



Gender, Place & Culture

A Journal of Feminist Geography

ISSN: 0966-369X (Print) 1360-0524 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cgpc20>

Living with the fence: militarization and military spaces on Guahan/Guam

Ronni Alexander

To cite this article: Ronni Alexander (2015): Living with the fence: militarization and military spaces on Guahan/Guam, Gender, Place & Culture, DOI: [10.1080/0966369X.2015.1073697](https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2015.1073697)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2015.1073697>



Published online: 18 Sep 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 2



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Living with the fence: militarization and military spaces on Guahan/Guam

Ronni Alexander*

Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University, Rokkodai 2-1, Nada-ku, Kobe 657-8501, Japan

(Received 30 May 2014; accepted 1 April 2015)

The landscape of Guahan/Guam, an organized unincorporated territory of the USA and the largest and southernmost island of the Mariana Islands archipelago, is visibly marked by chain link fences that enclose land taken for use by the US military. This US military presence on Guam is evidence of a long military colonial history that has stressed, particularly under US rule, the importance of the island's strategic location. The 'fence,' a frequently used but rarely defined expression, refers to a multiplicity of lines, most of which recreate a dichotomous view of military/local relations, and help to make invisible the complex web of identities that go through, over, and beyond its real and imagined spaces. Working from an understanding that theory must be grounded in experience, this article draws on interviews to explore the multiple meanings of the fence. It focuses on the ways the colonized, militarized, and gendered spaces of the fence promote US values, interests, and security concerns but also mark points of resistance to militarization and colonization. Exploring the ways colonization and militarization are played out on the bodies of those who live and work on the island, the article concludes that tearing down the 'fence' must include both demilitarization and decolonization, but in ways that transcend, rather than reproduce its present gendered and dichotomous spaces.

Keywords: Guam; gender; militarization; colonization; Chamoru

Guahan/Guam¹ is the largest and southernmost island of the Mariana Islands archipelago. It is a beautiful island with high mountains, verdant forests, and rocky shores surrounded by a turquoise sea, but its landscape is visibly marked by chain link fences stretching for kilometers and sporting a variety of 'No Entry' signs. These fences enclose US military bases, munitions depots, training areas, and other facilities, as well as undeveloped land not currently being put to any particular use, military or otherwise, but inaccessible to the land owners. Extending the term beyond its reference to the physical chain links, people on Guam refer to 'the fence' as delineating one or many engendered, colonized, and militarized physical, temporal and/or imagined spaces, including those involved in the current military build-up.²

This article explores the multiple meanings of the fence on Guam as a highly contested and politicized space, focusing on the ways it promotes US values, interests, and security concerns, but also marks a point of resistance to militarization and colonization. Using a feminist narrative approach (Ackerly, Stern, and True 2006; Wibben 2011; Jovchelovitch and Bauer 2000), it looks at ways gender, race, nationality, and militarization construct, and are constructed by, the fence. These narratives convey how people negotiate living

*Email: alexroni@kobe-u.ac.jp

with the fence and show how dichotomous understandings of the fence and security serve to undermine efforts for the creation of a safe and decolonized society.

The narratives, stories, and conversations used here are from interviews conducted on Guam between 2010 and 2014 in which people were asked how they were experiencing the current military build-up. The interviews were held in a variety of settings, and ranged in time from 15 minutes to several hours. The stories reveal the complexity of being American on Guam, and enhance understanding of the spatial networks and flows of living with the fence (Kothari 2011, 698). This use of stories to build on primary and secondary sources on the military build-up and analyses of militarization by scholars of feminist international relations and geography allows for a more nuanced understanding of the spatiality of the fence.

The article is divided into three sections. A short overview of the theoretical perspectives follows this introduction. The next section focuses on the impact of colonization and militarization, while the third section addresses some strategies for living with, and resisting, the fence. It includes a lengthy narrative illustrative of this struggle. The article concludes that 'tearing down the fence' must include both demilitarization and decolonization, in ways that transcend, rather than reproduce, its present gendered and dichotomous spaces.

Theoretical perspectives

On Guam, the 'fence' is a commonly used, but rarely defined expression that refers to a multiplicity of lines, most of which recreate a dichotomous view of military/local relations, and help to make invisible the complex web of identities that go through, over, and beyond its real and imagined spaces. This usage reflects academic analyses of such markers, wherein military fences are understood to both construct and be constructed by the colonized, militarized, and gendered spaces on which they stand (McClintock 1995; Massey 1994). What is more, the social processes such as militarization, globalization, and 'interlocking systems of inequality based on gender, race/ethnicity, nation and class' (Kirk 2008, 34) that surround military fences are not confined to particular localities, but rather those in one place can be constituted by, and are constitutive of, those in other places (Kim, Puri, and Kim-Puri 2005, 148; Sutton and Novkov 2008, 11). Each 'place' is an 'articulated moment in networks of social relations and understandings' (Massey 1994, 164) that do not necessarily conform to colonial/national borders. The discussion that follows focuses on Guam, with the understanding that it exists within such a network of transnational linkages. Among these are gendered, militarized, nationalized, and often contradictory ideas of safety and security. For example, for many Chamoru,³ the fence represents ideas of military security that make them feel more personally and globally 'secure,' even while loss of lands and cultural heritage makes them feel unsafe (Alexander 2013).

This article builds on challenges to the dualistic thinking underlying ideas of security and safety. Since the 1980's, feminist scholars of international relations have dynamically questioned the positivist, masculinist, and heteronormative foundations of the discipline (Sylvester 1994; Enloe 1989). This effort parallels that of critical feminist geographers grappling with the ways social relations are constructed through intersections of gender, sexuality, and identity with systems of power, oppression, and domination such as colonialism (Brown and Staeheli 2003; Dowler and Sharp 2001; Hyndman 2004; O'Tuathail 1996). McClintock (1995) and Collins (2000), for example, have turned their critical eye toward questions of identity, while Enloe (2000), Höhn and Moon (2010), and

Sturdevant and Stoltzfus (1992) have addressed the impact of military bases on women. Collectively, the work of these scholars challenges the dualistic thinking that underpins hierarchal systems such as militarism, colonialism, racism, and sexism. These are not homogenous systems, but are constituted of and by diverse and changing practices, and replete with moments of challenge and resistance (Kothari 2011, 697).

Processes of militarization are deeply entwined with colonization, citizenship, and state-building, and reinforced by the assumed monopoly of states over the mechanisms for violence through police and military forces. The gendered and militarized power hierarchies imposed under colonization affect the construction of citizenship, security, and nationality in the decolonized nation-state. Wesley-Smith (2007) argues that in the Pacific, decolonization 'is about the constant renegotiation of the awkward fit between, on the one hand, local institutions and practices formed or reformed during the colonial era and, on the other, superimposed, externally monitored ideas of state and nation' (184). Particularly for islands like Guam where colonization focused primarily on strategic concerns, decolonization becomes linked with militarized views of national security that are in contradiction with indigenous values such as consensus or respect.

Although the concept of human security has expanded the scope of security, national security as defined and expressed through military strength and power continues to be of particular importance. States garner support for military solutions through militarization, a 'contradictory and tense social process in which civil society organizes itself for the production of violence' (Geyer 1989, 79 in Lutz 2006). More specifically, militarization is a process of normalization and self-discipline where military ideas, behaviors, language, and objects enter into the intellectual, emotional, and physical lives of people, invading what are believed to be non-military spaces and/or aspects of their lives (Eichler 2011; Sjöberg and Via 2010; Höhn and Moon 2010). Militarization also shapes racialized, gendered, and dichotomous beliefs of normality and citizenship, militarizes social relations, and changes ideas of what constitutes security and safety (Gerson 2009, 50). It is a powerful intellectual and ideological tool with the capacity to make the absurd seem ordinary.

Colonization and militarization prioritize certain masculinities and femininities, including the construction of men as 'combatants' and women as 'victims' (Carpenter 2006), and rely on the creation of 'otherness' to justify superiority and domination and reinforce social hierarchies (Sutton and Novkov 2008). That is, 'Militarization ... requires *both* women's and men's acquiescence, but it *privileges* masculinity' (Enloe 2000, 4). Hegemonic masculinity, an important element of militaries and militarization, is constructed relative to subordinated masculinities within a multidimensional understanding of gender at particular historical and cultural moments (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005; Kimmel and Aronson 2008; Higate 2003).

On Guam, militarization helps to normalize the military presence and make it a part of everyday life, but as the following examples show, the degree of normalization is not universal. For example, in response to questions about feeling safe living near the fence even though there are supposedly nuclear weapons inside, one Chamoru man replied that he did not fear being a target in a US war and that the base is '... no intrusion ... They make emergency announcements about weather' ('Mike' 2013). In contrast, another Chamoru man responded to the same question with, 'How could I feel safe? I have nuclear weapons on my island!' (Certeza interview, 2013). For a young woman, the fence became visible at a particular time. 'They told us to go home and be with our families because North Korea was going to attack. I was scared! What kind of security is that?' ('Tina' interview, 2014).

Building the fence

The origin of the present US military fence on Guam lies in the arrival of Magellan in 1521. When Spanish colonization began in earnest in the mid-seventeenth century, the Chamoru resisted the disruption of their living arrangements and matrilineal social relations through enforced Catholicism, but the combination of war and disease decimated the population, leaving ‘mostly women, children and the elderly’ (Troutman 1998, 332). Spain’s solution was to import workers from its American colonies to serve the dual purposes of labor and repopulation, a policy that greatly impacted Chamoru bodies and culture.

Guam was ceded to the USA in 1898 at the end of the Spanish-American War. It was put under the administration of the US Navy, which further institutionalized marriage and a patriarchal separation of work and home. The ‘modern’ subject promulgated by the Americans practiced good hygiene, spoke English, and was not bound by the class/caste and spiritual values of traditional Chamoru society. As a result, people were separated from the land (PSECC 1996), and many of the indigenous cultural practices such as language, dance, and healing were prohibited and lost. However, although women suffered serious constraints in carrying out their matrilineal cultural responsibilities, some were able to protect some important beliefs and core values such as respect and reciprocity (Souder 1992). Chamoru activists today use dance, language, and healing practices to embody and reclaim pride in their values and culture, as well as sovereignty over their bodies and spaces (Teaiwa 1994, 96). One example is the reclamation of places known only by their English/colonized/militarized names, such as ‘Anderson Air Force Base,’ through re-naming them in Chamoru language (Flores-Mays interview, January 2013).

In 1941, the Japanese invaded Guam, beginning three years of brutal occupation. Chamoru understood their ‘liberation’ by returning US troops in 1944 within the framework of their core value of reciprocity, and ‘have since been caught in a never ending cycle of ‘paying back,’ which includes hosting US bases and supporting the military (Souder in Diaz 2001, 160). This was complicated in 1950 by the Organic Act of Guam (1950). The Act, a unilateral declaration by the US Congress, established civil administration and made Guam an organized unincorporated territory of the USA, a status it continues to hold today. It also granted American citizenship to many of Guam’s residents,⁴ but ‘left them unable to vote for president (or) select members of Congress with voting power ... Congress can overturn any law passed in Guam and can decide which parts of the US Constitution apply to it’ (Underwood 2013). Today, more than 60 years after its citizens gained US citizenship, Guam is listed among the 17 non-self-governing territories maintained by the United Nations Special Committee on Decolonization, and remains in a state of dependent and ambiguous flux. A Decolonization Commission charged with conducting a plebiscite on three options – full integration, free association, or independence – has been established but implementation remains stalled. On the surface, the delay is due to financial constraints and political entanglements, complicated by controversy over who ought to be eligible to vote.⁵ Reluctance on the part of the US to risk losing Guam, the so-called ‘tip’ of the American spear, is also a factor (Rogers 1988; Natividad 2012; Alvarez interview, 2013).⁶

American citizenship has helped to make invisible the contradictions of the simultaneous promotion of liberal ideas of decolonization, dependence on military ideas of security, and support for the military as soldiers and hosts, but citizenship alone does not guarantee acceptance as American. Clothing, food, and the ordinary activities of everyday

life are essential for becoming American, even as they contradict being Chamoru (Bhabha 1990). What is more,

the advances in rights that are linked to militarization have been conditioned upon the capacity of subordinated individuals to present themselves as crucial cogs in the American war machine and to frame their claims through the lens of American ideals that are simultaneously expansionist and classically liberal. (Sutton and Novkov 2008, 9)

The real and imagined fence is integral to the construction of 'being American' on Guam, but demarcates multiple and unequal 'Americas,' as well as other identities in Guam's diverse population.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the military was a part of everyday life on Guam. Hosting US bases and serving in the military were so normalized as to be rarely questioned (Flores-Mays interview, September 2013). 'It is hard to believe but ... we didn't even notice the military. It wasn't even on our radar' (Natividad interview, 2014). The impact of decisions made in Washington became more visible in the 1980s and 1990s, when the bases were downsized and Guam lost \$300 million in revenues ('Calvo' interview, 2013). Today, with increasing strategic focus on northeast Asia⁷ and growing opposition to US overseas bases, Guam's status as a US territory has again become important (Kan 2013). A Pacific Air Forces commander clearly expressed this sentiment: 'Guam, first of all, is U.S. territory ... I don't need overflight rights. I don't need landing rights. I always have permission to go to Guam. It might as well be California or New Jersey' (Brooke 2004). This attitude was also reflected in the 2006 Roadmap Agreement between the USA and Japan (USJSCC 2006) which was to '... ensure a long-term presence of US forces in Japan and transform Guam, the westernmost sovereign territory of the United States, into a hub for security activities in the region' (US Department of Defense 2010, 66). It was initially to include the relocation of 8000 US marines and their dependents from Okinawa to Guam.⁸ In November 2009, a Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Guam and Mariana Islands Military Relocation was issued by the Department of Defense. Local residents were given just 45 days (later extended to 90) to comment on more than 10,000 pages, but they did so with outrage at both the content and the US attitude.

In February 2010, the US Environmental Protection Agency conducted a mandatory review of the DEIS, giving it the lowest possible rating: 'Unsatisfactory: Inadequate information (EU3).' The EPA cited the lack of a specific water treatment plan, stating that the expected increase in population would impact Guam's 'existing substandard drinking water and wastewater infrastructure,' as well as cause 'unacceptable impacts to 71 acres of high quality coral reef ecosystem' (USEPA 2010, 1). A revised EIS has been submitted which the government claims addresses the objections (Calvo 2013 and interview, 2013), and at this writing, a supplemental statement (SEIS) is under review.

Living with the fence

On Guam, the fence is omnipresent. The major sources of revenue are tourism and the military, both of which are highly dependent on global politics and spaces. As Americans, people from Guam not only work at the bases, but many serve in the military, remaining in the reserves after they return from active duty.⁹ With few options for steady employment, many individuals and families see the military as an attractive job opportunity. But the allure of the military is more than just the pay check. The obligations that accompany the understanding of 'liberation' from the Japanese inform ideas of civic duty and patriotism that help to maintain and construct the fence. The conflation of notions of citizenship as 'belonging to the state/national collective' with military service and particular forms of

masculinity, class, and heteronormativity means that enlisting is seen as opportunity or entitlement. This not only makes criticism of the military difficult, but makes enlistment in the military appear to be a means of overcoming ‘otherness’ and crossing from one side of the fence to the other (Diaz 2001; Viernes 2009; Perez 2002). According to Bevacqua (2010),

... each time a Chamorro joins the military a secret compact is being signed. In exchange for their service, their sacrifice, they are to receive a set of very important and unique clothes, the military uniform. Hardly just any uniform, this one seems to pulse with powerful meanings. It is a uniform woven from the fabric of adulthood, stitched up tightly with strength, masculinity, agency, visibility and voice. (40)

Putting on the US military uniform negates the image of the colonial other as ‘dirty, ignorant, and childlike’ (Hattori et al. 1998, 113) and covers the nakedness created by colonization. It implies a way to regain pride and legitimacy lost in colonization:

Chamorro men have the opportunity to legitimize their manhood by reshaping their bodies and masculinities through the same military activities as their American counterparts in the military ... (They) can recoup a sense of ‘legitimate’ masculinity through joining the military and tapping into potent images of warriorhood. (Camacho and Monnig 2010, 163)

Tanji (2012) discusses how some Chamoru men reconstruct their masculine images through combining patriotism, obligation to the US and the ferocity of warriors from their past history (102) by joining the military, but many return disillusioned after finding the promise of equality illusive and becoming aware of their own dispossession. She distinguishes these disillusioned ‘Chamorro Warriors for decolonization’ (but not demilitarization) from the more traditional ‘Chamorro Man’ (104–105). These categorizations are useful for illustrating changes in attitudes toward the fence, but do not interrogate militarized and dichotomous masculinities, nor illustrate subordinate masculinities such as those that reject violence and military security. Tanji also suggests that Chamoru feminism is a potential force for transformation (109). Some women reject military security and take a holistic and grounded approach, using their connection with the land to assert Chamoru values and safety for their families. These women have been further strengthened by transnational links with groups struggling to stop sexual and other violence around military bases (Akibayashi and Takazato 2009).

Of course, as the following narrative shows, the military appeals to women, too. ‘Pat’ (interview, 2013) is a Filipina woman from Guam who was introduced to me as a young woman interested in issues of demilitarization and decolonization. She had been planning to enlist but changed her mind. She explained the change: ‘I wasn’t interested in these issues. I was on a totally different path, but then my friend joined the military and went to Afghanistan. Three weeks later she was dead. She wasn’t supposed to die. It changed my life.’ After her friend’s death, Pat began to question the whole idea of the military, militarization, and the impact of gendered expectations. Her friends, female and male, find the message of safety, security, protection, and equality expressed by the military attractive. ‘But the expertise of the military is in death and destruction.’ She told me that for boys, ‘Going into the military is just the next step on the trajectory of violence’ that begins with sports like wrestling and the glorification of those who commit violence. Pat’s view of adult responsibilities illustrates how the fence both constructs, and is constructed by, gendered understandings. ‘Boys feel they have to marry and support their families and so they go into the military. For girls, if they follow gender stereotypes and succeed in being “a woman” they can have a good life.’ Although most of her friends do not think about gender, Pat thinks feminism is important. It has, she says, ‘provided me with more

opportunities than my grandmother ... such as more career opportunities, more fluid understandings of sexuality, and the option of not getting married.'

Bevacqua (2010) argues that the uniform gives Chamoru soldiers three forms of completeness: voting, because soldiers on active duty can vote; visibility, because soldiers, particularly those who have sacrificed their lives, are visible in the media as symbols of patriotism; and voice, in terms of the voice of American universality which can both speak for others and prevent others from speaking (43–44). The completeness offered by the uniform is the key to the equality that citizenship should, but does not, provide. Lacking the right to vote for president and a voice in Congress, US citizens on Guam have no institutionalized way to regulate or control military affairs, even on their own island. Thus, many soldiers find themselves unable to completely cross the fence and find themselves fighting, and dying, for a democracy that they have not had the opportunity to experience for themselves.¹⁰

The military build-up has brought this contradiction into focus. In calling for decolonization, Chamoru women and men are turning to their culture in hopes of finding a way to renegotiate their relationships with the fence. Their task is not simple. The contradictions presented by the dichotomous message of the fence have led to disillusionment, confusion, and anger. There is a new level of engagement in political action, but also a range of opinion about what the target ought to be – the military build-up in particular, the military presence in general, and/or the whole question of decolonization (Alexander 2013; Tanji 2012). What is more, the growing tensions in northeast Asia and the strategic significance of Guam for the USA give a kind of legitimacy to the militarization of Guam in not only a local context ('the military is here to protect us'), but also a transnational one ('the military is here to protect freedom and democracy').

For many activists, the DEIS situation made the fence and its contradictions visible, underscoring the importance of space, but also place. Military security as embodied by the USA not only invades the safety of life on the island through increasing the likelihood of being a target, but also threatens the very essence of Chamoru life – land, water, and cultural practices. The promotion of Chamoru culture has emerged as a response to these threats, but this occurs in multiple ways. Some responses reconstruct and reflect colonial understandings of Chamoru/non-Chamoru binaries, such as opposition to further taking of land, especially sacred burial grounds and other important sites. Others invoke Chamoru values such as respect for others and for nature, as reflected in a new television program for children in Chamoru language that stresses protection of the environment.¹¹ Some organizations seek to link Chamoru and other communities. For example, We Are Guahan,¹² an organization promoting Chamoru rights, sees the threat to water resources as both an environmental issue and a problem for all non-military users, including the tourism industry (Flores-Mays interview, September 2013). And of course, many believe that the answer lies in accepting the build-up.

Guam today is a multicultural society with large numbers of people from the Philippines and other Micronesian islands. Self-determination aims to reconfigure the gendered, colonized, and militarized spaces of the fence, and 'for subjugated people, lines (of identity) are powerful' (Aguon interview, 2013). Some build-up supporters gloss over the differences, suggesting that all people on Guam are 'Guamanians' and that it is necessary to, '... protect the culture, environment, and move on economically. Having the military on Guam has led to strong patriotism ... Unfortunately, for a good quality of life we must make compromises' ('Calvo' interview, 2013). This 'we' subsumes Chamoru into the category of 'American.' But, "We" is a dangerous word in this situation because it allows the colonizer to set the framework and to choose who is "we" (Aguon interview,

2013). The challenge is how to revitalize Chamoru identity without reproducing similar binary orders. Living with the fence means negotiating these questions of gender, citizenship, and political status. These are hard choices and even among supporters there is growing skepticism about the build-up, if not the military. In addition to concerns over water, land, and other resources, some are worried about the everyday impact of military expansion on tourism. For example, 'There is already too much traffic, and the build-up will make it worse. Traffic is bad for tourism' (Cruz interview, 2013).

Indigenous values and gender roles connect women with the land and offer a more holistic view of safety and security, but the incentives offered by the military are powerful. A re-enlisting Chamoru soldier focused on the build-up itself.

I'm in the Army, and we are disposable. One dies, and they can always get another. But the build-up, it is going to destroy this island and Chamoru culture. They are going to take the land and pollute it, and the Marines are going to attack the women.

When asked why he was re-enlisting, he replied, 'I'm American' ('Joe' interview, 2014).¹³ The young man's mother told me about other reasons for his re-enlistment, including the fact that her son's military salary pays her medical and other expenses ('Julie' interview, 2014). A young feminist woman and opponent of the build-up shared her story, too. At the time of this writing, she is seriously considering enlistment in response to expectations from her family for both income and status ('Tina' interview, 2014).

This article has argued that narrative is important for understanding how the threads of colonization, militarization, and gender have become woven into, and weave, the fabric of life with the fence. The following excerpts are from one woman's story of her struggle to live with, and resist, the fence. She tells of her efforts to regain personal and community dignity through putting together the fragmented pieces of Chamoru culture.

LisaLinda Natividad (Natividad interviews, January 2013) is a mother, teacher, scholar, social worker, and activist. She is a strong, talented woman who is committed to the cause of decolonization in all of its forms – political, spiritual, emotional, physical, and intellectual. Her journey to becoming an activist began when she went to University of Hawaii and discovered how little she knew about her own island and culture.

Natividad shared stories about her family and her work with disadvantaged local woman who are completely unaware of their heritage as Chamoru women.

Guam is an example of 'successful' colonization of the worst kind. It has erased history to such an extent that people don't even know how things were in the past ... Chamoru society was matricentric and not matrisomething else; it isn't just about who owns the land. Women had a really important role. I tell women now about a saying that the 'mother is the strength of the family,' and they are so surprised to hear how strong women were. If a man cheated on his wife, the women got together and chased him away. They could even kill him! But it didn't work the other way around; men couldn't do the same to women. Under colonization, women have had to accommodate to patriarchal values in order to co-exist. Many women today have no idea about our past ... The United States took our land. Land is everything to Chamoru people. Take it away, and they are lost; they don't know what to do. My grandfather was a farmer, but he had to work for wages. Different hours, different lifestyles ... My grandmother spoke only English with her own daughter!

Natividad confirmed that being in the military is a goal for many young people, but after being discharged, they struggle to balance their patriotism and beliefs about 'America' with the life they led as soldiers and their disappointment with the reality they found in the military. Many of these veterans believe the answer lies in getting the right to vote in national elections, rather than making fundamental changes in the relationship with the USA.

Being a soldier is high status on Guam, but not on the US mainland. You can earn money, travel, have an easier life ... Even my own son says things like, 'I'm a boy, I like military things! Besides, the houses are nicer ...' Militarism is everywhere here. Career day at the high school is like an advertisement for different parts of the military ... So people go into the military, and to be successful there, they don't think about what they are doing ... Of course they find racism, sexism, and other contradictions. Veterans say that they went overseas and found themselves not wanting to kill people because 'they look just like us.' But it is hard to talk about and doesn't necessarily mean they suddenly become critical thinkers. They become confused.

Natividad explained how her work focuses on showing that Chamoru core values of respect and reciprocity are contradictory to militarism, stressing that Chamoru people have a holistic view of the world that centers on the land and is in opposition to an understanding of security as military protection. She talked about peace and security:

We are taught, and most people believe, that the military is here to protect us and keep us safe. Peace might mean having enough food or good houses, but safety is something different. It is connected to the war, and the Japanese ... During the Japanese time, women covered themselves with animal faeces so they wouldn't be raped. Some women were forced to be 'Comfort Women' and there is so much shame! They can't even tell anyone. Of course that makes the situation with the US more complicated. Every family has someone in the military, and for a long time it has been the key to creating a better life for the entire family. This military build-up is the first time people have begun to question 'safety.' The Environmental Impact Statement actually comes right out and says that there will be 'no significant impact on the economy.' We need to understand that peace and safety come from inside, from the land and our lifestyle, and not from the military.

Natividad's story underscores the complexities of the fence. Affirmation of Chamoru values and history risks reproducing military colonial binaries but her work demonstrates that, in fact, Chamoru values require a holistic understanding that transcends the dichotomous logic of militarization and colonization.

Conclusion: working to transcend the fence

This article began with suggesting that on Guam, military colonialism has resulted in gendered, colonialized, and militarized spaces that are both constructed by, and construct, the 'fence.' The imposition of language and other practices prioritized and diffused colonial values while at the same time devalorizing Chamoru culture. These practices both coincided with, and differed from, those of the fence. Militarization and colonization virtually destroyed Chamoru language and culture, and impacted the expression and meaning of identities such as feminine/masculine, Chamoru and American. Living with the fence has transformed some of its spaces and reproduced others. Today, the military build-up has caused forms of resistance that offer opportunities for further transformation that exceeds the spatiality of the fence.

To claim a particular identity means both gaining a 'name' and drawing boundaries between those who belong inside, and those who stay on the periphery or remain outside. Four hundred years of military colonization have put severe constraints on Chamoru culture, but not destroyed it. Today, activists are trying to revitalize Chamoru culture, spirituality and the connection to the land. Natividad's story reveals how they are grappling with how to do it in a way that changes the dichotomous lines of the fence creating space for a multiplicity of new, 'we(s)' with different understandings what it means to be safe, and to be secure.

The vision of a decolonized and demilitarized Guam speaks to a more connected and vital future, but will require identifying and incorporating diversity and finding ways to

replace the fence with a different configuration of social relations that is not dependent on dichotomous spaces. In so doing, it will also challenge understandings of safety and security based on the capacity for denial and destruction, replacing them with world views incorporating Chamoru values of respect for life and living.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the themed section editors, Katherine Natanel and Marsha Henry, for their insight and the opportunity to be a part of this project. I also want to thank the editors of *Gender, Place and Culture* and the anonymous referees for their challenging comments and suggestions. In particular, I would like to thank Pamela Wood for her tireless support and LisaLinda Natividad, Michael Lujan Bevacqua, Hope Cristobal, and all the others on Guahan who continue to share their stories to help me learn about their island.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. 'Guahan' is the Chamoru name. 'Guam' is used here to emphasize that the island remains colonized. The islands north of Guam comprise the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, which entered a commonwealth relationship with the USA in 1978.
2. This build-up is to increase military holdings to about 40% of the island, and entails, among other things, the drilling of 22 water wells and the destruction of a reef with at least 110 species of coral in order to construct a deep-draft wharf for nuclear air-craft carriers, each of which carry 85 fighter jets and 5600 people. An influx of soldiers and foreign workers will greatly increase the population. For updated information, see <http://guambuildupeis.us/draft-documents> (Accessed May 25, 2014).
3. 'Chamoru' (Chamorro) are the indigenous people of Guahan.
4. An organized territory is a 'United States insular area for which the United States Congress has enacted an organic act.' An unincorporated territory is a 'United States insular area in which the United States Congress has determined that only selected parts of the United States Constitution apply' (US Department of the Interior). The Organic Act of Guam (1950) granted all citizens residing on Guam at the time of the enactment, as well as their children born after 11 April 1899, statutory, or congressional, US citizenship.
5. Many Chamoru see the Commonwealth vote as the exercise of the right to self-determination. Accordingly, eligibility to vote should be restricted to those fitting the 1950 Organic Act definition of Chamoru (Cristobal interview, 2013).
6. In 1997, a draft Guam Commonwealth Act was defeated in a Congressional hearing due to strategic interests and territorial policy (Quimby 2011, 365–6; Perez 2002, 462).
7. In November 2011, US President Obama outlined plans for what became known as the Pacific 'pivot,' moving the focus of US strategy to Asia (China) and away from the Middle East (Manyin et al. 2012).
8. The number has been reduced to about 5000 marines and 1500 dependents, at an estimated cost of US\$8.6 billion (\$3.1 billion from Japan, \$5.5 billion from The USA) (Calvo 2013:2). The US Congress has been reluctant to appropriate funds, but in December 2013, the US Senate approved \$494 million for military construction on Guam, \$200 million of which has been allocated for projects related to the relocation of marines from Okinawa (Dalenio 2013).
9. JROTC, ROTC, and Naval Reserves actively recruit on Guam. See for example <https://www.facebook.com/pages/NAVY-RECRUITING-STATION-GUAM-1/114819841875824> (Accessed May 22, 2014).
10. Cooley (2008, 4), for example, discusses the 'tension inherent in the current US strategy of promoting democracy abroad while maintaining an extensive global basing presence – the pursuit of one may actually undermine the viability of the other.'
11. Nihi! <http://nihikids.org>

12. Organizations such as We Are Guahan (<http://www.weareguahan.com/>) and a weekly public radio program called 'Beyond the Fence' (<http://kprg.podbean.com/>) were born out of opposition to the DEIS.
13. 'Joe' thought that even if Chamoru culture was lost on Guam, it would remain intact on the island of Rota, CNMI. Natividad claims that rapid development in CNMI is seriously threatening Chamoru culture there (Natividad interview, 2014).

Notes on contributor

Ronni Alexander is a scholar, educator, and activist. She is a professor of transnational relations at the Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University, and specializes in peace studies. Her particular area of interest is gender and security, with a focus on the Pacific Islands. Currently, she is exploring the role of alternative modes of expression such as art and art-making in building peace. Ronni first came to Japan in 1977 and worked for five years in Hiroshima before moving to Tokyo to attend graduate school. She has been working at Kobe University since 1989, achieving her present tenured position in 1993. In 2006, Ronni began the Popoki Peace Project and has been active in community action and education for peace, including work in the areas affected by the 2011 triple disasters in northeast Japan. Ronni's publications include scholarly works as well as her picture books, the *Popoki's Peace Book* series.

References

- Ackerly, Brooke, Maria Stern, and Jacqui True, eds. 2006. *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Akibayashi, Kozue, and Suzuyo Takazato. 2009. "Searching for Global Solidarity in Anti-US Base Movements." (in Japanese) *Impaction* 169: 1–7.
- Alexander, Ronni. 2013. "Militarization and Identity on Guam: Exploring Intersections of Indigeneity, Gender and Security." *Journal of International Cooperation Studies* 21 (1): 1–22.
- Bevacqua, Michael Lujan. 2010. "The Exceptional Life and Death of a Chamorro Soldier: Tracing the Militarization of Desire in Guam, USA." In *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Shigematsu, Camacho and Monnig, 33–62. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bhabha, Homi, ed. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.
- Brooke, James. 2004. "Looking for Friendly Overseas Base, Pentagon Finds It Already Has One." *New York Times*. 7 April.
- Brown, Michael, and Lynn Staeheli. 2003. "'Are We There Yet?' Feminist Political Geographies." *Gender, Place and Culture* 10 (3): 247–255. doi:10.1080/0966369032000114019.
- Calvo, Mark. 2013. *Pacific Military Realignment 'The Guam Buildup' Program Status Update* Slide Show. Guam: Military Build-up Office. Accessed January 10, 2014. <http://www.guamchamber.com/gu/docs/about-us/archives/general-membership-meeting-presentations/pacific-military-realignment-program-status-update.pdf>
- Camacho, and Monnig. 2010. "Uncomfortable Fatigues: Chamorro Soldiers, Gendered Identities, and the Question of Decolonization on Guam." In *Militarized Currents: Toward a Decolonized Future in Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Shigematsu, Camacho and Monnig, 147–180. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Carpenter, R. Charli. 2006. *'Innocent Women and Children': Gender, Norms and the Protection of Civilians*. Ashgate.
- Collins, P. H. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. 2nd edition New York: Routledge.
- Connell, R. W., and James Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19 (6): 829–859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639.
- Cooley, Alexander. 2008. *Base Politics: Democratic Change and the U.S. Military Overseas*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Daleno, Gaynor Dumat-ol, *Pacific Daily News*, December 21 2013. Online version. <http://www.guampdn.com/article/20131221/NEWS01/312210020/Buildup-takes-step-forward-Senate-vote>
- Diaz, Vincente M. 2001. "Deliberating 'Liberation Day': Identity, History, Memory, and War in Guam." In *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War*, edited by T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama, 155–180. Durham: Duke University Press.

- Dowler, Lorraine, and Joanne Sharp. 2001. "A Feminist Geopolitics?" *Space & Polity* 5 (3): 165–176. doi:[10.1080/13562570120104382](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562570120104382).
- Eichler, Maya. 2011. *Militarizing Men: Gender, Conscription, and War in Post-Soviet Russia*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 1989. *Bases, Beaches, and Bananas: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gerson, Joseph. 2009. "US Foreign Military Bases and Military Colonialism: Personal and Analytical Perspectives." In *The Bases of Empire: The Global Struggle against U.S. Military Posts*, edited by Catherine Lutz, 47–70. Amsterdam: Pluto Press.
- Hattori, Anne Perez, K. Camacho, E. B. Manibusan, J. C. Sablan, and M. P. H. Sasaki. 1998. "Guam, Mariana Islands." In *Resistance in Paradise: Rethinking 100 Years of U.S. Involvement in the Caribbean and the Pacific*, edited by D. Wei and R. Kamel, 109–129. Philadelphia, PA: American Friends Service Committee & Office of Curriculum Support, School District of Philadelphia.
- Higate, Paul. 2003. *Military Masculinities: Identity and the State*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Höhn, Maria, and Seungsook Moon, eds. 2010. *Over There: Living with the US Military Empire from World War II to the Present*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Hyndman, Jennifer. 2004. "Mind the Gap: Bridging Feminist and Political Geography through Geopolitics." *Political Geography* 23 (3): 307–322. doi:[10.1016/j.polgeo.2003.12.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2003.12.014).
- Jovchelovitch, Sandra, and Martin Bauer. 2000. *Narrative Interviewing* [online]. London: LSE Research Online. Accessed March 9, 2015. <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2633>
- Kan, Shirley. 2013. "Guam: U.S. Defense Deployments." *Congressional Research Service* 7-5700: RS22750.
- Kim, Hyun Sook, Jyoti Puri, and H. J. Kim-Puri. 2005. "Conceptualizing Gender-Sexuality-State-Nation: An Introduction." *Gender and Society* 19 (2): 137–159. doi:[10.1177/0891243204273021](https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243204273021).
- Kimmel, Michael S., and Amy Aronson. 2008. *The Gendered Society Reader*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kirk, Gwyn. 2008. *Contesting Militarization: Global Perspectives*, edited by Sutton, et al., 30–55.
- Kothari, Uma. 2011. "Contesting Colonial Rule: Politics of Exile in the Indian Ocean." *Geoforum* 43 (4): 697–706. doi:[10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.07.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.07.012).
- Lutz, Catherine. 2006. "Empire Is in the Details." *American Ethnologist* 33 (4): 593–611. doi:[10.1525/ae.2006.33.4.593](https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.2006.33.4.593).
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.
- Manyin, Mark, et al. 2012. "Pivot to the Pacific? The Obama Administration's 'Rebalancing' Toward Asia." . Congressional Research Service, 7-5700, R42448. www.crs.gov
- Massey, Doreen. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Natividad, Lisalinda. 2012. "Statement of the Non-Self-Governing Territory of Guam to the Pacific Regional Seminar on the Implementation of the Third Decade for the Eradication of Colonialism: Current Realities and Prospects." Quito. Accessed January 15, 2014. http://www.un.org/en/decolonization/pdf/crp_2012_guam.pdf
- Perez, Michael. 2002. "Pacific Identities beyond US Racial Formations: The Case of Chamorro Ambivalence and Flux." *Social Identities* 8 (3): 457–479. doi:[10.1080/1350463022000030001](https://doi.org/10.1080/1350463022000030001).
- Political Status Education Coordinating Commission (PSECC). 1996. *Issues in Guam's Political Development: The Chamorro Perspective*. Agaña: PSECC as mandated by Public Law 20-99.
- Quimby, Frank. 2011. "Fortress Guåhån." *Journal of Pacific History* 46 (3): 357–380. doi:[10.1080/00223344.2011.607606](https://doi.org/10.1080/00223344.2011.607606).
- Rogers, Robert F. 1988. "Guam's Quest for Political Identity." *Pacific Studies* 12 (1): 49–70.
- Sjoberg, Laura, and Sandra Via, eds. 2010. "Gender, War, and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives." Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO (Praeger).
- Souder, Laura. 1992. *Daughters of the Island: Contemporary Chamorro Women Organizers on Guam*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Sturdevant, Sandra, and Brenda Stoltzfus. 1992. *Let the Good Times Roll: Prostitution and the U.S. Military in Asia*. New York: The New Press.

- Sutton, Barbara, and Julie Novkov. 2008. "Rethinking Security, Confronting Inequality: An Introduction." In *Security Disarmed: Critical Perspectives on Gender, Race, and Militarization*, edited by Barbara Sutton, Sandra Morgen, and Julie Novkov, 3–29. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Sylvester, Christine. 1994. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanji, Miyume. 2012. "Chamorro Warriors and Godmothers Meet Uncle Sam: Gender, Loyalty and Resistance to the US Military Occupation in Postwar Guam." In *Gender, Power, and Military Occupations: Asia Pacific and the Middle East since 1945*, edited by de Matos and Ward, 98–117. New York: Routledge.
- Teaiwa, Teresa. 1994. "Bikinis and Other s/pacific n/oceans." *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (1): 87–109.
- Troutman, Charles H. 1998. "Does Guam have a Political Identity?" In *Guam History: Perspectives I*, edited by L. Carter, W. Wuerch, and R. Carter, 329–344. Mangilao, Guam: Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam.
- Tuathail, Gearóid. 1996. "An Anti-geopolitical Eye: Maggie O'Kane in Bosnia, 1992–93." *Gender, Place and Culture* 3 (2): 171–186. doi:10.1080/09663699650021873.
- Underwood, Robert. 2013. "Guam's Political Status." *Guampedia*. Accessed January 16, 2014. <http://guampedia.com/guams-political-status/>
- United States Department of Defense. 2/2010. "Quadrennial Defense Review Report." Accessed January 10, 2014. <http://www.defense.gov/qdr/qdr%20as%20of%2026jan10%200700.pdf>
- United States Department of the Interior (DOI) Office of Insular Affairs. "Definitions of Insular Area Political Organizations." Accessed March 5, 2013. <http://www.doi.gov/oia/islands/politicatypes.cfm>
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 16 February 2010. "Letter to Mr. Roger Natsuhara." Accessed January 27, 2014. [http://yosemite.epa.gov/oeca/webeis.nsf/\(PDFView\)/20090394/\\$file/20090394.PDF?OpenElement](http://yosemite.epa.gov/oeca/webeis.nsf/(PDFView)/20090394/$file/20090394.PDF?OpenElement)
- United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee (USJSCC). May 2006. "United States-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation." USJSCC Document. Accessed May 22, 2014. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/n-america/us/security/scc/doc0605.html>
- Viernes, J. P. 2009. "Won't You Please Come Back to Guam? Media Discourse, Military Buildup, and Chamorro in the Space Between." In *The Space between: Negotiating Culture, Place, and Identity in the Pacific*, edited by A. Marata Tamaira, 103–118. Occasional Paper Series 44. Honolulu: Hawai'i: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- Wesley-Smith, Terrence. 2007. "The Limits of Self-Determination in Oceania." *Social and Economic Studies* 56: 182–306.
- Wibben, Annick. 2011. *Feminist Security Studies: A Narrative Approach*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cited Interviews/Conversations

- Aguon, Julian. (Attorney). 12 September 2013.
- Alvarez, Edward. (Executive Director, Commission on Decolonization). 15 September 2013.
- Calvo, Mark. (Director, Military Build-up Office). 16 September 2013.
- Certeza, Joseph. (Mural artist). 12 September 2013.
- Cristobal, Hope. (Guahan Coalition for Peace and Justice). 6 May 2010, 16 September 2013.
- Cruz, BJ. (Vice Speaker of Guam Legislature). 12 September 2013.
- Flores-Mays, Cara. (We Are Guahan). 3 January 2013, 9 September 2013.
- 'Joe' (pseudonym). (Re-enlistee). 2 January 2014.
- 'Julie' (pseudonym). (Joe's mother) 2 January 2014.
- 'Mike' (pseudonym). (Resident). 12 September 2013.
- Natividad, LisaLinda. (Professor, University of Guam). 1 January 2013, 16 September 2013, 2 January 2014.
- 'Pat' (pseudonym). (Student). 1 January 2013.
- 'Tina' (pseudonym). (Student). 5 January 2014.

ABSTRACT TRANSLATIONS

Vivir con el cerco: militarización y espacios militares sobre Guajan/Guam

El paisaje de Guajan/Guam, un territorio no incorporado organizado de los Estados Unidos y la isla más grande y más al sur del archipiélago de las Islas Marianas, está visiblemente marcado por cercos de alambre que encierran la tierra tomada para el uso por las fuerzas armadas de Estados Unidos. Esta presencia militar de los EE.UU. en Guam es evidencia de una larga historia colonial militar que ha enfatizado, particularmente bajo el dominio de los EE.UU., la importancia de la ubicación estratégica de la isla. El “cerco”, una expresión utilizada frecuentemente pero raramente definida, se refiere a la multiplicidad de líneas, la mayoría de las cuales recrea una mirada dicotómica de relaciones militar/local, y ayuda a volver invisible la compleja red de identidades que atraviesa, pasa sobre y va más allá de sus espacios reales e imaginados. Basándonos en la noción de que la teoría debe estar fundamentada en la experiencia, este artículo se apoya en entrevistas para analizar los múltiples significados del cerco. Se centra en las maneras en que los espacios colonizados, militarizados y generizados del cerco promueven los valores, intereses y preocupaciones de seguridad de los EE.UU., pero también marcan puntos de resistencia a la militarización y la colonización. Al explorar las formas en que la colonización y la militarización se llevan a cabo en los cuerpos de aquellos que viven y trabajan en la isla, el artículo concluye que tirar abajo el “cerco” debe incluir tanto la desmilitarización como la descolonización, pero de formas que trascienden, en vez de reproducir, sus espacios actualmente generizados y dicotómicos.

Palabras claves: Guam; género; militarización; colonización; chamorro

与围篱共生：关岛上的军事化与军事空间

关岛是美国所组织的未立州之领土，亦是玛丽安娜列岛最大、且最南边的岛屿，该岛的地景，以铁丝网围篱包围美国军用土地著称。美军在关岛的存在，是长期的军事殖民历史的证据，强化了该岛的战略位置，特别是在美国统治之下。“围篱”作为经常被使用、却鲜少加以定义的表现，指向界线的多重性，这些界线当中，多数再创造了军事 / 在地关系的二元对立观点，并且掩盖了行经、越过并超脱其实际和想像空间的复杂认同网络。有鉴于理论必须植基于经验之理解，本文运用访谈，探讨围篱的多重意涵。本文聚焦殖民、军事化且性别化的围篱空间，提倡美国价值、利益及安全考量的方式，并同时标示出抵抗军事化与殖民之处。本文探讨殖民和军事化，在该岛上居住并工作的人们身上展现的方式，于结论中主张，拆除“围篱”必须包含去军事化与去殖民，但必须以超越、而非再製当前的性别化二元对立空间的方式进行之。

关键词：关岛；性别；军事化；殖民；关岛颂歌