luxembourg state enacted strong language policies such as standardizing the language, requiring immigrants to pass a basic Luxembourgish language test for naturalization, and compulsory classes in school taught entirely in Luxembourgish. In addition, Luxembourg did not experience a significant period of time when an external power disrupted the speech community. In fact, today there is a strong Luxembourgish ethnolinguistic identity among the people due to the historical event of Nazi Germany's occupation of Luxembourg, when the people of Luxembourg demarcated their native German language variety from the invading Germans as a form of resistance. A more relevant example for Guam CHamorus is the case of Māori language revitalization.

In the 1800s, Britain established New Zealand as a colony, and subsequently European settlers overtook the indigenous Māori population of New Zealand as the largest demographic group. The New Zealand state enacted pro-assimilation policies for the Māori, which actively

---

[38] Luxembougish is a standardized variety of Moselle Franconian.
[39] Approximately half of the residents of Luxembough are non-native.
[40] Since Luxembough borders France and Germany, most of the residents are multilingual in French and German.

discouraged the Māori language in favor of English. Furthermore, economic conditions led many Māori to move into urban English-dominated areas, contributing to the decline of the Māori language. By the 1950s, the majority of Māori children were being raised only in English (King, 2018). By all accounts, the Māori were in an inexorable language shift to English, until the Māori ethnic/indigenous revival began in the 1960s and 1970s. This led to many strong language revival initiatives such as *kōhanga reo* (language nests), *kura kaupapa* Māori (Māori philosophy schools), kura reo (language schools), bilingual media etc., which caused an increase in number of Māori speakers, most importantly among the young (King, 2018). By 2010s, the health of the Māori language appeared significantly restored, as around 4 out of 10 households with an adult-speaking Māori were intergenerationally transmitting the language to the children (King, 2018).

While I can summarize a list of strategies the Māori used, so Guam can emulate them, I argue that the language policies, initiatives and successful implementation by the New Zealand government and grassroots organizations were only possible for the Māori for several key reasons: a strong sense of a collective indigenous and ethnolinguistic identity, strong political aspirations that are separate from their settler state, a Māori educated class who are pro-sovereignty, a degree of internal self-determination due to the Treaty of Waitangi, strong state support, a strong economy that can pay for revitalizing programs, and language policies receiving wide support among both Māori and non-Māori of New Zealand. This contrasts with CHamorus who lack a strong CHamoru indigenous and ethnolinguistic identity, strongly identify with America, and appear satisfied with the status quo under American rule, lack federal support for language revitalization, have a weaker economy that is sustained through United States federal spending, and a late-emerging educated CHamoru class that did not link the language to national identity (Clampitt-Dunlap, 1995).

This difference between the CHamorus and Māori is due to their different sociopolitical histories, and a direct result of the CHamorus being colonized for over 400 years, the longest of any Pacific Islands people. The experiences of WWII and the liberation of CHamorus from the Japanese occupation, tied CHamorro identity and political aspirations to America, and discouraged popular support for any semblance of radical CHamoru nationalism. The local ideology of English as the language of success, with the accompanying shift from a subsistence to a cash-based economy, led to a decreasing use of the CHamoru language in the private and public spheres. Thus, the priority of the CHamoru-controlled Government of Guam and the typical CHamoru person was not language maintenance, but rather economic growth and achieving the American dream.

Garcia (2012) observed "Greater success then is reserved for those ethnolinguistic groups whose strong ethnolinguistic identities match their ability to enact language policies that support their strong beliefs on behalf of their languaging, as well as their strong languaging both in private and public" (p. 91). CHamorus have the ability to enact language policies, as they control the Legislature, yet they have enacted only a few mostly symbolic language policies. While since the 2000s there has been a more conscious effort to revitalize the CHamoru language, such as additional mandatory CHamoru cultural and language classes in public schools and the language immersion program initiative in 2019, these are still inadequate and may be too late to reverse the language shift. The issue is not that Guam lacks language planners who can research and articulate much better suggestions then I ever can; rather, the issue is that language revitalization is not a priority, and never has been for the Government of Guam and the majority of Guamanians for reasons already mentioned in the previous paragraph. As a result of the lack of

priority, government funding specifically for language revitalization efforts is abysmal when compared to the Māori or Hawaiians.

According to the 2019 Government of Guam budget, about $2.2 million out of a $956 million budget is allocated to the Department of CHamoru Affairs (DCA). While one mission statement of the DCA is to revive the CHamoru language, the vast majority of the DCA operations is not directly for language revitalization efforts. The CHamoru Studies and Special Projects Division which is inclusive of the CHamoru Language and Culture Program K-5 and the CHamoru Mandate Program Secondary are both locally funded, although I could not find the exact numbers for the amount of local funds used to cover the classes. Besides, as previously mentioned, due to the nature of mandatory public school CHamoru classes, the inconsistent 20-minute language lessons are ineffective for any actual learning of the language. Another government agency that focuses entirely on the CHamoru language, *I Kumision I fino' CHamoru yan I fina'na'guen historia yan I lina'la' taotao tano'* (the Commission on CHamoru Language and the Teaching of the History and Culture of the Indigenous People of Guam) was appropriated $202,200.

In contrast, according to the 2019 New Zealand Wellbeing budget, around NZ$18.3 million was allocated specifically for language revitalization programs and efforts; NZ$7 million for Innovative *Te Reo* Māori Media Content: Increasing Engagement with *Te Reo* Māori Across a Range of Media Platforms, NZ$1.5 million for Implementation of the *Maihi* Māori and Te *Whare o Te Reo Mauri Ora:* Restoring *Te Reo* Māori as a Nurturing First Language, NZ$3.46 million for Implementation of the *Maihi Karauna* Strategy, NZ$2.2 million for *He Whakarākai Whanaungatanga ki waenga i Te Mana ā-Rohe me te Iwi/Māori ki te Hāpai Rangapū:* Enhancing Relationships Between Local Government and Iwi/Māori to Improve Partnerships,

181

and NZ$375,000 for *He Tautoko i Te Rūnanga Nui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa* Māori Supporting *Te Rūnanga Nui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa* Māori (Robertson, 2019). There are several other programs that overlap with the Māori language support programs, which add additional millions. New Zealand can afford to spend millions on Māori revitalization due to its strong economy. The inadequacy of the efforts of CHamoru language revitalization are even more apparent when contrasted with the indigenous Hawaiians who achieved a measure of success in Hawaiian language revitalization.

The effort to revitalize the Hawaiian language was part of the larger Hawaiian ethnic revival in the 1970s and 1980s, similar to other indigenous groups (Warner, 2001). However, unlike the case of the CHamorus, the Hawaiians learned from the Māori how to enact similar language immersion programs early on (Cowell, 2012). According to the 2019 Office of Hawaiian Affairs annual report, the first DOE Hawaiian Language Immersion Programs opened at Waiau Elementary School in Pearl City, and at Keaukaha Elementary in Hilo in 1987. As of 2019, there are a total of 18 *kula kaiapuni* in the Department of Education, another 6 Hawaiian Immersion Public Charter Schools, and it is reported that about 20,000 indigenous Hawaiians and non-indigenous state residents are able to speak Hawaiian fluently.

Cowell argues that Hawaiian language revitalization was largely successful relative to other language revitalization efforts due to "the particular history and socio-cultural conditions of Hawaii: in particular in the nineteenth-century independent monarchy, the twentieth-century multi-ethnic territorial experience, and the resultant "political" and "dispersed" nature of Hawaiian identity, across multiple practices and a large part of the population of Hawaii" (2012, abstract). Hawai'i has a political history of an independent multi-ethnic state with the Hawaiian language as a standard written language. Before the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy

by the US, the language was delinked from ancestry and became used in the government and by many non-indigenous residents in the kingdom. During the ethnic/indigenous revival in the 1960s and 1970s, Hawaiian nationalists tapped into this past to tie the language with a nationalist movement for sovereignty, and these unique conditions allowed the language revival to be more successful because it was linked to nation-building to demarcate indigenous Hawaiians as a nation.

In conclusion, language revitalization has failed on Guam for numerous reasons. In general it can be attributed to a lack of priority for the Government of Guam and Guamanians, a weakened CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity, a Chamorro[41] identity that strongly identifies with America, tolerance of and even satisfaction with the status quo, a lack of strong federal support, and a late-emerging CHamoru elite class which did not link the language with nationalism. The combination of these factors doomed the efforts at language revitalization to fall short.

Language policy makers and advocates must start by re-examining their assumptions regarding their goals and the purpose of revitalizing the language, based on the finding from this thesis. The thesis indicates that the CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity has weakened among CHamoru youth. Only about 5% of CHamoru Millennials on Guam self-reported as having conversational ability in CHamoru (Leon Guerrero, 2016). Most did not consider the language to be necessary for CHamoru identity, confirming the results of an earlier study, which found that a majority of CHamoru surveyed did not consider the knowledge of the CHamoru language as necessary to be considered CHamoru (Riley, 1975). In addition, practically all young CHamorus feel an attachment to the language, but not all necessarily feel an attachment to CHamoru nationalist aspirations.

---

[41] Intentionally spelled as "Chamorro" to emphasize that this Chamorro identity "has been constructed through as well as in response to American colonization" (Cruz, 2012, p. 3).

All the pro-language rhetoric that young CHamorus constantly hear does not lead to active learning for the majority of them, because CHamoru language revitalization is also a socio-cultural issue. The goal is not just to learn the language for the sake of the language, but actually to use it and make it a part of daily life. As the linguist Andrew Cowell stated, "Only the re-engineering of cultural ecology around language is likely to produce critical masses of young speakers who will begin raising their children as new first-language speakers." (2012, p. 187). CHamorus have not achieved success in the ethnolinguistic arena of language revitalization, although they have achieved political and economic success.[42] Due to the series of unfortunate events in Guam's sociopolitical history, achieving socioeconomic success was engineered around the English language. Following Garcia (2012), Table 2 compares the CHamoru language with other languages in terms of ethnolinguistic identity and language policy. It is improbable that the CHamoru language could be revitalized in Guam to the level of a second language on par with English, without a policy of mass compulsory attendance of CHamoru language immersion schools. With this information in mind I have several recommendations for policy makers.

---

[42] Politically, there have been several CHamoru senators and two CHamoru governors who lack proficient CHamoru speaking ability. In the Underwood v. Camacho gubernatorial campaign, Underwood claims that his knowledge of CHamoru was politically weaponized by Camacho supporters to attack him.

Table 2.

Graded Components of Ethnolinguistic identity and language policy

	Successful LP efforts		Less Successful LP efforts	
Ethnolinguistic identity	Strong	Strong	Strong	Moderate
Beliefs about languaging	Strong	Strong	Moderate	Weak
Languaging in private	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Weak
Languaging in public	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Weak
Language management by in-group	Strong	Strong	Weak	Weak
Language management by out-group	Strong	Strong	Weak	Weak
Example of groups	Lxmbrgns Basques Catalans	Māoris Hawaiian Welsh	Tseltals/Tsotsils Quechuas Amazigh-speakers (Berbers) Alsatian	Gallo-speakers Breton-speakers Dines **CHamoru**
Results	Language maintenance & Development	Language revitalization & Development	Language threatened	Language shift

Note. Adapted from *Ethnic identity and language policy*, by Ofelia Garcia (2012), CHamoru placement is based on my own classification.

Recommendations for Policymakers

As Table 2 shows, all the major components of CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity and language policy are moderate to weak, which is leading to a language shift. Under the current conditions, achieving the ambitious goal of establishing the CHamoru language alongside English as a functional second language is impossible without mass compulsory language training, funding, and a cultural shift around the CHamoru language. In light of the current

sociocultural and political conditions on Guam, I propose that policy makers reorient their goal to the difficult, albeit more achievable goal of maintaining and slowly expanding the number of CHamoru language speakers through support of a small dedicated community.

Initially, this will be almost entirely a top-down approach, which is necessary because CHamorus lack a strong CHamoru national identity separate from the United States, and a strong ethnolinguistic identity. The top-down approach will rely on the Government of Guam and support from Guam's political and social elite. Guam's current sociocultural and political conditions inhibit any significant progress towards language revitalization without strong language policies from the Government of Guam. Thus, the survival of the language is contingent upon the enactment of strong language policies by the Government of Guam.

While in the past 40 years, the Government of Guam has made efforts to protect the CHamoru language, it is not enough to stem the language shift. The Government of Guam must appropriate more funds towards a single government agency with the sole purpose of CHamoru language revitalization. Perhaps this agency may be an expanded *Kumision I fino' CHamoru* or some other new agency. Garnering public support, especially among non-CHamorus, will be very difficult; I will leave that task to the politicians. However, I do suggest that they gradually increase the funding of CHamoru language revitalization efforts by annual increments. As the recent funding controversy for FestPac has indicated (Leon Guerrero, 2020) many CHamorus and non-CHamorus on Guam do not prioritize funding for "culture," and language revitalization efforts will probably be viewed as such. It is one thing to support language revitalization efforts in the abstract, and another to allocate funding towards it.

The lion's share of the funding must go to support CHamoru language immersion efforts similar to the Hurao Academy collaboration with Guam Department of Education (GDOE) and

186

the P.C. Lujan Elementary School initiative. This is probably the most efficacious method for gaining a significant number of speakers. If gaining speakers is the main goal, then local funding for the CHamoru language and cultural programs in public schools must be redirected towards language immersion programs rather than general classes. However, I would not recommend this strategy, which may lead to a greater increase in the number CHamoru speakers because it would have the effect of reducing public recognition of CHamoru culture among non-CHamorus. The CHamoru language and cultural programs in the public schools instill among students a sense of understanding and respect towards CHamoru culture, and thus help to maintain the CHamoru sociocultural and political order on Guam. Although these classes may be ineffective at producing fluent speakers, the possible long-term consequences for the CHamoru socio-cultural and political order of canceling these classes may not be worth the additional speakers gained.

Although my thesis focused on young non-fluent CHamorus aged 18 years or older and I desire for all CHamoru to become fluent, I recommend that only a minimal amount of additional government funding be dedicated towards this demographic; because addressing the factors that influence their language learning decisions would require an unattainable amount of resources and political power. According to the CHamoru Identity Language Articulation model, language perpetuation efforts must focus on the external inhibiting factors that prevent all CHamorus from actively learning the language—in particular, the issues of inutility and lack of language community (see Figure 1). Increasing the utility of CHamoru is complex and difficult, due to funding limitations, legal issues, and ethnic tension. For example, if the Government of Guam gave tax breaks for people who earned a CHamoru elementary speaking certificate, or required applicants for government jobs to pass a CHamoru language exam, would such an action bring lawsuits by non CHamorus against the Government of Guam on the grounds of discrimination?

Would this raise ethnic tension? While policies such as tax incentives, hiring preference, and island-wide discounts for young CHamorus who achieved a certain degree of CHamoru fluency would increase the utility value of the CHamoru language, these are not recommended as it might ignite ethnic tension and lead other ethnic groups to politically mobilize along ethnic lines and form a coalition against CHamorus. While Guam's political culture is stable, and is not extremely divided along ethnic lines, it must not be taken for granted.

If additional resources do become available, then language programs and recommendations that do not overtly raise the utility of the language may be enacted. Tamar Celis (2017) makes several excellent recommendations for language revitalization that will probably not raise the ethnic tension. Two recommendations which I particularly want to point out is the Master-Apprentice Program and the Little Elder system. The Master-Apprentice Program pairs a non-fluent CHamoru with a native CHamoru speaker for language training sessions, and both are provided with stipends. This program provides the crucial language resource of a native CHamoru speaker. The Little Elder system utilizes outstanding language students in language immersion programs to serve as role-models to other CHamoru language students. This system provides the much-needed networking with fellow CHamoru language contemporaries (Celis, 2017).

These two programs are excellent because they serve to connect CHamoru language learners to each other and to native speakers without raising the ethnic tension. It avoids raising ethnic tension due to its relatively low resource cost and its non-intrusive nature for Guamanians who do not desire to learn the language. If no funding can be allocated to efforts such as these, then the instruction of post high school CHamoru second language learners should be left up to

grassroots efforts and existing CHamoru language programs and materials because government resources should primarily be directed towards young CHamorus in language immersion schools.

Another potential strategy is to direct resources to Guam's CHamoru and non-CHamoru political and social elite. This will personally invest Guam's most powerful, educated, and wealthiest individuals in the CHamoru language revitalization project, which will have positive effects for the status of the CHamoru language and its use in the community. If somehow, the CHamoru language became the language of Guam's elite, it might cause the establishment of a hegemonic order around the CHamoru language (Berreto, 1998). As a result, it can organically lead to preferential hiring and treatment based on CHamoru speaking, which ultimately increases the social and economic utility of the CHamoru language among other things.

The CHamoru Language Commission must be strengthened, as this organization would play a huge role in the revitalization of the CHamoru language. They must continue the standardization of CHamoru from the diversity of different ways of speaking CHamoru. While there are many individuals who are critical of this process, it is best to ignore them, as in every language standardization project there is always resistance. However, the standardized CHamoru will ultimately need approval from the CHamoru people. The goal should be the acceptance by the youth, rather than the acceptance by older CHamorus. Standardized CHamoru can be normalized amongst the youth in the school systems, while more difficult for older CHamoru without mandatory CHamoru language education.

CHamoru spelling conventions and grammatical rules must be enforced. CHamoru teachers must attend the *Kumision* conventions to update themselves on the standardized spelling and grammatical rules. Understandably, some critics may argue that the focus on spelling distracts from the goal of actually creating language speakers. However, now is a crucial time to

officially finish the standardization of the language because there is an emergent genre of CHamoru-language literature, media, and education tools. If decades later, a standardized language is not codified, then the different varieties in spellings will continue the disunity. I could give other suggestions, such as utilizing the Catholic Church or island celebrities to promote the CHamoru language, but these would require more resources and political power than what is realistically attainable in the current sociocultural and political conditions on Guam.

Strategic Essentialism

In order to strengthen CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity, specifically with the CHamoru language, government officials and teachers must continue to perpetuate essentialist notions of culture and language in all arenas. This may also help perpetuate the CHamoru youth's tacit support for the language, even though it may not significantly increase the number of CHamoru learners, as Underwood (1989) has noted. Best of all it is free. Government leaders, employees, and teachers must maintain and reinforce the essentialist ideologies that young CHamorus hold about the language and culture—their emotional attachment to the language and culture, their apprehensions about the impending "death of the language," and their rhetoric that "the language is a part of us."

This tactic benefits most CHamorus no matter what political or cultural goals they have. For CHamorus who enjoy the socioeconomic status quo, it contributes to the maintenance of the CHamoru led sociocultural and political order on Guam in conjunction with the benefits as an organized unincorporated territory of the United States. It accomplishes this by being a cultural and political rallying tool for CHamorus to assert their cultural identity. The CHamoru language serves as a reminder for non-CHamorus that the indigenous people of Guam exist. For

CHamorus who are seeking autonomy or even independence, this tactic rhetorically supports CHamoru prominence, and helps foster a collective ethno-national identity as a basis for seeking self-determination.

Implications for CHamoru Indigenous Rights Activists and Nationalists

Indigenous rights activists will continue to have tacit support from the majority of young CHamorus. These young CHamorus desire to protect the CHamoru language, culture and land, at least in an abstract sense. Whether this translates to young CHamorus supporting specific policies that require the appropriation of additional funds specifically for language revitalization is not clear. For CHamoru activists, particularly nationalists who advocate specifically for immigration control and CHamoru self-determination, they need to be very cautious as many young CHamorus probably perceive these proposals to be a form of discrimination and even racism.

If the majority of CHamorus do not connect CHamoru language revitalization to achieving political autonomy or outright independence from the United States, is there really any purpose for language revitalization beyond biodiversity arguments and achieving psychological well-being? As this thesis research has shown, many CHamorus do not link the preservation of the CHamoru language with nationalist aspirations, for reasons already discussed, supporting the notion that language loyalty does not always accompany strong feelings of nationalism (Riley, 1975). This is something for CHamoru nationalist to think about, as I have been doing throughout the writing of this thesis.

Shift of Thought

As a result of this thesis research project, my views on the CHamoru language have shifted. I used to believe that CHamoru language fluency was the key for building CHamoru nationalism, decolonization, and ultimately political sovereignty. However, I now believe that language is an outdated key for a changed lock. For the majority of CHamorus, the CHamoru language is not linked to nationalist aspirations for an independent state. Although this linkage can be established, as it has been in the majority of nationalist projects, it is not feasible in the current sociocultural and political conditions of Guam, as I have already discussed.

I am indebted to Kenyan author Ngũgĩ wa Thiongo's pivotal works such as *Decolonizing the Mind*, as it greatly influenced my thoughts on the role of language in the process for decolonization. Yet I no longer entirely agree with Thiongo's view that language is the foundation of culture, or equivalent to the mind, or that it is imperative for colonized people to speak their indigenous language in order to decolonize their minds and other aspects of society. While this Whorfian linguistic determinist view was applicable at the time for the young African states as a way of building their national identities, it may not be applicable to the reality of CHamorus on Guam today.

Instead, the CHamoru language should serve primarily to promote the well-being of CHamorus and to maintain the sociocultural and political position of CHamorus. Due to the salience of language in constructing identity, using the "mother tongue" has psychological benefits for the speakers. Even though I am consciously aware of the forces that shape my attitudes towards the CHamoru language, I am happy when I speak the language. While CHamoru fluency is ideal, it is not what ultimately matters; what matters is the act of learning and using CHamoru to instill CHamoru pride contributes to the maintenance of CHamoru ethnic

192

boundaries and well-being. CHamoru programs that incorporate the CHamoru language, such as the CHamoru cultural dance schools, contribute to the well-being of CHamoru by giving CHamoru youth guidance, self-esteem, a sense of place, and positive socialization.

While the public-school classes in CHamoru language and cultural have failed to produce fluent speakers, they contribute to instilling CHamoru pride and respect amongst CHamorus and non-CHamorus. This may contribute to the maintenance of the CHamoru sociopolitical and cultural order on Guam. On social media, the language has evolved beyond conversational communication. Youth frequently use the language as a marker of their CHamoru identity. Perhaps, most important of all, the language allows us to connect with our elders in their native language. Still, I do not entirely dismiss the nationalist dream of CHamoru liberation. Maybe in the future, when there are language immersion schools producing a new generation of CHamoru speakers, political mobilization around the language may be possible.

Perpetuating a Colonized Language Approach?

Some critical indigenous scholars may critique my implications and recommendations for CHamoru language revitalization as too colonial or "state" centric. They could argue that we must decolonize language revitalization and re-imagine decolonization outside of the colonized or state-centric framework. Yet I have found no alternative compelling solution that is applicable to Guam. Guam is in a unique position: The CHamorus still maintain a strong sociopolitical and economic position on Guam and the Guam Legislature is mostly composed of CHamorus or CHamoru-sympathetic politicians. It is better now than to wait later for the Government of Guam to implement strong language policies, which is to my knowledge, the best tool and perhaps only realistic way of reversing the language loss or at least maintaining the CHamoru language.

The Government of Guam has given official recognition to the CHamoru language, an act of advocacy and support that many peoples around the world would want from their own government, whether their language was endangered or not. Likewise, the Guam government has supported a language immersion school program, which began in 2019, an approach that utilized the non-profit Hurao Academy in combination with government agencies. My suggestions here are not new. Dr. Robert Underwood and other linguists had been warning since the 1970s and 1980s that if language trends continued, the CHamoru language would be endangered. Despite those studies, the Government of Guam failed to prioritize support for the language until very recently. If the Government of Guam does not continue to prioritize support for the language through the 2020s, then the language shift to English will be complete once the older fluent speakers pass away.

Conclusion

CHamoru identity is shaped, negotiated, and contested by political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural, and historical forces, which have led to a weakened CHamoru ethnolinguistic identity and language shift. For CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z who lack a strong ethnolinguistic identity, what the language means for their CHamoru identity is not entirely clear, as there has not been a comprehensive study of their conceptualization of CHamoru identity. By analyzing how young CHamorus articulate their CHamoru identity in relation to the CHamoru language, we can understand the processes of CHamoru identity re-articulation and the political, economic, ideological, socio-cultural and historical forces that guided and actively shape ethnolinguistic identity among CHamoru Millennials and Generation Z. The information is relevant for CHamoru language advocates, policymakers, and teachers.

The typical young CHamoru articulates their identity mainly in terms of everyday customs and values, which excludes the CHamoru language as a critical aspect of their CHamoru identity. This reflects their reality as CHamorus growing up without fluency in the language. However, young CHamorus still generally see positive value in learning the language, as well as a connection between the CHamoru language and CHamoru identity. CHamorus who believe the language to be an integral part of their identity almost always have gone through an experience that caused them to question whether their identity as CHamoru could be fully realized without some knowledge of the CHamoru language. This experience leads to an awakening stage from the "default CHamoru identity" through the process of identity re-articulation. The exception is CHamorus raised in non-typical households where the language is already is daily use; these CHamorus are raised to value the language. While CHamorus who included CHamoru language ability as a critical part of their CHamoru identity are more likely to actively learn the language, they are nevertheless inhibited due to external factors that affect all CHamorus, no matter how they articulate their identity, from actively learning CHamoru.

Another significant finding is that the participants conceptualized CHamoru ethnic identity in terms of nine attributes: (1) blood/genealogy; (2) practicing cultural values; (3) knowledge and understanding of cultural values; (4) knowledge of history; (5) being raised or living in the CHamoru lifestyle or culture; (6) language ability; (7) living in the homeland; (8) ethnic consumerism; and (9) personal feelings of self-identifying as CHamoru. CHamorus either invoked, emphasized or deemphasized one or several of these attributes in their understanding of CHamoru in-group membership. Most CHamorus hold the belief that individuals can claim CHamorus identity without a speaking knowledge of the language, even amongst many of those who believe language is critical to CHamoru identity. Overall, CHamorus prefer inclusivity over

195

exclusivity when defining CHamoru ethnicity, particularly when it comes to language ability. Until more CHamorus become fluent and use the language, it is unlikely that language fluency will be a major marker of CHamoru identity. Instead, other aspects of their conceptualization of CHamoru identity—such as blood/genealogy, values of respect, familia, etc., even personal feelings of self-identifying as CHamoru and so on—are likely to act and continue to act as major markers of identity for CHamorus Millennials and Gen Zers, even though on social media, the CHamoru language is the prominent marker of CHamoru identity for young CHamorus.

Another significant finding is that young CHamorus make commonsense ontological assertions about the connection between language and people, consistent with nationalist ideologies that posit a natural linkage between ethnicity and language. CHamorus' essentialist beliefs about identity and culture lead them to protect their language for psychological and political reasons. These essentialist beliefs often come into conflict with the linguistic reality that they lack CHamoru language fluency often causing ambivalence. Language revitalization efforts reflect the larger socio-political battle for CHamorus to maintain their cultural and political prominence on Guam in the face of demographic changes, Americanization, and globalization. These forces threaten the position of CHamorus because they impose liberal multiculturalism and American ideas of equality and politics, which stigmatize ethnic-based politics and mobilization. CHamorus challenge these ideas and combat marginalization by using the concept of indigeneity in order to maintain the CHamoru sociocultural and political order.

Arguments based on indigeneity allow CHamorus to tap into the international human rights discourses, which hold that indigenous peoples have the collective human right to maintain their way of life, in their land, within the borders or under the hegemony of states. Although CHamorus in general may not articulate the political development of indigeneity, arguments

from indigeneity are self-evidently made by CHamorus to explain why they are a unique ethnic group on Guam and deserving of pro-CHamoru policies. As such, CHamorus use indigenous-based discourses to argue specifically that the CHamoru language, culture, and land ought to be preserved, revitalized and perpetuated by the government and community. However, many young CHamorus do not use indigeneity discourses to the extent that CHamoru nationalists do, to argue specifically for control of immigration and CHamoru self-determination. This is because young CHamorus are either ignorant of the issues and are not radicalized, or they perceive the CHamoru nationalist positions to be discriminatory or even racist.

This perceived connection between the CHamoru nationalist position and discrimination/racism is ideologically shaped by the power relations between the United States and Guam. As a colony of the United States of America and because CHamorus are US citizens, Guam and its residents are subjected to the liberal and multicultural ideologies of the United States. Young CHamorus were brought up on a culturally diverse island, and they understand diversity within the framework of American multiculturalism and equality. The media reinforces this connection and ignorance amongst the residents through the lack of news coverage on the potential harms of these ideologies towards the CHamoru people, and through the promotion of such ideologies. Naturally, some young CHamorus are uneasy and skeptical about these CHamoru nationalists' positions because they perceive them, at least initially, as violating their underlying assumptions. However, for CHamorus who have "awakened" usually through education, they resist these dominant ideological tendencies on Guam from the standpoint of CHamoru nationalism.

CHamoru language revitalization is a momentous task, and as this thesis has argued, nearly impossible due to the sociopolitical history and current political conditions of Guam.

CHamoru policy makers must re-orient the language goal to maintaining a small multi-lingual but progressively expanding language community, as anything more ambitious is impossible without unlimited political power. In order to navigate the multi-cultural and liberal socio-political order, policy makers must not make any overt policies that will increase the economic utility of the language, as public backlash would possibly kill any effort. The Guam Legislature could start allocating funds in gradual increments towards CHamoru language immersion programs, as this has proven to be the most effective, humane, and pragmatic way of increasing the number of speakers amongst the youth and the next generation of "elites" should learn CHamoru. Older second-language learners should be a lower priority for government allocation of resources, because the vast majority of these individuals are inhibited from actively learning for socioeconomic reasons. However, if additional resources are available, then resources must go to programs that connect CHamoru language learners to each other and to native speakers. If there are no resources to spare, then pre-existing educational resources and grassroots efforts such as non-profit CHamoru classes and online material will continue to support older CHamoru second-language learners. This is probably the most realistic solution that Guam can achieve under the current conditions. While CHamoru fluency is ideal, the maintenance of a sense of CHamoruness, the CHamoru sociopolitical and cultural order on Guam, and the promotion of the well-being of CHamorus, are in my view more important than attaining language fluency.

This study contributes to the broader literature on CHamoru identity and language perpetuation in several ways. First, the study provides a theoretical model, CHamoru Identity Language Articulation Model, which identifies decision pathways and processes to explain why some CHamorus actively learn the language while others do not. The model maps out the various motivating and inhibiting factors that influence participants' learning of the CHamoru language.

198

The model may be expanded to include other factors that influence how non-fluent CHamorus articulate their identity. Second, the study identifies nine attributes that CHamorus use to conceptualize CHamoru ethnicity. Third, the study provides a better understanding on how young CHamorus understand CHamoru identity and indigeneity. Future studies concerning ethnic identity, indigeneity, and language revitalization should examine these motivating and inhibiting factors to verify for validity and generalizability, as this study was based on a single qualitative study of fourteen CHamorus. Further research should explore how the CHamoru language is used on social media. Future research should also further analyze the nine attributes—and others—that young non-fluent CHamorus use to define CHamoru ethnicity.

References

Asia Pacific Forum of National Human Rights Institutions and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2013). The United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples: a manual for national human rights institutions. Sydney: United Nations.

2019 Office of Hawaiian Affairs Annual reports. (2019). https://19of32x2yl33s8o4xza0gf14-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2019annualreport_WEB.pdf

Babauta, L. (2019). WWII: War Atrocities: Tinta and Faha Massacres, Malesso. Retrieved December 7, 2019, from https://www.guampedia.com/war-atrocities-tinta-and-faha-massacres/

Berreto A. A. (1998). Language and Elites. Barreto A. A. (Eds.). *Language, Elites, and the State: Nationalism in Puerto Rico and Quebec* (pp. 31-46) Praeger: Westport Connecticut London

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th edition). Boston: Pearson.

Bevacqua, M. L. (2010) *Chamorros, ghosts, non-voting delegates: GUAM! Where the production of America's sovereignty begins* [Doctoral dissertation, University of California at San Diego].

Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond "identity". *Theory and society, 29*(1), 1-47.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press.

Camacho, K. L. (2011). *Cultures of commemoration: The politics of war, memory, and history the Mariana Islands*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Carson, M. T. (2012). An overview of latte period archaeology. *Micronesica*, *42*(1/2), 1-79.

Carson, M. T. (2014). *First settlement of Remote Oceania: earliest sites in the Mariana Islands* (Vol. 1). Springer Science & Business Media.

Carson, M. T. (2017). Inhabiting remote tropical seashores at 1500–1100 BC: Water, practicalities, and rituals in the Mariana Islands. *Journal of Field Archaeology*, *42*(4), 269-282.

Celis, T. (2017). *The Indigenous Initiative: Creating A Theoretical Model For The Language Learning Motivations of Heritage Language Learners* [Master's thesis, University of Guam].

Chan freska [youngbiha]. (2020, January, 9). I've spent the last 10 years fighting against it. From Pagan, Litkyan, Magua and Tailalo to Tinian and Pagan. I will continue to fight for our land, water, and dignity, peace and safety of our people. We deserve so much more what the EIS laid out for us [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/youngbiha/status/1215102167125614592

Chan freska [youngbiha]. (2020, January, 10). Not to come for any diaspora Chamoru, but there is truth to this tweet…you can have Chamoru heritage but being an islander comes from living in an island lol [Laughing out loud]. There is kana connection that can only be felt here. Up to you how important it is to have that connection yourself [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/youngbiha/status/1215507190540161024

Chan freska [youngbiha]. (2020, January, 11). Can all diaspora Chamorus do us non-voting Marianas Chamorus a favor and please not vote for any more war-mongering imperialist leaders in the states? If you can't make it home pls at least help us to protect our land and waters from rapid militarization. SYM love y'all (heart emoji) [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/youngbiha/status/1215826221071646721

Chan freska [youngbiha]. (2020, January, 17). Indigenous Chamoru feminism is not the patriarchy run by women [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/youngbiha/status/1217967490241683458

Clampitt-Dunlap, S. (1995). *Nationalism, native language maintenance and the spread of English: a comparative study of the cases of Guam, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico* [Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de Puerto Rico].

Clement, M. (2019). English and Chamorro Language Policies. Retrieved December 10, 2019 from http://www.guampedia.com/us-naval-era-langauge-policies/

Clifford, J. (2013). *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press.

Cobo, M. (1987). Study of the Problem of Discrimination Against Indigenous Populations, UN Doc: E/CN.4/Sub.2/1986/7ADD.4UNDoc.

Cowell, A. (2012). The Hawaiian model of language revitalization: Problems of extension to mainland Native America. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 218*, 167–193.

Cravens, H. (2010). What's New in Science and Race since the 1930s?: Anthropologists and Racial Essentialism. *The Historian*, *72*(2), 299-320.

Cruz, M. T. F. (2012). *(Re) searching identify: being Chamorro in an American colony* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa].

Daes, E. I. A. (2008). An overview of the history of indigenous peoples: self-determination and the United Nations. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, *21*(1), 7-26.

Diaz, V. M. (2010). *Repositioning the missionary: Rewriting the histories of colonialism, native Catholicism, and indigeneity in Guam*. University of Hawai'i Press.

Diego, E. A. P. (2010). *Reclaiming Identity in Articulating what it Means to be Chamorro: A phenomenological Study of Indigenous People of Guam* [Doctoral dissertation, Gonzaga University].

Dorian, N. (1999). Linguistic and Ethnographic Fieldwork. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. (pp. 25-41). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press

Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).

Driver, M. G., & Brunal-Perry, O. (1996). *Carolinians in the Mariana Islands in the 1800s: Selected Documents from the Holdings of the Spanish Documents Collection at the Micronesian Area Research Center*. Guam, Micronesian Area Research Center.

Duchêne, A. & Heller, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Discourses of endangerment: Ideology and interest in the defence of languages*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Edwards, J. (2012). *Language and identity: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellingson, T. (2001). *The myth of the noble savage.* University of California Press.

Eugenio, H. V. (2016). Keeping Chamorro language alive.
Retrieved December 7, 2018, from
https://www.guampdn.com/story/news/2016/08/20/keeping-chamorro-language-alive/88987310/

Farrell, D. A. (2011). History of the Northern Mariana Islands to partition. *Public School System, Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands*, 189.

Fishman, J. A. (1972). *Language and nationalism: Two integrative essays.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers

Fishman, J. A. (1985). Epilogue: The Rise and Fall of the "Ethnic Revival" in the USA. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity.* (pp. 489-527). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter & Co press.

Fishman, J. A. (1994). The truth about language and culture (and a note about its relevance to the Jewish case). *International journal of the sociology of language*, *109*(1), 83-96.

Flores, J. A. (1999). *Art and identity in the Mariana Islands: issues of reconstructing an ancient past* [Doctoral dissertation, University of East Anglia].

Flores, J. (2004). Artists and activists in cultural identity construction in the Mariana Islands. In T. V. Mejil & J. Miedema (Eds.), *Shifting Images of Identity in the Pacific* (pp. 119–134). Leiden, Netherlands: KITLV press.

Garcia, O. (2012) Ethnic identity and language policy. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of language policy* (pp. 79-99). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gellner, E. (2008). *Nations and nationalism*. Cornell University Press.

Grillo, R. D. (2003). Cultural Essentialism and Cultural Anxiety. *Anthropological theory*, *3*(2), 157-173.

Hammarström, H. (2016). Linguistic diversity and language evolution. *Journal of Language Evolution*, *1*(1), 19-29.

Hannum, H. (1993). Rethinking self-determination. *Va. J. int'l L.*, *34*, 1.

Hannum, H. (1998). The right of self-determination in the twenty-first century. *WAsh. & lee l. rev.*, *55*, 773.

Hattori, A. P. (2004). *Colonial dis-ease: US Navy health policies and the Chamorros of Guam, 1898-1941*. University of Hawaii Press.

Hattori, A. P. (2014). Navy Blues: US Naval Rule on Guam and the rough road to assimilation, 1898-1941. *Pacific Asia Inquiry 5 (1)*, 13-30.

Hunter-Anderson, R. L. (2011). The Latte Period in Marianas prehistory. *Pacific Island Heritage*, 17.

Higuchi, W. (2019). Japanese Occupation of Guam. Retrieved January 3, 2020, from https://www.guampedia.com/japanese-occupation-of-guam/

Hobsbawm, E. (1996). Language, culture, and national identity. *Social research*, 1065-1080.

Hobsbawm, E. (2012). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge University Press.

Iwamoto, H. (1996). Japanese Southward Expansion in the South Seas and its Relations with Japanese Settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1919-1940. *South Pacific Study*, *17*(1), 30.

Jenkins, R. (2014). *Social identity*. Routledge.

Joseph, G. M., & Rosenberg, E. S. (2001). *Foreign in a domestic sense: Puerto Rico, American expansion, and the Constitution*. Duke University Press.

King, J. (2018). Māori: revitalization of an endangered language. In K. L. Rehg & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Endangered Languages* (pp. 592-612). United States, New York: Oxford University Press.

Kumar, R. (2019). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Sage Publications Limited.

Kuper, K. G. (2014). *Na'lå'la' I hila'-ta, na'matatnga I taotao-ta: Chamorro language as liberation from colonization* [Master's thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa].

Kastoryano, R. (2011). Multiculturalism. In B. Badie, D. Berg-Schlosser & L. Morlino (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* (Vol. 5, pp. 1629-1632). SAGE Publications.

Leon Guerrero, E. (2017). Testing the effectiveness of some variables in influencing Guamanians' interest level and speaking ability in the Chamorro language. Unpublished.

Leon Guerrero, J. (2020). In defense of our people. Retrieved April 29, 2020, from https://www.postguam.com/forum/letter_to_the_editor/in-defense-of-our-people/article_4b2ede18-30f0-11ea-bb15-af38b4366c62.html

Leon Guerrero, V. (2018). Chamorro Registry and the Decolonization Registry. Retrieved December 12, 2018, from https://www.guampedia.com/chamorro-registry-and-the-decolonization-registry/

Limtiaco, S. (2019). Guam starts new effort to save dying CHamoru language. Retrieved December 10, 2019, from https://www.guampdn.com/story/news/local/2019/04/22/guam-starts-new-effort-save-dying-chamoru-language/3536584002/

Lytra, V. (2016). Language and ethnic identity. In S. Preece (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of language and Identity* (pp. 131-145). Oxon: Routledge

Makaveli [brittvlou]. (2020, January, 10). Bruhhhhh Chamorro's raised in the states are ANNOYING (hands up emoji) y'all can wear as much Guam gear as you want but if your foot never touched the island, your soul never felt her. like get outta here w your wanna be "islander" ass (roll eyes up emoji) (skull emoji) [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/brittvlou/status/1215393001196879873

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re) constituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies: An International Journal*, *2*(3), 137-156.

May, S. (2013). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. Routledge.

McGarry, J. (2001). *Northern Ireland and the divided world: post-agreement Northern Ireland in comparative perspective*. Oxford University Press.

Mchombo, S. (2009). In Nyanja. In K. Brown & S. Oglive (Eds.). *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World* (pp. 791-797). Elsevier

Miller, C. (2003). Linguistic policies and the issue of ethno-linguistic minorities in the Middle East. *Islam in the Middle Eastern studies: Muslims and minorities*, 149-174.

Milmo, C. (2014). Cornish to be recognized as a national minority along with Scots, Welsh and Irish. Retrieved February 6, 2020, from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/cornish-people-formally-declared-a-national-minority-along-with-scots-welsh-and-irish-9278725.html

Molix, L., & Bettencourt, B. A. (2010). Predicting well-being among ethnic minorities: Psychological empowerment and group identity. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 513-533.

Monnig, L. A. (2007). *"Proving Chamorro": Indigenous narratives of race, identity, and decolonization on Guam*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign].

Muehlmann S. (2007) Defending diversity? Staking out a common global interest. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of Endangerment* (pp. 14-34). New York: Continuum.

Mydas [mylisharojas]. (2020, January, 10). It's sad the "real" islanders want to shame people who have chosen to live in a different place. My son's have Chamorro blood running through their veins and that makes them as much Chamorro as any "real" islander [Tweet]. Retrieved from https://twitter.com/mylisharojas/status/1215528049518579712

Nihi Kids. (2019, June 19). *Nihi! Kids TALK to Chamoru Activists | KIDS TALK | Nihi!* [Video]. Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GbHsU-jpWPk

Pacific Policy Research Center. 2010. Successful Bilingual and Immersion Education Models/Programs. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, Research & Evaluation Division.

Pacific Region Compendium (2015). Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/ana/pacific_compendium_final.pdf

Patrick D. (2007). Indigenous language endangerment and the unfinished business of nation states. In A. Duchêne & M. Heller (Eds.), *Discourses of Endangerment* (pp. 35-56). New York: Continuum.

Pennycook, A. (2002). Mother tongues, governmentality, and protectionism. *International Journal of the Sociology of language*, 11-28.

Perez, M. P. (1997). *The dialectic of indigenous identity in the wake of colonialism: The case of Chamorros of Guam* [Doctoral dissertation, UC San Diego].

Perez, M. P. (2005). Colonialism, Americanization, and indigenous identity: A research note on Chamorro identity in Guam. *Sociological Spectrum, 25*(5), 571-591.

Peterson, J. A. (2012). Latte villages in Guam and the Marianas: Monumentality or monumenterity. *Micronesica*, *42*(1/2), 183-208.

Phillips, M. (2019). Land Ownership on Guam. Retrieved December 7, 2019, from https://www.guampedia.com/land-ownership-on-guam/

Pinker, S. (2003). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. Penguin.

Quimby, F. (2019). Guam Commonwealth Act. Retrieved February 6, 2020, from https://www.guampedia.com/guam-commonwealth-act/

Rechebei, E. & Chung, S. (2018). Language Revitalization in the CNMI and Guam. In a C. L. Salvatordore (Ed.), *Cultural Heritage Care and Management: Theory and Practice* (pp. 83-93). Rowman & Littlefield Lanham Maryland

Robertson, H. G. (2019). Summary of Initiatives in Budget 2019 https://www.budget.govt.nz/budget/pdfs/summary-initiatives/b19-sum-initiatives.pdf

Roberts R. C. (2011) Rectificatory Justice. In Chatterjee D. K. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Global Justice.* Springer, Dordrecht

Rogers, R. F. (1998). Requiem for a quest: the failure of Guam's leaders to secure fundamental political change. In D. R. Shuster, P. Larmour & K. V. Strokirch (Eds.), *Leadership in the Pacific Islands: Tradition and the Future* (pp. 89-99). Canberra, Australia: National Centre for Development Studies.

Rogers, R. F. (1995). *Destiny's Landfall: A History of Guam*. University of Hawaii Press.

Riley, G. A. (1975). Language loyalty and ethnocentrism in the Guamanian speech community. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 286-292.

Ruane, M. C. M., Aflague, A. K., Casimbon, R. G., & Tenorio, M. L. V. 2018 GUAM Economic Report.

Rudwick, S. (2004). 'Zulu, we need [it] for our culture': Umlazi adolescents in the post-apartheid state. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *22*(3-4), 159-172.

Rudwick, S. (2008). Linguistic Culture and Essentialism in South Africa. *Macrolinguistics, 2,* 149-163

Rudwick, S. (2018). Language, Africanisation, and identity politics at a South African university. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *17*(4), 255-269.

Russell, S. (1998). *Tiempon I Manmofo'na: ancient Chamorro culture and history of the Northern Mariana Islands* (No. 32). Division of Historic Preservation.

Santos-Bamba, S. J. (2013). The languages of three generation of Chamorro women. *Pacific Asia Inquiry, 4*(1), 84-93.

Scholz, B. C., Pelletier. F. J, & Pollum, G. K. (2016). Philosophy of Linguistics. In Z. Edward (Ed.). *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 edition). Stanford University: Metaphysics Research Lab

Shimizu, H. (1987). NANSHIN-RON: ITS TURNING POINT IN WORLD WAR I. *The developing economies*, *25*(4), 386-402.

Smith, T. B., & Silva, L. (2011). Ethnic identity and personal well-being of people of color: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *58*(1), 42.

Souder, L. (2019). Guam starts new effort to save dying CHamoru language. Retrieved December 10, 2019, from https://www.guampdn.com/story/news/local/2019/04/22/guam-starts-new-effort-save-dying-chamoru-language/3536584002/

Souder, L. (1992). *Daughters of the island: contemporary Chamorro women organizers of Gaum* (No. 1). Guam, Micronesian Area Research Center

Souder-Jaffery, L. M. T. (1985). *New Perspectives on the Chamorro Female Experience: Case Studies of Nine Contemporary Chamorro Women Organizers* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii at Manoa].

Higuchi, W. (2019). Japanese Occupation of Guam. Retrieved January 3, 2020, from https://www.guampedia.com/japanese-occupation-of-guam/

Taitano, G. (2019). Chamorro vs. Chamoru. Retrieved January 3. 2020, from https://www.guampedia.com/chamorro-vs-chamoru/

Taitano, G. (2020). Origin of CHamoru as an ethnic identifier. Retrieved January 3, 2020, from https://www.guampedia.com/origin-of-chamorro-as-an-ethnic-identifier/

Townsend, L., & Wallace, C. (2016). Social media research: A guide to ethics. *University of Aberdeen*, 1-16.

Underwood, R. (1987). *American education and the acculturation of the Chamorros of Guam* [Doctoral dissertation. University of Southern California].

Underwood, R. (1989). English and Chamorro on Guam. *World Englishes*, *8*(1), 73-82.

Underwood, R. (2017). Underwood: Philippines, Guam tied by Spanish-American War. Retrieved January 10, 2020, from https://www.guampdn.com/story/opinion/columnists/2017/06/09/underwood-philippines-guam-tied-spanish-american-war/383054001/

UN General Assembly, *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples : resolution / adopted by the General Assembly*, 2 October 2007, A/RES/61/295, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/471355a82.html [accessed 22 January 2020]

Van der Waal, K. (2008). Essentialism in a South African discussion of language and culture. In A. Hadland, E. Louw, S. Sesanti & H. Wasserman (Eds.), *Power, Politics, and Identity in South African Media* (pp. 52–72). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC press.

Vannini, P., & Williams, J. P. (2016). Authenticity in culture, self, and society. In *Authenticity in culture, self, and society* (pp. 17-34). Routledge.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

What does it mean to be CHamoru?
This question seeks to get the participants comfortable talking about CHamoru identity, and explores how the participants conceptualize CHamoru identity without priming them with questions about the CHamoru language

How was the CHamoru language present in your life when you were growing up?
This question seeks to get participants exposure and experiences of the CHamoru language when they were young. Such as whether the participant grew up in a CHamoru speaking household, who were the speakers of CHamoru if there any.

How is the CHamoru language currently present in your life?
This question seeks to get participants exposure and experiences of the CHamoru language currently. It will identify the current sources of CHamoru language exposure, language attitudes, and the context in which they occurs in.

How would having CHamoru fluency change your life if in any way?
This question and possible follow up probing questions based on the responses seeks to answer if the participants feel that they need language fluency to fulfill certain aspects of their CHamoru identity; Identifying those particular identity aspects which language fluency fulfills or greatly improves; Understanding the context in which CHamoru language becomes important for identity; Uncover how the participants engage with the CHamoru language with their everyday activities.

How would CHamoru identity look like without CHamoru language fluency?
This question seeks to find how the participants conceptualize their own CHamoru identity and with lack of fluency without directly asking them.

What is at stake for CHamorus not speaking CHamoru?
This question seeks to explore participants level of cultural anxiety.

What would CHamoru identity look like in the future?
This question explores participants perception on the current events and changes of CHamoru identity, and how it would influence future CHamoru identity. Particularly, seeing if CHamoru language fluency is conceived as part of future CHamoru identity.

Appendix B. Cover Letter

Dear _____

I am a graduate student in Micronesian Studies at the University of Guam. I am conducting a study on non-fluent CHamoru identity. The approximate number of subjects involved in this study will be nine.

Semi-structured interviews, and if consented, will be conducted which will take approximately one to three hours to complete. The interview consists of around nine questions concerning identity and the CHamoru language.

You will be asked to complete a demographic form. The form asks questions pertaining to: age, ethnicity, and gender.

Risks are minimal. Participants are only asked to be interviewed that will take anywhere from one to three hours to complete.

The information obtained about you will be kept in confidence. No names will be used. The interview is completely confidential. Names will only be able to be traced by the researcher. Responses to the interview questions cannot be traced back to the respondents. The information may be used for statistical or scientific purposes without identifying you as an individual. Data is stored in a computer hard drive. This information will only be accessed by the private investigator which will then be coded and analyzed. Participants identities will be kept anonymous and all data will be secured in password protected files. Files will be permanently erased after 6 months or as soon as research project is completed.

Any significant new findings will be provided to you during the course of the study.

You are free to withdraw from this project without penalty. Should psychological or physical injury occur, consultation or first aid will be provided, but no financial compensation will be given. Further information can be obtained from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs at the University of Guam concerning pertinent questions about the research and an explanation of your rights as a research subject. The Research and Sponsored Programs serves as the official contact office in the event of research related injury to you (671) 735-2672

Thank You

_____
Edward Leon Guerrero, Graduate Student, Micronesian Studies

_____
Dr. Donald H. Rubinstein, Professor, Anthropology/Public Health/Micronesian Studies, 735-2155, rubinste@triton.uog.edu

Appendix C. Consent Form

<u>**CONSENT FORM TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**</u>

This form states that I agree to participate in a research project being conducted by <u>Edward Leon Guerrero.</u> This research is being conducted for <u>a graduate thesis for Master of Arts in Micronesian Studies.</u>

PROJECT TITLE: Umespipiha Fino' CHamoru Among non-fluent CHamorus on Guahan: Articulating CHamoru identity without CHamoru fluency

I.   **INFORMED CONSENT.** As the investigator of this project and a University of Guam respecting the privacy and protection of all research participants is ensured, this form presents general but obligatory information about your participation in this project.

II.   **OBJECTIVE.** To understand non-fluent CHamorus' negotiations of the CHamoru language with their CHamoru identity

III.   **PROCEDURE(S).** 1) Subject is informed about the nature of the project. 2) Subject is informed about the risks & safeguards and confidentiality. 3) subject is informed about the voluntary nature of the study. 4) Consent form is given. 5) Subject is then interviewed. 6) Subject will be informed when the interview is completed. 7) Follow up questions will be answered immediately after.

IV.   **RISKS & SAFEGUARDS AND CONFIDENTIALITY.** The information obtained about you will be kept in confidence. Any significant new findings will be provided to you during the course of the study. Your responses will be recorded using Audacity an audio recording program that stores all audio information. The instrument used to record will be the Audio-Technica AT2020 microphone. This information will only be accessed by the private investigator which will then be coded and analyzed. Information will be used only for scientific purposes. Any follow up questions will be done in person or via email. Participants identities will be kept anonymous and all data will be secured in password protected files. Data will be permanently erased after 6 months or as soon as research project is completed. No component of this study is expected to cause any emotional or physical harm to participants. Should a physical injury occur, appropriate actions will be taken to aid the situation, but no financial compensation will be given.

V.   **VOLUNTARY NATURE OF STUDY.** Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from this project at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled.

VI.   **UOG SERVICES.** Isa Psychological Services Center provides free mental health services to UOG students, staff, faculty, and members of their families, as well as to adults, children, and families from the local community who are not able to access services elsewhere. The services include: Individual psychotherapy for adults, adolescents, and children, Family and couples therapy, Group therapy, Clinical assessment, Crisis intervention, Consultation, Outreach programs, Personal growth retreats. **Center Hours:** Monday to Friday: 9:00 am – 5:00 pm **Phone:** (671) 735-2883 **Email:** isa@triton.uog.edu **Location:** Humanities and Social Sciences Building, Room 202

VII.   **QUESTIONS AND CONTACT INFORMATION.** If you have any questions or would like additional information about this research, I can be contacted at lg.edward.e@gmail.com

By agreeing to participate, you are giving your consent for me to utilize the data collected in academic research. Thank you for your time and contribution to my study.

<u>**Signature of Informed Consent**</u>

I have carefully read the above and understand this agreement.

I freely consent and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Print Name: _____   Date: _____

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert F. Kennedy Library

FROM: Edward Leon Guerrero

SUBJECT: Thesis

****

Transmitted herewith is an original copy of the above subject from:

Student's Name: Edward Leon Guerrero

                       Title of Thesis: Umespipiha i Fino' CHamoru Among non-fluent Young
                       CHamorus on Guåhan: Exploring language revitalization, ethnolinguistic
                       identity, indigeneity and CHamoru activism amongst non-fluent CHamoru
                       Millennials and Generation Z

Number of Pages: 211 (including abstract)   **(plus this authorization = 212)**

****

I hereby grant permission to the University of Guam to furnish upon request copies in whole of the Thesis described above, in written or electronic format, as determined by the library.

I am aware that a graduate student of the University of Guam owns the copyright of his or her thesis or special project. However, as a condition of being awarded the degree, I grant the University the non-exclusive right to retain, copy, use and distribute the thesis or special project, together with the right to require its publication for archival use.

I am further aware that a graduate student may delay or restrict release of his or her thesis or special project or a portion thereof for up to two years in cases where part or all of the thesis or special project is being published elsewhere or the work is subject to patent disclosure requirements.

Edward Leon Guerrero ELG   _5/19/2020_
            SIGNATURE   DATE