



Civilizing the Guam Museum

Christine Taitano DeLisle
University of Michigan

University of Michigan
Working Papers in Museum Studies
Number 4 (2010)


The logo for Museum Studies at the University of Michigan. It features a stylized orange icon of a museum building with three levels, followed by the text "MUSEUM STUDIES" in a bold, orange, sans-serif font, and "UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN" in a smaller, orange, sans-serif font below it.

Museum Studies Program
Charles H. Sawyer Center for Museum Studies
University of Michigan Museum of Art
525 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1354

Office phone: 734-936-6678
Fax: 734-786-0064

www.ummsp.lsa.umich.edu
ummsp@umich.edu

© 2010 University of Michigan
All rights reserved

The University of Michigan Museum Studies Program's series of "Working Papers in Museum Studies" presents emerging research from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, all focused on the multiple concerns of the modern museum and heritage studies field. Contributions from scholars, members of the museum profession and graduate students are represented. Many of these papers have their origins in public presentations made under the auspices of the Museum Studies Program. We gratefully thank the authors published herein for their participation.

This paper was first presented as part of the University of Michigan Museum Studies Program's "Issues in Museum Studies" lecture series on April 16, 2009. It is the product of research supported by a U-M Museum Studies Program Fellowship for Doctoral Research in Museums. Tina DeLisle is a member of the 2005 cohort in the U-M Museum Studies Program and is currently a research fellow and lecturer in the Program in American Culture at the University of Michigan.
cdeLisle@umich.edu

Civilizing the Guam Museum

Christine Taitano DeLisle
University of Michigan

In 2006, the Guam Museum Foundation unveiled its plans for a new museum. According to Andrew Laguaña of Architects Laguaña + Cristobal, the firm whose blueprint for the new museum was chosen as the winning design, the design was inspired by the work of Chicago architect and city planner Daniel Burnham. Quoting Burnham, Laguaña elaborated:

Make No Little Plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably will themselves not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will not die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and your beacon beauty. Think big.¹

At \$20 million, the largest public commission in Guam's history to-date, the 52,000 square-foot of museum space is indeed a grand (and for some, a grandiose) undertaking. For this reason, the Guam Museum has stirred different emotions: excitement, trepidation, and skepticism. There is trepidation and skepticism, given the global recession and Guam's own fiscal hardship, but also excitement, because in its 79 years of existence—starting with what former Guam Museum Director (1995 to 2007) Tony Palomo called the museum's "modest beginning" under the American Legion—the Guam Museum has never had a permanent facility.²

This paper sets out to trace this "modest beginning" as part of a larger history that examines the transformation of the Guam Museum from a civilizing and modernizing project under the auspices of military colonialism and U.S. Naval rule from 1898 to 1950, to a territorial government and nationalist project that struggles to balance a specifically indigenous heritage with a multicultural and multiracial society in Guam emergent in the second half of the 20th century under self-rule.³ This paper and its title draw from Elaine Gurian's analyses of the changing definitions of museums and the challenges that they face in the 21st century in colonial, postcolonial, and in Guam's case, neo-colonial milieus.⁴ I focus on two particular moments in the pre-World War II history of the Guam Museum. First, I examine the establishment of the Museum in 1932 by the American Legion in Guam. This establishment and sponsorship by the Legion culminated in a movement that is intelligible within a naval colonial narrative of civilization and progress for Guam and the native

Chamorros.⁵ Of particular interest is how both white and native members of the Legion saw the Museum as a vehicle for pushing political progress in Guam, most especially U.S. citizenship for Chamorros. This is noteworthy because, though the push for U.S. citizenship might seem to be, from the perspective of an anti-colonial struggle, a conservative tack, the Chamorro leadership at the time understood that U.S. citizenship for the Chamorros would grant coverage and application of the U.S. Constitution over the island and thus protect Chamorros against the whims of naval governance. U.S. citizenship was sought as a way to gain political rights and civil liberties that just did not exist under military rule. Second, I focus on the prewar relationship between the naval governor, Willis Bradley, and the Legion. Bradley is most noted for championing a Bill of Rights for Chamorros under his term (1929 to 1931), for which he was blackballed by the military hierarchy in Washington D.C. What is less known is that Bradley played a major role in assisting the Legion in the establishment of the Guam Museum and that this relationship helped establish another crucial one between the Bishop Museum in Honolulu and the Guam Museum. This new relationship led to the restructuring of the Guam Museum and, beginning in 1930, to the de-accessioning of objects from the Bishop Museum to the Guam Museum. A second instance of de-accessioning took place in 2000 when the Bishop Museum repatriated a large set of Chamorro ancestral remains to Guam.

Exhibiting Culture, History, and "One Hundred Percent Americanism": The Guam Museum under the American Legion

The Guam Museum opened its doors in 1932 under the auspices of the American Legion. Members of the American Expeditionary Forces founded the American Legion in 1919 to improve troop morale during World War I and the Guam-based Mid-Pacific Post Number 1, one of nearly 15,000 posts established worldwide, opened in 1930.⁶ Though this was the era of the Great Depression, which had impacted the island to some degree, Guam experienced relative growth in its physical and political infrastructure. In 1929, for example, Governor Bradley addressed the question of the political rights of the Chamorros, installing a local Bill of Rights for which he is still fondly remembered.⁷ In keeping with the Legion's larger mission to "preserve the memories and incidents of the U.S. involvement in the Great Wars" and to "foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism," Post Number 1 organized activities on Guam such as Armistice Day.⁸ The Legion also did its share to promote the U.S. Navy's larger civilizing and modernizing projects

in the areas of public education, public works, and public health.⁹ It awarded annual prizes for categories such as best school garden, best agricultural club work, best marching and drilling, and most beautiful schools.¹⁰ But beginning in 1931, the Legion pledged its resources “fully” to establishing the Guam Museum and identifying its (the Legion’s) members as the Museum’s “official custodians.” Later that year the Legion launched a fundraising campaign, the highlight of which was a minstrel show that featured Chamorro and American military performers.¹¹

Prior to 1932, there had already been talk about a museum. According to local historians in Guam, the Guam Teachers’ Association, a predominantly-Chamorro organization, had attempted to establish a museum but could not because it had lacked the resources.¹² In 1926, amidst debate on the subject of erecting monuments, the editor of the monthly newspaper, *The Guam Recorder*, identified a museum as being of more value and benefit to the island. *The Guam Recorder*’s readership was comprised of American military in Guam, their families in the U.S., and elite Chamorros. The editor, W. W. Rowley, was a prominent American businessman and civic leader of the Elks Club and Masons in Guam. Rowley had also married into a Chamorro family. Rowley judged that a museum was an “urgent” matter for Guam, pointing out that the “specimens of historical value and interest have been collected and sent away from the island,” and that it would not be long before it was “too late to start to collect these articles which museums are so keen on securing.”¹³ “If Guam had a Museum,” he continued, “many of these specimens (sic) . . . would probably be returned to us.”¹⁴ Rowley was referring specifically to Hans Hornbostel, who had been commissioned by the Bishop Museum in Honolulu to collect specimens and artifacts from the Mariana Islands between 1924 and 1926. Subsequent historical scholarship has revealed that Hornbostel’s fieldwork in the Northern Marianas in particular, which was then under the Japanese Mandate, was also a cover for espionage work for the U.S. Navy.¹⁵ In the context of imperial rivalry and museum collection then, the Bishop Museum in Honolulu had, so to speak, killed two birds with one stone in sponsoring Hornbostel’s own disturbing of Chamorro ancestral remains and their valued personal and collective possessions. In Guam, Saipan, Tinian, and Rota, Hornbostel conducted several archaeological digs at ancient Chamorro *latte* (stone pillar) sites, unearthing pottery, stones, fishhooks, tools, and ancestral remains that had been dated as far back as 3500-4000 before present.¹⁶ The imperial and museum “intertextuality” was also evident in the Hornbostel household: his wife, Gertrude (who Chamorros remember fondly as “Trudes Aleman” or “Gertrude the German”), with whom he eloped years earlier, was the daughter of a German entrepreneur in Guam, Hans Constenoble, who collected Chamorro folklore and legends. Gertrude’s own affiliation to the colonial work of the museum is seen in the fact that she established her own curio shop.¹⁷

In 1931, after heeding the concerns of U.S. Navy Chaplain Francis Albert (one of its charter members), and with *The Guam Recorder* assisting “in all ways possible,” the American Legion took up the Guam Museum cause.¹⁸ Albert, who was also Superintendent of Guam’s Department of Education (D.O.E.), told fellow legionnaires:

I have noticed in the schools of Guam the children’s eagerness to grasp new ideas. Unlike in the States, or in other countries, where children are apt to remain firm in their natural land traditions, the school children of Guam today have nothing by which to remember the customs of the older generations. Their penchant for absorbing new ideas is commendable, but we also must find means of preserving Guam’s relics and customs of the past for them and those to come in the future.¹⁹

Albert’s concerns echoed those expressed by *The Guam Recorder* editor in 1926 about the urgency in preserving the island’s historical relics in the onset of American modernity under the U.S. Navy, with both Americans operating on the assumption that Chamorro culture was extinct. For the D.O.E. Superintendent, Chamorro children had “nothing by which to remember the customs of their older generations.” When he compared them to other children in America and other countries, perhaps he was referring to Native Americans and other natives who held “firm in their natural land traditions.”

For the Editor of *The Guam Recorder*, the principal import for a museum was the lack of credible information about Guam’s past. According to Rowley, it was “almost impossible to learn any of the ancient history of Guam *from the inhabitants*” at the time.²⁰ For the Superintendent, this was the case because of the Chamorro “penchant” for the new. On the other hand, *The Guam Recorder* editor seemed to suggest the opposite: that progress and modernity had not come quickly enough to Guam, and that to hasten their arrival and realization, one needed to properly identify and situate, to display, the pre-modern or primitive native background to the ongoing present. Modernity after all, like America, needs a primitive and native past with and out of which it must articulate itself.²¹ And museums are crucial sites for the production of modernity and national identity.²² It is worth speculating on the role of the Bishop Museum in this regard. What does it mean that the Bishop Museum was part of an antiquarian society that had strong interests in Polynesian origins, but that it was named after and drew its resources from a particularly powerful elite native Hawaiian woman who herself had strong philanthropic interests for her own people? Or how exactly did the Bishop Museum’s mission of collecting not just Hawaiiana but Pacific artifacts justify its extensions into Micronesia? Could it have imagined that authority because there were no competing museums in the region that had

been taken over by competing imperial countries? Or perhaps the museum was a powerful way to participate in competing imperialisms.

Perhaps recognizing the inability of Guam to compete in this regard, in the preservation of its objects of “historical value,” Rowley pushed the issue:

Guam has no building suitable or other secure method for perserving (sic) records of historical value, no museum where collections of natural, scientific or literary curiosities, or works of art may be placed for future reference ... A substantial reinforced concrete building wherein such collection now available could be safe from the ravages of time, fire, flood, earthquake and typhoons, would be of much more value and interest to the present inhabitants and the generations to come, than the monuments that have been proposed.²³

Once the Museum was established, its new home located in the island’s capital city of Hagåtña in the Plaza de España, seat of the Spanish colonial government and later U.S. Naval administration, the real, more difficult, work began for the Legion. In the Museum’s monthly column of *The Guam Recorder*, Mid-Pacific Post Commander Hiram Elliott appealed to the island’s community for assistance of any kind if even in the form of a “booster.” In October 1935, on the third anniversary of the Guam Museum, Elliott tried to pique the public’s interest and curiosity in the Museum which he said housed “the most interesting and curious artifacts of the ancient Chamorro civilization, including implements and tools used in Guam in early centuries.”²⁴ Saving the most “curious” Chamorro artifact for last, Elliott then spoke of the Museum’s most recent acquisition:

Since the establishment of the museum, much has been done to bring to light its real significance to the people, and as a consequence its caretakers have been more liberal in their efforts to achieve this purpose. Particularly noteworthy of interest in the Guam Museum to the future Chamorro children is a collection of skeletal structural material donated by the Bernice P. Bishop Museum of Honolulu. These remains of the aboriginal Chamorro were among the few excavated in the different parts of the Island several years ago by the field workers of the Honolulu institution and donated to the Guam Museum at the request of the local American Legion post.²⁵

Resounding the sentiments expressed earlier by fellow legionnaire Francis Albert and American business and civic leader W. W. Rowley about an acculturated people, Post Commander Elliott then reminded Chamorros that a “clear conception of past history” could only be acquired

by “actually viewing the objects which were at the time existing” and which were on display at the Guam Museum. These included specimens of the ancient Chamorro *latte*, ancient Chamorro sling stones, but also, interestingly, the private chapel of Guam’s first-ordained Chamorro priest, Pádre Jose Palomo, and Palomo’s own collection of ancient relics. Here, the more recent and ongoing history under Catholicism is also rendered part of the definitive past. America was the future. “In the Guam Museum,” Elliott continued, “can be seen many articles indicative of the past history of Guam ... after all, a thorough knowledge of one’s ancestors often times results in the proper growth of racial pride.”²⁶

Two months later, again in the “Guam Museum” column of *The Guam Recorder*, Post Commander Elliott appealed once more to the public:

Day after day, the urgent need of relic preservation becomes increasingly apparent. This is not the only time when the possibility of collecting antiquities was brought up but without avail. We are fortunate to have conquered the first obstacle found on our way to establishing the Guam Museum for the proper safe-keeping of every worthy antiquity. We urge that every help due us be heartily contributed so as to push us one or two steps higher than where we are, for we are very eager to have some preservation in order to enable us to present something to our children of tomorrow.²⁷

Elliott’s tone was one of disillusionment. He lamented a lack of interest in the Museum, although it is not clear if it was the Americans, the military personnel, or the entire Guam population, or just the natives, who lacked interest.²⁸ He did seem to appeal to Chamorros in particular, later in his message, to take more of an interest in something that the Legion felt would benefit all residents, but especially the native Chamorros. His lament, however, was overshadowed by the preponderance of his requests, with prior examples. “From a sea shell donation of a Umatac school-child to hearty and full indorsement (sic) of everyone in Guam,” Elliott reminded the reader that the Museum was not simply an enterprise of the Legion in Guam but “an undertaking to be supported by every individual islander of all walks of life.” The Museum, he continued, was “established with no preference to any private concern or one particular society but for the general welfare of the community and without any one possessing authority to lay claim of ownership on it.”²⁹

The Museum, of course, was in fact established around specific concerns and narrow definitions of Chamorro culture in the wake of progress and American modernity. It evolved with Guam’s social and political development and aspirations for a civil society, that is, literally, a society

that had won limited civil rights, but firmly under modern American values and norms. Its leadership was composed of American men – typically married into Chamorro families – and an upstart movement of Chamorro men who pushed for civil liberties that were not forthcoming under naval rule. Indeed, the American Legion was only one among a proliferating number of fraternal organizations, filled with Chamorro men and white men, like the Hagåtña Civil Club, the Young Men’s League of Guam, the Guam Chamber of Commerce, the Elks Clubs, and the Masons.

As we saw earlier, legionnaires and other elite Americans in Guam were concerned that, in their desire for English, schools, better roads, and better hospitals, Chamorros were either already acculturated or on the verge of losing their native culture and history. As I have argued elsewhere, rather than seeing these native desires as signs of acculturation, they are better understood as acts of transculturation, with cultural crossings and innovations based on native notions of propriety and progress.³⁰ The acculturation thesis, which defines modernity and progress on exclusively western and American terms, also comes with a particular way of legitimizing its own forms of cultural and historic preservation over others. This is evidenced in the view of the Museum as a “veritable storehouse of history” when we can rather easily see indigenous conceptions of the past in practices like family genealogies, music and dance, and even tattoo, although the latter is not readily apparent in the historical record or in the record of Chamorro past and present bodies other than in introduced forms.

Another evidence of the narrow ways of conceptualizing culture and history is seen in the Guam Museum’s organization in 1935 of island-wide tours for transient visitors. Such tours occurred toward the tail end of the Legion’s management of the Museum, which was finally taken over by the Naval Government in 1936. An early manifestation of what Teresia Teaiwa has called “militourism,” or the particularly powerful and insidious combination of military and tourist practices that tend to structure social and cultural life in the Pacific Islands, the island-wide tours took advantage of a spike in the number of visitors made possible by regularized air “clipper” service between the U.S. mainland and China, which had island stopovers across the Pacific Island region.³¹ The inaugural flight of Pan American Airways’ China Clipper in 1935 was the first of many trans-Pacific air service flights from San Francisco to Manila and onwards to China, and featured stopovers in Honolulu, Midway, Wake Island and Guam.³² Such island-wide tours for such transient visitors – comprised equally of military personnel and their dependents, government dignitaries, and elite civilians eager to see the world – played no small role in expanding and extending American hospitality in the tropics, indeed of helping the military convert the Pacific into a veritable

“American lake.” Such tours were also consistent with the Legion’s broader mission of “fostering and perpetuating a one hundred percent Americanism,” further showing the complicity of the museum project with the broader naval colonial project of “civilizing and modernizing” Guam and the Chamorros.

However, the Legion’s efforts to foster, through museum activities, “one hundred percent Americanism” also bumped up against the limits of the Navy’s civilizing and modernizing mission, notably around the issue of U.S. citizenship. As mentioned earlier, Chamorro leaders had as early as 1901 clamored for a clarification of their political rights under U.S. Naval military rule, and actively sought U.S. citizenship as a means for their protection. Chamorro male leadership, and some Chamorro women, like Agueda Johnson, had also received support and assistance in this endeavor by a specific cadre of foreign men—first liberal and revolutionary Filipino insurrectos who were exiled to Guam by the Spanish at the end of the 19th century, many of whom remained and lived in Guam in the first two decades of U.S. naval rule, and then later, American men who married into Chamorro families and imagined long term settlement on the island. For the former, agitating against military rule was an expression of nationalism, while for the latter, it was an expression of civil rights and progress, particularly when white American men were forbidden from marrying native women by miscegenation edicts and proclamations by naval governors.³³ Sometimes, in other words, the stakes in civilization and progress by some rubbed up against the same stakes by others. Nowhere perhaps is this more evident than in a series of letters between Legion Post Commander Hiram Elliott and Navy Governor Willis Bradley who is noteworthy as the lone colonial official who championed civil and political rights for the Chamorros and paid the price for it.

The Stakes in “Civilizing”: Governor Bradley, the Legion, and the Guam Museum

Though the Museum would open in 1932 under Governor Edmund Root (1931-1933), Governor Bradley in fact had laid the foundation earlier. As mentioned earlier, Bradley promulgated a Bill of Rights. He also reorganized the Guam Congress, which was something of a misnomer insofar as its members were handpicked by previous Governors and acted only as advisors. Under Bradley however, congressmen and congresswomen along with village mayors were elected by the people of Guam and finally given legislative powers.

Bradley maintained a high level of interest in Guam and in Chamorro political affairs long after his administration. In fact, the American Legion petitioned President Franklin Roosevelt and Secretary of Navy Claude Swanson to reappoint Bradley at the end of Governor Root’s term.³⁴

In the petition, the Legion identified Bradley in particular as the right person “for the good of Guam,” and also specifically linked the “good of Guam” to the “unfinished project of the Guam Museum.”³⁵ It is interesting and telling that an unfinished Museum was included in the argument made by the Legion—comprised of elite Chamorro men and white men married into Chamorro families—for the selection of a naval governor. The Museum, a product of a particular milieu of political progress and civil society in Guam, also became an important symbol and catalyst for other forms of progress and development. For the Legion, the Museum was a “sign of the times,” but its viability and success and the rewards of other forms of civilization rested on a particular narrative and legacy of progress, under Bradley.

Although he was not reappointed, Bradley, a charter member of the American Legion in Guam, maintained close connections with the Legion and close tabs on Guam and the Guam Museum. At Elliott’s request, Bradley, Captain of the Navy Yard at Pearl Harbor at the time, inquired with the Bishop Museum about the return of objects to Guam from the Hornbostel Collection. Elliott reminded Bradley that with little resources for acquisitions, the Guam Museum was “hard pressed to find anything of value as an antique” especially after Hornbostel “scoured” the island.³⁶ In numerous visits to the Bishop Museum during his six-month tour in Hawai’i, Bradley pressed for the repatriation of materials and remains, which resulted in the Bishop Museum returning hundreds of duplicate specimens and artifacts to Guam, including, eventually, two boxes of human remains. During his duty in Hawai’i, Bradley also initiated a series of training sessions conducted by the Bishop Museum in Guam. At Bradley’s urging and request, the Director of the Bishop Museum had agreed to send Bishop Museum Curator E. H. Bryan to Guam to train the Guam Museum in museum technique, display and preservation. Bryan also helped restructure the Guam Museum, often along the lines of a natural history museum such as the Bishop Museum. This included collection and display of Guam’s flora and fauna.

Indeed, even after it became apparent that he would not be returning to Guam for a second term as governor, Bradley continued to work closely and effectively, sometimes under moments of tension, with Bishop Museum curator E.H. Bryan for the repatriation. The issue of Chamorro human remains is particularly noteworthy. After the return of duplicated objects, Bryan informed Bradley that the Bishop Museum would not return anything else. In Guam Elliott sought Bradley’s assistance for a final return—the human remains—on which Bryan eventually capitulated. The question of Guam’s political growth was attached to the correspondence that Bryan attached to the shipment in order to clear the air and iron out any tensions or misunderstandings that might have arisen over the process. After reminding Elliott that this would be the Bishop

Museum’s final shipment, Bryan adds:

This shipment gives you a very good exhibit of skeletal material. It is quite probable that a little digging around the archaeological ruins would furnish you with dozens, if not hundreds of other skeletal remains. . . . With our very best aloha for the growth and development of the Guam Museum.³⁷

With a touch of native Hawaiian expression of deep love and affection (or was it good riddance?), the Bishop Museum also closed its transaction with the Guam Museum by informing officials that it should do its own excavations for Guam’s “growth and development.”

With the deaccessioning of objects from the Bishop Museum, Bradley offered objects from his personal collection of Guam memorabilia to the Guam Museum. Some of his objects, such as the baseballs used during the first games played on Bradley Field in the Plaza, were meant to illustrate just how Americanized the Chamorros had become. Other exhibits of the “one hundred percent Americanism” included the original Chamorro Bill of Rights, which not only got Bradley in trouble by his military superiors, but earned for the Legion, which supported the measure, some degree of suspicion from subsequent Naval governors.³⁸ Though the Navy decided in 1936 to not reassign Bradley to Guam, the Legion continued to use the Guam Museum as part of its support for progress and development in ways that made the Guam Museum itself a showcase of Guam’s progress and development.

For example, the Legion reminded Governor Root’s successor, George Alexander (1933-1936), that he should continue the progressive work carried out by previous governors, to “improve the living conditions” of the Chamorro people, to bring a full measure of “prosperity for all” in Guam, and to add to the contentment and happiness of the entire island.³⁹ In this, the Legion reminded the Governor that the Guam Museum was a matter of priority. It is safe to conclude that in 1936, prosperity, contentment and happiness for the Guam Legionnaires as for the overwhelming majority of Chamorro leaders and their American brothers-in-law, included hopes for American citizenship. Indeed, it was in 1936 that such a bill finally worked its way to the U.S. Congress, where it was subsequently killed after the testimony by the Navy’s top officer in Washington D.C.⁴⁰ Interestingly, the forces that led to the crafting of the citizenship bill and its introduction can be traced directly back to powerful American political and business leaders who began to travel to Asia aboard the Pan American Clippers. Whenever word spread that V.I.P.’s were arriving on Guam, local leaders quickly organized barbecues and beach outings in order to capture the ears and attention of the visitors around the issue of Guam’s political quest for citizenship.⁴¹ The Guam Museum’s

island-wide outings may have been part of an insidious process of militourism, but they were also important spaces of lobbying against the whimsical and arbitrary if not benevolent tyranny of the U.S. Naval Government. And, as if to also reel in the terms of development, in 1936, Washington D.C. removed the Guam Museum from under the auspices of the American Legion Mid-Pacific Post Number 1 and placed it firmly and formally under the U.S. Naval Government of Guam. Shortly after, the Navy rescinded some of Bradley's policies. For example, the Navy abolished the office of the village commissioners and deputy commissioners. And for the first time, the Navy sets a clear mission for the Guam Museum: To "insure that the material evidences of earlier civilization on the Island of Guam may be properly preserved and cared for."⁴²

In this pre-war effort to revamp the Guam Museum, the Naval Government also recruited Margaret Higgins, the wife of a naval officer, to serve as the museum's curator. She also translated Father Francisco Garcia's *The Life and Martyrdom of the Venerable Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores* (1683). Garcia's account in Spanish (there were a handful of Italian translations) has become something of a national treasure. However, it is Higgins' late-1930 English translations, as they were serialized in the Navy's major organ of expression at the time and as part of the mission of the Navy-run Guam Museum, that first provided Chamorros with an official accounting of their past that differed from the vernacular versions contained in legends and those contained in church rituals, like devotions called novenas. Such accounts became instrumental in the 20th century Chamorro movement to canonize Padre Sanvitores.⁴³

Indeed, in the post-war years and in what some Chamorros call a new era of U.S. colonialism and militarism, the Government of Guam- and Chamorro-led Guam Museum has become a nationalist project—whether it is simply a nationalist project or anti-colonial nationalist project remains to be seen. This is evidenced in a number of events and developments, two examples of which occurred between the 1980s and 1990s. One involved a traveling exhibition sponsored by the Guam Museum in the 1980s that began to question the legitimacy and nobility of the Catholic mission in the 17th century, asserting even that it was responsible for genocide. Another development occurred in the 1990s when the Guam Museum Commission insisted that the Museum should privilege indigenous Chamorro histories and perspectives over more recent multicultural contributions.⁴⁴

Today, the Guam Museum is faced with even more challenges, beginning with the question of just how it can raise \$20 million for the planned state-of-the-art facility. This challenge becomes even greater in light of the Pentagon's official announcement in 2006 that it would be relocating some 8,000 American marines, their

dependents, and support infrastructure from Okinawa to Guam by 2013. The relocation has been estimated to involve a total of 42,000 people, costing some 15 billion dollars, thereby skyrocketing the island's total population from about 173,000 in 2008 to 215,000, an increase in nearly 25%, in less than five years.⁴⁵ Such an explosion in the island's demographics will surely add tremendous social, economic, and political stress and challenges for Guam, and especially for its Chamorro heritage. But, such a shift will also represent not just a new phase of an old and ongoing colonial legacy but also a new and large and challenging "target audience" for the Guam Museum planners to have to contend with, to have to plan for, even accommodate. We can only imagine, at this point, just how the planners might conceptualize and exhibit the stresses and challenges that will become associated with the influx of this remarkably large, typically conservative, and characteristically hyper patriotic group of new Americans who will no doubt have some interest in the island's cultural and political pasts. As I have tried to show in this paper on the prewar history of the Guam Museum, the native Chamorro cultural past has always been linked to both American (and Naval) and Chamorro perspectives on modernization and civilization, always articulated to questions of political status if not self-determination or at least home-rule (under the flag and the Constitution of the United States). It is too early too tell, at the end of the first decade of the 21st century, on the eve of the latest (and largest) round of U.S. militourism to hit Guam, just how its Museum planners will consider, conceptualize, exhibit, display, indeed, engage, the newest forms of the island's "one hundred percent Americanism." To be sure, however, the endeavor was anything but a "modest beginning."

Notes

- 1 As quoted in the Guam Museum website: <http://www.guammuseum.com/welcome-message.htm>. For a history of Burnham's role in the 1893 Chicago World's Fair and "The White City" see Erik Larson. 2004. *The Devil in the White City: Murder, Magic, and Madness at the Fair that Changed America*. New York: Vintage Books.
- 2 "Faninadahen Kosas Guahan – Guam Museum." Multi-Year Report. January, 1999, 1. Prepared by Antonio M. Palomo, Executive Director, with assistance by Priscilla C. Villagomez.
- 3 The archival research for this project originates from a current book project that examines the gendered dimensions of U.S. colonialism in Guam and the role of American Navy wives in the "benevolent assimilation" of the Chamorros. Though Navy wives are not my main focus for this paper, many of them, like one Margaret Higgins, refashioned themselves in Guam as "new women" (women who transcended traditional gender norms around private and public and Victorian notions of proper women's behavior) through military projects like the Guam Museum. I argue that Navy wives rearticulated middle-class notions of white womanhood in Guam through what one Navy wife called the "small matters," and that in these cultural, political, and social spheres, Navy wives met Chamorro women who were equally determined to rearticulate traditional gender roles and social identities. One such woman was Agueda Johnston. Johnston was a prominent educator who also became active in the effort to build a museum for Guam. See Christine Taitano DeLisle. *Navy Wives/ Native Lives: The Cultural and Historical Relations between American Naval Wives and Chamorro Women in Guam, 1898-1945*. 2008. PhD Dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- 4 See Elaine Heumann Gurian. 2006. *Civilizing the Museum: The Collected Writings of Elaine Heumann Gurian*. London and New York: Routledge. Gurian urges museums to not simply abandon traditional museum practices but to embrace new practices around issues such as civic responsibility and social services. Other works on the changing museology have informed this paper: Gail Anderson. Editor. 2004. *Reinventing the Museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Paradigm Shift*. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press; Tony Bennett. 1995. *Birth of a Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. New York: Routledge; Stephen E. Weil. 2002. *Making Museums Matter*. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian.
- 5 For a history of how museums emerged out of civil societies but also became powerful cultural institutions that inculcated "civilized" behavior, see especially Tony Bennett 1995.
- 6 "The American Legion" in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VII, Number V, August 1930, 99. See also the American Legion's official website: <https://www.americanlegion.com/>. The Legion was started in Guam under the leadership of Commander J. A. McCormack and Chaplain Francis Albert both of whom had prior experience in Legion activities. Commander McCormack was one of the organizers of the American Legion who attended the caucuses in Paris and St. Louis in 1919 according to the article, "American Legion Mid Pacific Post No. 1 Hold First Public Function" (119) in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VII, Number VI, September 1930, 107, 118-9. On seventeen charter members and membership totaling 60 in August/September 1930, see the unpublished article "Guam American Legion Post Hold First Public Function" by Comrade J. S. Aflague, Post Historian and Member Publicity Committee. Folder: American Legion, Guam, 1930-1937, 1 of 2. Willis J. Bradley Papers. Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam. Mangilao, Guam; "American Legion" in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XIII, Number IV, July 1936, 4; official website of the Mid-Pacific Post Number 1 at: <http://www.guam-online.com/americanlegion/membership.htm>.
- 7 The Chamorro Bill of Rights resembled the U.S. Constitution's first Ten Amendments but was eventually rendered null by the U.S. Navy.
- 8 Program for Armistice Day Ceremonies, Mid-Pacific Post Number 1 American Legion, Guam, November 1930 Folder: American Legion, Guam, 1930-1937, 1 of 2. Willis J. Bradley Papers; "Guam Observes 20th Anniversary of the Armistice" in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XI, Number 9, December 1938, 14-5; 38-9; "American Legion Armistice Day Ceremonies" in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XV, Number X, January 1939, 13.
- 9 On the Navy's "civilizing" project in Guam in the areas of public education, public health, and public works, see the U.S. Navy Report on Guam, 1898-1950. United States Government, Department of Defense, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. Washington D.C.: U.S., 1950.
- 10 "American Legion Awards Prizes for School Endeavor" in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VII, Number XI, February 1931, 225; "American Legion Cups" in *The Guam Recorder*, July 1934, 69.
- 11 "Guam to Have a Museum ... Local Post, American Legion, To Sponsor A Collection of Scientific Curiosities and Records of Historical Value" in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VI, September

- 1931, 355; “American Legion Minstrel” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VIII, November 1931, 398. See also reference to an American Legion minstrel show in W. W. Rowley’s letter of September 29, 1931, Willis J. Bradley Papers; Copy of minstrel program in Folder: Invitations and Programs, Willis J. Bradley Papers. In 1933, the Legion’s letterhead reads: “Official Custodians of the Guam Museum.” Letter from Hiram Elliott to Willis Bradley, February 1933, Willis J. Bradley Papers.
- 12 “Faninadahen Kosas Guahan – Guam Museum” 1999, 4. Although there was no specific mention of the Guam Teacher’s Association, *The Guam Recorder*, noted the effort by Guam’s schools in collecting “a considerable amount of material” in “Guam to Have a Museum ... Local Post, American Legion, To Sponsor A Collection of Scientific Curiosities and Records of Historical Value” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VI, September 1931, 355.
- 13 “Monuments” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume 2, Number 22, January 1926, 295; “Guam Prominent Resident Passes Away” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XIII, Number XI, February 1937, 6-A, 18-B.
- 14 Ibid.
- 15 When the U.S. acquired Guam from Spain after the Spanish American War in 1898, the Northern Mariana Islands were sold to Germany. When World War I broke out, Japan seized Germany’s holdings in the Marianas and the rest of Micronesia.
- 16 The Bishop Museum eventually de-accessioned and returned some objects to the Guam Museum in the 1930s, including the skeletal remains of one Chamorro ancestor. At the request of Chamorro rights activists in the 1990s, the Bishop Museum repatriated several more Chamorro ancestral remains to the Government of Guam.
- 17 For the reference to the “The Curiosity Shop” owned and operated by Gertrude Hornbostel, see *The Guam Recorder*, Volume 5, Number I, April 1928, 2. See also Ad for Hornbostel’s “Island Curio Shop” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume 5, Number I, April 1928, 15.
- 18 “Guam to Have a Museum ... Local Post, American Legion, To Sponsor A Collection of Scientific Curiosities and Records of Historical Value” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VI, September 1931, 355.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 Ibid. See also “Monuments” (reprinted from Recorder, January 1926) in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VI, 361.
- 21 Philip J. Deloria. 1998. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 22 Bennett 1994; Gerard Corsane. Editor. 2005. *Issues in Heritage, Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*. New York: Routledge; Alissandra Cummins. 2004 (Autumn). “Caribbean Museums and National Identity” in *History Workshop Journal*. Issue 58, 224-45.
- 23 “Monuments” 1926, 295.
- 24 “Guam Museum Observes Third Anniversary ... Greater improvement seen under present Naval Administration Plans” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XII, Number 7, October 1935, 179.
- 25 Ibid. In 2000, in response to the protests of Chamorro rights activists, the Bishop Museum again repatriated ancient Chamorro remains to Guam. That same year, the Bishop also repatriated approximately 75 sets of ancient Chamorro remains collected in the early 1900s to the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas (C.N.M.I.). See the article by Jean Christensen, “Native Hawaiians’ Remains Coming Home” in *Los Angeles Times*. April 16, 2000, 1.
- 26 “Guam Museum Observes Third Anniversary . . . Greater improvement seen under present Naval Administration Plans” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XII, Number 7, October 1935, 179.
- 27 “The Guam Museum” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XII, Number 9, December 1935, 250.
- 28 Letter from Rowley to Bradley, November 19, 1934. Willis J. Bradley Papers.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Christine T. DeLisle. 2008. “Tumuge’ Pâpa’ (Writing It Down): Chamorro Midwives and the Delivery of Native History” in *Women Writing Oceania: Weaving the Sails of Vaka*. Caroline Sinavaiana and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, Editors. Special Issue of *Pacific Studies*. Volume 30, Numbers (1/2), 20-32; DeLisle 2009.
- 31 Teresia K. Teaiwa. 1999. “Reading Gauguin’s *Noa Noa* with Hau’ofa’s *Nederends*: ‘Militourism,’ Feminism and the ‘Polynesian’ Body” in *Inside Out: Theorizing Pacific Literature*. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, Editors. Colorado: Rowman and Littlefield, 249-64.
- 32 When asked about the history of the Guam Museum under the American Legion, present Museum Curator Tony Ramirez said the Legion wanted to “showcase Guam’s culture” to visitors who arrived to Guam in large numbers onboard the new Pan American Airways China Clipper flights. See a three-part series

entitled “The Guam Museum” by Sonya Artero on KUAM News, which ran 1-3 February 2008.

- 33 In 1919, Governor William Gilmer passed the Navy’s first anti-miscegenation law prohibiting whites defined as those not having Chamorro, Filipino, or Negro blood from marrying Chamorros or Filipinos. Executive General Order No. 326, September 29, 1919. “Executive General Order & Notices” in *Guam News Letter*, Volume XI, Number 4, 10. Folder: 1919-1937. Note: Within the letter submitted to former Navy Governor Edward Dorn there is a reference to the letter coming from those ‘who are known as the “Shoe Gang.”’ Edward J. Dorn Papers. Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress. Washington D.C.
- 34 Legion Commander Elliott inquired if Bradley was interested in returning to Guam. Letter from Elliott to Bradley, December 6, 1932. In his response, Bradley expressed a strong desire to return to Guam. Letter from Bradley to Elliott, January 13, 1933. Willis J. Bradley Papers.
- 35 On the Legion’s petition to the Navy to reappoint Bradley see Letter from Elliott to Chief of Naval Operations, January 13, 1933; Letter from Elliott to Bradley, April 17, 1933. Willis J. Bradley Papers.
- 36 Letter from Elliott to Bradley, November 24, 1933. Willis J. Bradley Papers.
- 37 Letter from Bryan to Elliott, January 30, 1934. Willis J. Bradley Papers.
- 38 Letter from Bradley to Elliott, January 29, 1934. Willis J. Bradley Papers. Bradley talked repeatedly with Elliott about the repercussions of his actions in Guam.
- 39 *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XI, Number 8, November 1934.
- 40 “Citizenship for Residents of Guam: Hearings Before the United States Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, Seventy-Fifth Congress, First Session.” April 9, 10, 16; June 9, 1937. United States Congress.
- 41 Penelope Bordallo-Hofschneider. 2001. *A Campaign for Political Rights in Guam, 1899-1950*. Saipan: NMI Division of Historic Preservation; *Hale’-ta: I Ma Gubetna-ña Guam, Governing Guam: Before and After the Wars*. 1994. Agana, Guam: Political Status Education Coordinating Commission.
- 42 Guam Museum Papers. Guam Museum Notes. September 1937, 31. Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam. Mangilao, Guam.
- 43 For a history of the effort to canonize Sanvitores and

Chamorro political and cultural stakes, see Vicente M. Diaz. Forthcoming. *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Idigeneity in Guam*. Pacific Islands Monograph Series. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

- 44 “Report of the Museum Commission.” December 2, 1991.
- 45 Steve Limtiaco. “Marines are coming, but movement not expected to start for at least 6 years.” *Pacific Daily News*. 2006 Year in Review at: http://www.guampdn.com/guampublishing/specialsections/top10_2006/03marines.html; Gaynor Dumat-ol Daleno. “20 years of growth in 5: Guam Population Will Add 42,000 by 2013.” *Pacific Daily News*, September 14, 2008 at: <http://www.guampdn.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20080914/NEWS01/809140308>.

Bibliography

Archival Collections

Willis J. Bradley Papers. Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam. Mangilao, Guam.

Edward J. Dorn Papers. Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress. Washington D.C.

Margaret M. Higgins Papers. Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam. Mangilao, Guam.

Agueda I. Johnston Papers. Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam. Mangilao, Guam.

John L. McCrea Papers. Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress. Washington D.C.

Guam Museum Papers. Richard Flores Taitano Micronesia Area Research Center, University of Guam. Mangilao, Guam.

Primary Sources

“American Legion” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XIII, Number IV, July 1936, 4.

“American Legion Armistice Day Ceremonies” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XV, Number X, January 1939, 13.

“American Legion Awards Prizes for School Endeavor” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VII, Number XI, February 1931, 225.

“American Legion Cups” in *The Guam Recorder*, July 1934, 69.

UM Working Papers in Museum Studies, Number 4 (2010)

“American Legion Mid Pacific Post No. 1 Hold First Public Function” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VII, Number VI, September 1930, 107, 118-9.

“American Legion Minstrel” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VIII, November 1931, 398.

Executive General Order No. 326, September 29, 1919.

“Executive General Order & Notices” in *Guam News Letter*, Volume XI, Number 4, 10.

“Guam Museum Observes Third Anniversary ... Greater improvement seen under present Naval Administration Plans” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XII, Number 7, October 1935, 179.

“Guam Observes 20th Anniversary of the Armistice” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XI, Number 9, December 1938, 14-5; 38-9.

“Guam Prominent Resident Passes Away” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XIII, Number XI, February 1937, 6-A, 18-B.

“Guam to Have a Museum ... Local Post, American Legion, To Sponsor A Collection of Scientific Curiosities and Records of Historical Value” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VI, September 1931, 355.

“Island Curio Shop” (Advertisement) in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume 5, Number I, April 1928, 15.

“Monuments” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume 2, Number 22, January, 1926, 295-6.

“Monuments” (Reprinted from *Recorder*, January 1926) in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VIII, Number VI, 361.

“The American Legion” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume VII, Number V, August 1930, 99.

“The Curiosity Shop” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume 5, Number I, April 1928, 2.

“The Guam Museum” in *The Guam Recorder*, Volume XII, Number 9, December 1935, 250.

The Guam Recorder, Volume XI, Number 8, November 1934.

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Gail. Editor. 2004. *Reinventing the Museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Paradigm Shift*. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press.

Bennett, Tony. 1995. *Birth of a Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Corsane, Gerard. Editor. 2005. *Issues in Heritage*,

Museums and Galleries: An Introductory Reader. New York: Routledge.

Cummins, Alissandra. 2004 (Autumn). “Caribbean Museums and National Identity” in *History Workshop Journal*. Issue 58, 224-45.

DeLisle, Christine Taitano. 2008. *Navy Wives/Native Lives: The Cultural and Historical Relations between American Naval Wives and Chamorro Women in Guam, 1898-1945*. PhD Dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

_____. 2007. “Tumuge’ Pâpa’ (Writing It Down): Chamorro Midwives and the Delivery of Native History” in *Women Writing Oceania: Weaving the Sails of Vaka*. Caroline Sinavaiana and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, Editors. Special Issue of *Pacific Studies*. Volume 30, Numbers (1/2), 20-32.

Deloria, Philip J. 1998. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Diaz, Vicente M. Forthcoming. *Repositioning the Missionary: Rewriting the Histories of Colonialism, Native Catholicism, and Indigeneity in Guam*. Pacific Islands Monograph Series. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

Gurian, Elaine Heumann. 2006. *Civilizing the Museum: The Collected Writings of Elaine Heumann Gurian*. London and New York: Routledge.

Larson, Erik. 2004. *The Devil in the White City: Murder, Magic, and Madness at the Fair that Changed America*. New York: Vintage Books.

Teaiwa, Teresia K. 1999. “Reading Gauguin’s *Noa Noa* with Hau’ofa’s *Nederends*: ‘Militourism,’ Feminism and the ‘Polynesian’ Body” in *Inside Out: Theorising Pacific Literature*. Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, Editors. Colorado: Rowman and Littlefield, 249-64.

Weil, Stephen E. 2002. *Making Museums Matter*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian.

Government Reports

“Faninadahen Kosas Guahan – Guam Museum.” Multi-Year Report. January, 1999, 1. Prepared by Antonio M. Palomo, Executive Director, with assistance by Priscilla C. Villagomez.

“Report of the Museum Commission.” December 2, 1991.

U.S. Navy Report on Guam, 1898-1950. United States Government, Department of Defense, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. Washington, D.C.: U.S., 1950.



Television and Newspaper Reports

Christensen, Jean. "Native Hawaiians' Remains Coming Home." *Los Angeles Times*. April 16, 2000, 1.

Artero, Sonya. "The Guam Museum" (Parts 1, 2, 3). KUAM News, 1-3 February 2008.

Websites

<https://www.americanlegion.com>

<http://www.guammuseum.com>

<http://www.guam-online.com/americanlegion>

<http://www.guampdn.com>